73-A2080
5 11
R5
2d Set

Appendix

American Hospital Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, a reporter of great ability, keen insight, and outstanding objectivity is Michael J. O'Neill, the Washington bureau chief of the Medical World News. Mr. O'Neill has recently paid tribute to the director of the Washington office of the American Hospital Association, Kenneth Williamson, whom Congress knows as a most effective spokesman for hospitals. Those of us in the health field have a high regard for Ken Williamson and his dedicated services; and I am very pleased to call the attention of the Members of the Senate to the article entitled "Capital Rounds," which was published in the March 26, 1965, issue of Medical World News.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAPITAL ROUNDS

(By Michael J. O'Neill)

Kenneth Williamson, the American Hospital Association's man in Washington, is a quiet operator. He shuns the spotlight as vigorously as a politician seeks it. But he knows the Government and Congress like the back of his own hand. And he gets results.

It is no accident that the House Ways and Means Committee's new medicare bill is just about what the doctor ordered—as far as the American Hospital Association is concerned. Williamson and his staff have been working behind the scenes for nearly a decade to bring this about.

They have kept in constant and cooperative touch with key figures in the Government, such as medicare's chief architect, Wilbur J. Cohen. They have worked closely and well with such congressional leaders as Ways and Means Committee Chairman WILBUR D. MILLS, Democrat, of Arkansas. And they have even maintained friendly contacts with the AFL–CIO's top spokesman on social security affairs, Nelson H. Cruikshank.

Even more important, however, is that Williamson long ago recognized that powerful political and social forces were propelling the Federal Government more and more deeply into the health field. And he decided that these forces could not be rolled back, or even simply dammed up. The most the American Hospital Association could hope to do, he felt, was to influence the trend enough to promote a good working relationship between the Government and the hospitals, and thus avoid a permanent estrangement.

Williamson knows the hospital field inside and out. As an experienced hospital administrator, he helped start Blue Cross in southern California, helped fight a compulsory health bill as head of the California Hospital Association, and later served as executive director of the Association of Western Hospitals. He joined the American Hospital Association as assistant director during World War II and sparked the development of many of its important programs.

CONSERVATISM NO BAR TO REALISM

After a brief tour of duty as executive vice president with the Health Information Foundation, Williamson returned to the American Hospital Association as an associate director in 1953 and took over its increasingly important Washington operations. He is a conservative and just as opposed to Government medicine as most doctors. But he is also a hard-boiled political realist who feels that it is better to work with rather than against the political and social tides.

"The primary requirement is to meet the needs of the public," he says. "There are certain things which the voluntary field can do by itself. But where we see that the needs cannot be met this way, we should take the initiative to bring in the Government in a supporting role. If you just sit on your haunches and oppose the Government at every turn, you run the very great risk of ending up forcing the Government to go further than it wants to or needs to."

Williamson disagrees with his American Medical Association colleagues who argue that medicare and similar Federal health programs are driving the country straight down the road to socialized medicine. "One of the main reasons that socialized medicine has developed in Britain and some other countries," he says, "is that the health groups failed to act voluntarily to bring the Government in to help meet the public's needs. As a result, a system they don't like was forced on them. We are on quite a different course here in the United States. We are moving toward a partnership with the Government in the health field. And this is a good thing."

THE AMERICAN HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION GIVES COMPLETE COOPERATION

In addition, Williamson argued for cooperating fully with every Government agency, congressional committee, Senator, or Congressman working on aged-care legislation. Whether a proposal was good, bad, or indifferent, the American Hospital Association cheerfully supplied technical data, cost estimates, special analyses, and anything else that was requested.

Williamson encouraged the Social Security Administration to make on-the-spot studies of hospitals, and talked the hospitals into cooperating fully. The American Hospital Association called in special teams of experts, arranged meetings, and sponsored studies to help the drafters of legislation solve special problems.

As a result, Cohen, MILLS, and other key officials gradually concluded that they could depend on the hospitals to cooperate in the development of an effective medicare bill. They were receptive to the American Hospital Association's suggestions—even to the idea that it would be good to have Blue Cross serve as an intermediary between the hospitals and the Government.

On this point, Williamson and his staff kept insisting that Blue Cross could do a better administrative job than the Government, charge less, provide better controls over hospital standards and utilization, develop a more effective information program for the aged, and smooth relations between the the hospitals and the Social Security Administration. And a provision to let hospitals pick their own administrative agency—which will almost certainly be Blue Cross—finally found its way into the medicare bill.

Williamson and his team also played a role in getting the bill's drafters to provide full reimbursement for hospital costs, to permit the Joint Commission on Accreditation to police standards, and to require a hospital affiliation for long-term facilities.

All in all, the many medicare provisions favoring hospitals are the product of years of behind-the-scenes effort and skillful legislative strategy. And much of the credit for this belongs to the American Hospital Association's quiet man in Washington.

Jewish Federation-Council of Los Angeles Honors Congressman Jim Corman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON EDWARDS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, on January 31, 1965, the Jewish Federation-Council of Greater Los Angeles presented its coveted Hollzer Award to Congressman JAMES C. CORMAN. The award was in recognition of JIM CORMAN'S outstanding service in fostering good will and understanding among religious and racial groups in the Los Angeles area.

The award was presented by Mr. Walter S. Hilborn, dean of the Jewish community of Los Angeles. Mr. Hilborn is a member of the board of directors of the Jewish Federation-Council of Greater Los Angeles and a vice chairman of its community relations committee.

I know that my colleagues of both parties would like to join in this salute to JIM CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I place in the RECORD both Mr. Hilborn's introductory remarks and the acceptance speech of our distinguished colleague from California [Mr. CORMAN]:

PRESENTATION OF AWARD BY MR. WALTER S. HILBORN

Throughout the years we have worked diligently to strengthen civil rights guaranteed to all persons by the Constitution and to preserve the basic separation of church and state. Each year at our annual meeting we adopt resolutions which evidence our dedication to these ideals. Thus, we were vitally concerned with the ultimate enactment of the civil rights bill by the Congress last year.

Congressman JAMES CORMAN, our honoree, was a decisive factor in each field. His important role in the enactment of the civil

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

rights bill was described by John Averill in the Los Angeles Times in the following eulogistic language:

"As one of the junior members of the House Judiciary Committee he demonstrated such immediate talent in piercing to the heart of complex legal questions and shattering arguments by the opposition, that he wound up as the leading utility man for the Northern Democratic forces, backing the bill." Aveill quoted a southerner: "If we could have Corman on our side, we might have come out of this in better shape."

For his leadership in this historic fight we are deeply indebted to Congressman CORMAN. We are equally grateful to him for his fight against the Becker amendment, which—if it had passed—would have brought religion into our public schools. In this fight he showed himself to be a man of principle and of courage. His position on that issue almost cost him his seat in Congress, for his opponent and right wing radical extremists used this during the last campaign to smear and defeat him. Fortunately, they failed at it.

His battles fought were our battles. All we can do is honor him by presenting to him the highest and most coveted award of the organized Jewish community, named after our first president, the late Judge Harry Hollzer. The award, which bears his likeness, has the following inscription:

"TO CONGRESSMAN JAMES CORMAN

"For outstanding service in fostering good will and understanding among religious and racial groups in the Los Angeles area.

"Presented by the Jewish Federation-Council of Greater Los Angeles at its annual meeting, January 31, 1965. "Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together."

Congressman CORMAN, it is a distinct honor and privilege to present this award to you in behalf of the Jewish Federation-Council of Greater Los Angeles. May this occasion always be one of the durable satisfactions of your life.

ACCEPTANCE OF AWARD BY CONGRESSMAN JAMES CORMAN

You all must know how truly honored and delighted I am to receive the Hollzer Memorial Award. This occasion reminds us of the impact for good that one man's life can have on the lives of so many. The 66 years that Harry Hollzer was on this earth and, more specifically, the 13 years he devoted to unifying the Jewish community of Los Angeles, have given to our city an organization with purpose, with direction, and with strength, an organization which has eased the burden of countless citizens and has enriched the total community.

The most debilitating question in this large, complex, and imperfect world of ours is always "But what can I—only one—do about it?" When we are tempted to answer that question with "Nothing," we would be well advised to review the life of a single man, Judge Harry Hollzer.

To share with you this observance of 500 combined years of service is a stellar occasion. That is a lot of years—more years than all the committee chairmen, put together, have served in the Congress. That 500 years of service has changed the lives of thousands of citizens of Los Angeles. It has given orphaned children homes and families. It has helped combat racial bigotry and anti-Semitism. It has made loans available to students and businessmen. Truly, it has reached almost every segment of community life.

The fact has not escaped my attention that last year you honored a prominent politician, the year before a famous Methodist lawyer. I cannot claim to be in their class, but at least I am in the category of both. You have generously mentioned two efforts in which it was my good fortune to be involved during the last Congress: Passage of the Civil Rights Act and defeat of the Becker amendment. It was a satisfying year for me, and a successful one for all who have some understanding of, and respect for, the constitutional rights of individual Americans.

FREEDOM OF RELIGION

In dealing with the Becker amendment, our greatest adversary was a broadcast misunderstanding of what religious freedom in America is all about. It is my observation that most people respect the right to religious freedom of each American. Though theologically we may suspect that all our Friday or Sunday morning seatmates are headed for Hell in a breadbasket, we're willing to go along with the system which gives them that choice. Yet, many have lost sight of the proper relationship between the church and the state. If we are to retain that freedom of choice, we must keep our religious activities above and beyond the control of Government. The Becker proposal, advocated as a step toward bringing God into our public life, would, in truth, have brought Government regulation into our individual religious convictions and practices.

This controversy is rooted in a nationalism that has more and more become defied. Patriotism for one's country is a laudable trait. But nationalism raised to the level of religious fervor is disastrous. History is replete with the tyrant's use of religious nationalism.

We have won the battle with Becker, thanks to the vigorous efforts of every major religious denomination in this country. His cause is pretty well laid to rest. But this was the battle, not the war. The ill-conceived union of the cross and the flag, as epitomized by Gerald L. K. Smith, is a trusted tool of the rightwing. We are far from delivered from that scourge.

CIVIL RIGHTS

A much more constructive endeavor of the 88th Congress was the passage of the Civil Rights Act. This legislation was a reflection of a new high in our national standards of morality. We abolished the legality of racial discrimination in important segments of American society. To all Americans, we said that race, color, or religion would no longer be used to deny equality at the ballot box, in the marketplace, or in the enjoyment of public facilities. The act was the accomplishment of two great Presidents and two great political parties each making substantial and constructive contributions. John F. Kennedy was the principal architect of the bill. Lyndon B. Johnson made it his first objective when history thrust the Presidency upon him. Congressmen CELLER and MCCULLOCH in the House, and the then Senator HUMPHREY and Senator KUCHEL in the Senate, led a successful legislative battle which was beyond the most optimistic hopes of those of us who support strong civil rights legislation.

I think we would not do proper honor to the memory of Harry Hollzer if we took this occasion to congratulate ourselves for a job well done in the field of human relations and, more specifically, race relations. At best, we may say that we have a job well begun. We must recognize that the Negro would have considerably less than equality, and the Nation considerably less than harmony, if we must resort to legislative statute and court decree at every point in our interracial relations. We shall not have attained our ultimate goal until that day when a legislative committee could find no witnesses interested in civil rights legislation, and that day when a judge would be shocked that a citizen would have to come to his court to obtain equality with his fellow citizen of another color.

MORALITY AND THE LAW

Frequently, during the course of our hearings on the Civil Rights Act we were urged to do nothing because you cannot legislate morality. We rejected this premise, not because it was untrue, but because it was irrelevant. Just as all laws do, the 1964 Civil Rights Act prohibits certain kinds of conduct. It doesn't establish morality in the hearts of men.

This is the promising and exciting challenge which lies ahead for each of us and for our Nation. If one wonders how far we have to go, I would remind you that just last November an overwhelming majority of Californians decided that although we are delighted to have Negroes play baseball at Dodger Stadium, we don't want them playing on our neighborhood sandlots. But 20 short years ago we wouldn't even let them play in Dodger Stadium. Let's hope it doesn't take us 20 years to realize what we are doing to ourselves by the decision we made last November. We need to think a little less about how lucky Willie Mays is that he is allowed to play baseball and a little more about how fortunate we are to live in a day when we can watch him. I'd like to say, parenthetically, that this analogy would be a little more accurate, and our chances for winning the 1965 World Series would be a little better, if Willie Mays played more often in Dodger Stadium and less at Candlestick Park.

PROGRESS IN HUMAN RELATIONS

The discouraging part of our progress in race relations is that, although no one wants to go back from whence we came, few seem to want to go on from where we are. I suggest to you that in this endeavor each of us has a tremendous opportunity to prove the validity of racial equality by living it daily. For most of us it is going to involve change. From time to time it will be awkward and, from time to time, we may have to be unpleasant to those who resist change. But the objective is well worth the effort. If we can relieve our society of the artificial barriers which lock some people out and other people in, if we can remove fear and suspicion from our own hearts, then our few brief years on this planet will certainly have been worth while to us, to our neighbors, and to our Nation.

Proposed Voting Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, a number of people have called to my attention an excerpt from Babson's Reports, dated March 22, 1965, and entitled "Southern Transition." These comments from Babson's Reports are concerned with the President's proposed voting rights legislation. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTHERN TRANSITION

Southern businessmen—particularly those in communities or regions having majority Negro population—are weighing the implications of passage of the proposed voting rights bill.

If the measure should be passed in the essential form proposed by the President, it would, for practical purposes, do away with all but the simplest of voter qualification tests for local as well as national elections.

There's no doubt that political control of countless southern towns, cities, even coun-

ties, will be in the hands of Negro citizens within a short space of time.

In most cases, local Negroes do not have the education, training, or ability to handle governmental responsibility.

A further problem is the fact that the Negroes in countless communities constitute the have-not group, and it is feared the local taxes may be raised drastically by the new governments in an effort to correct this imbalance hurriedly by much enlarged welfare programs and other redistributive devices.

This could lead to the abandonment of some property and the closing or relocation of local businesses.

It appears quite likely that a large number of "ghost towns" may thus be created, requiring a substantial Federal assistance.

Because of the deep feelings developed during the recent crises, it cannot be expected that the passage of a law will correct all that is wrong, or protect the affected areas from new—and sometimes graver—problems of transition.

Astronauts Get a Wet Welcome

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Gay Talese has accurately captured the spirit of the welcome given our astronauts, Virgil I. Grissom and John W. Young, in New York City on Monday. This New York Times reporter clearly describes the enthusiasm and support of the New York public and, I believe, the Nation, of our space program, as personified by our heroic astronauts. Particular note should be taken of the words spoken by our Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY for this tumultuous welcome in New York City. Surely this represents the ground swell of American opinion to continue our exploration and development of space:

ASTRONAUTS GET A WET WELCOME—BUT CHILLY RAIN HERE FAILS TO DAMPEN THE JOY OVER GRISSOM AND YOUNG

(By Gay Talese)

New Yorkers littered the sky yesterday with tons of swirling tickertape, confetti, and old newspaper headlines—and at the bottom of it all, moving slowly up lower Broadway, surrounded by marching bands, were two quiet Americans: Virgil I. Grissom and John W. Young.

It was no day for a parade. It rained hard and the wind was raw. And yet at noon several thousand people waited along Broadway to cheer the astronauts who last week rocketed into space—and yesterday rode past at 7 miles an hour in a Lincoln convertible.

Sitting between them, poised and gregarious—so different from the astronauts—was Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, who had flown to New York an hour before. At La Guardia Airport, he greeted the spacemen, their families and dignitaries.

"The people of the United States," he said, "are proud of the achievements of these two young men and I am sure that New York, rain or no rain, will give them a welcome the likes of which they have never had."

Then the motorcade, consisting of 25 autos and 40 police motorcycles, formed and the ride began from LaGuardia to the starting point of the parade—Bowling Green Park in downtown Manhattan.

This is New York's oldest park. In 1776 there was a riotous scene there with patriots knocking off the British crowns that capped the park's fence. But at 12:05 p.m. yesterday, as the parade began to move, the fence and the park's trees were streaming with ticker tape tossed from a dozen skyscrapers by hundreds of people who did not mind getting their heads wet in the driving rain.

OVER 5,000 POUNDS OF PAPER

Most of the tape and wastepaper, 5,000 pounds of it, was provided by the city's department of public events; but it was so windy at noon that paper was blown from one window to another, from one skyscraper to another.

Marge Scheyder, a receptionist standing at a 13th-floor window of the Irving Trust Co.'s offices, had only to stretch a hand to catch flying ticker tape and throw it down at the astronauts below.

Five minutes after the parade began, Major Grissom, Lieutenant Commander Young, and Vice President HUMPHREY were entangled in tape and speckled with confetti, and the windshield wipers of their car swabbed furiously in an effort to prevent the soggy paper from blocking the view.

Ahead on Broadway the space heroes could see flags waving on both sides of the street, cameras flashing in their faces, people waving from roofs and those in the street yelling, "Good work, Gus. Attaboy, John."

As they continued to roll uptown toward city hall the astronauts discovered part of the international world that is New York. They moved past the offices of Lufthansa, then Sardi's Pizza, then Berlitz; then the Bank of Montreal, the Bank of Tokyo, the French American Banking Corp., the Marine Midland Trust Co., the Bank of North America.

Then they passed McCoy's Irish Bar—and a drinker stood on a stool and yelled out the door, "Good boy, Gus." A woman in the Parklane Hosiery Shop, inspecting seamless micromesh stockings, walked out into the rain and stood on her toes and tried to see.

But she could not see a thing; most people could not. The police ringed the motorcade so tightly that, to most sidewalk witnesses yesterday, the parade was merely the noise of motorcycles, the flash of cameras, the long strands of ticker tape that tangled even with the tower of Trinity Church and cut across the nose of the courtyard statue of John Wattes—last royal recorder of New York (died 1836).

Commander Young's middle name is Watts, but he is no relation of the royal recorder. When the motorcade finally got to city hall, Mayor Wagner took the commander to a painting of New York State's 15th Governor, John Young (1847–1949). No relation, the astronaut said.

After Mayor Wagner introduced the spacemen to dignitaries in city hall, they all assembled on the portico steps. The bands continued to play, rain falling into the brass instruments, everybody drenched, and that is why the speeches were so short.

The commissioner of public events, Richard C. Patterson, introduced everybody to the crowd and then Mayor Wagner presented the two astronauts, as well as to Dr. Robert C. Seamans, with the city's highest award—to Gold Medal of Honor.

Dr. Seamans, who is Associate Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, said: "I think I can speak in behalf of the entire space program when I extend a vote of thanks for the opportunity you have given us to explore space."

THE SPACEMEN JUST SMILE

The astronauts, who generally abhor public speaking and even shy away from interviews, said nothing. They merely smiled, as did their families seated nearby. Then Vice President HUMPHREY, hatless as he was in the parade, told the gathering:

"America salutes not only the astronauts, not only the scientists, and not only their families, but the thousands and thousands of people engaged in the space program who made this Gemini flight possible."

After the city hall program was over, at 12:50 p.m., the motorcade moved to the United Nations.

There the Secretary General, U Thant, presented medals and two autograph sets of United Nations stamps to the astronauts. Then it was a private lunch at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel and more speeches, more praise, more applause.

That is the way it continued even as the space heroes and their party made plans to see the Broadway musical, "Hello, Dolly."

Major Grissom was put in a spot he likes to avoid—speaking to the public. Smiling, he told the Waldorf-Astoria gathering: "We were overwhelmed by New York—as all small-town boys should be."

Then Commander Young, still damp, said, "I haven't seen so much water since we got out of the Atlantic."

Today the astronauts are scheduled, after a brief stop in Newark, to appear in Chicago—for another parade and more receptions and speeches.

A World They Never Made—Luckily

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MILWARD L. SIMPSON

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, with his usual wit and preception, Columnist-Publisher Jenkin Lloyd Jones has zeroed in on the beatnik and Zen Buddhist set which flutters around the campuses of many of our great northern universities. In a column entitled "A World They Never Made—Luckily," Mr. Jones notes:

There is euphoria in self-pity, comfort in blaming the older generation, smugness in unbarbered rebellion that is not much else.

Mr. Jones spent a few hours in the "kookie corner" of one of our northern universities—"a place where aversion to soap has somehow been confused with profundity," and he was not at all impressed with what he saw.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that his column from the March 27 Washington Star on the kooks and their corner be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A WORLD THEY NEVER MADE—LUCKILY

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

I have been visiting a couple of our great northern universities and in one of them I spent half an hour sitting around the kookie corner looking at and listening to the beats and the Zens.

The kookie corner usually occupies part of the large basement snack bars in the student union buildings where coffee is cheap and talk is priceless. For laboratory examples of sophomoric sophistry and contrived eccentricity you can't beat it.

It is a place where aversion to soap has somehow been confused with profundity. Here is where the beards gather, and the girls in blue jeans and boots carry guitars. Sheep dog hair-dos and Neanderthal hair-

cuts are a dime a gross. But saddest of all is the uniform—the uniform of the slob.

The kookie corner abounds with talk—high flown, furious, cynical or bitter. No one has much experience, and not many are really very good students, but cork-weight ideas feathered by polysyllabic words are batted back and forth like badminton birds, and everyone imagines he is enunciating great truths.

At the round table next to me I tuned in on a Niagara of conversation between one musk ox, two male airedales, two nanny goats and a chittering chimpanzee about the evils of American militarists and our "imperialist posture" in Vietnam. They were sympathizing with themselves over the possibility of being caught inside a fireball, and a proposed protest march was under discussion.

The musk ox laughed bitterly and shook his shaggy head.

"It's a world I never made," he said.

Now, there, of course, was truth.

For all the frightening implications of a technology that can now destroy continents (which the musk ox and his friends had nothing to do with) there are several other things they had nothing to do with, either.

One was the building of the great university, the product of millions of man-hours behind the plow, in the snow-drifted lumber camps, in the foundries and offices. It was built because citizens, most of whom had never seen the inside of a college classroom, were prepared to contribute an enormous value of cheese, wheat, automobiles, and pulp, which they might otherwise have put in their own pockets, to the higher education of their children, including the musk ox.

There have been other dividends from the world he never made. One is life. If persons now long dead had not dissected plague victims, experimented with dangerous pox pustules and permitted themselves to be bitten by anopheles mosquitoes, three of the six places at that roundtable would be vacant.

The musk ox and his friends may plan a protest march in safety because men long forgotten chose to die at barricades. The fact that the denial of this right in faroff Selma, Ala., gains the top headlines indicates the measures of the victory. The musk ox may go to the university library and read books sneering at representative democracy and advocating the dictatorship of the proletariat because men risked death for freedom of speech in the world he never made.

Ah, yes. The musk ox is against militarism and war. On this campus the week after the military ball there is the antimilitary ball. The beats and the members of ad hoc committees for this and that are out in force.

When I was in college I was sure that wars were made by shadowy "merchants of death," promoting their huge munitions industries from castles in Switzerland. Weapons made wars. Disarmament, even if only we disarmed, was the answer.

So I laughed at my friend, Andy, who was in ROTC, wasting his time in the afternoons parading around with that ridiculous Springfield on his shoulder.

When the roof fell in at Pearl Harbor Andy and a thin khaki line were over on Bataan. Andy never got back. But he bought a little time while the rest of us could build some ships, go through crash training, and get over to restore the situation.

"World I never made." There is euphoria in self-pity, comfort in blaming the older generation, smugness in unbarbered rebellion that is not much else.

I wonder what the sons and daughters of the musk ox, the airedales, the nanny goats and the chimp will say about the world their parents made.

Another Tragedy in Alabama—But Who Is To Blame?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following editorial from the Southwest Virginia Enterprise, Wytheville, Va., of March 30, 1965:

The cowardly murder of a Michigan housewife, mother of five children is another horrible tragedy—the aftermath of Martin Luther King's big production of a nonsensical propaganda show. We again point out the idea—the march and everything connected with it was absurd. It positively accomplished nothing except widening the gap between two races, and paint a distorted and prejudiced picture of Alabama and the South. Also it is now recognized as we emphasized prior to the march of eccentrics, that the entire plan would have flopped if the TV, radio, wire services, magazine reporters and photographers had not made the inexcusable mistake of labeling it as news—taking priority over every happening or event anywhere on the globe.

The Enterprise fully recognizes the various reasons that can be advanced as to why a mother with five children shouldn't be far away from home, and taking chances that scarcely any woman would take in being a chauffeur for the Selma-to-Montgomery marchers.

But the fact remains that low minded criminals fired upon her car as she drove along the dark highway and those so involved are madmen. The cowardly act is regretted by the citizens of Alabama, by Governor Wallace, and southerners' regrets are even deeper than that of the majority of the people of the remainder of the Nation.

The distraught and highly nervous husband the day after the killing acted naturally in placing the blame on Governor Wallace. But any half-way fair-minded person will readily realize that Mr. Luizzio is in gross error, as is anyone anywhere who attempts to place the blame or condemn the Alabama chief executive. The same idea prevailed when the Rev. James Reeb died from injuries received while engaged in civil rights demonstrating in Selma. This is the proof of what takes place when hysteria is created. A pent-up-electrically-charged emotional situation has created a national disgrace.

Who is really to blame for the deaths in Alabama? Governor Wallace refused to allow the march. When he realized the President and Justice Department were going to assure the march in disobedience and against highway safety laws and State laws, Wallace wisely requested that the Federal Government assume the responsibility for the safety of the demonstrators. How correct he was, for think how much louder would have been the hue and cry if only State police and State troopers had been on duty. Yet Mr. Johnson's wrath was very evident at being asked to accept the responsibility for the march he approved.

It is our contention the responsibility for the death of Mrs. Luizzio and likewise Reverend Reeb rests upon the shoulders of the leaders and planners of the march of infamy. Dr. Martin Luther King would not have been stopped in his determination and obsession to grab the headlines and see the irrational plan was carried out. President Johnson and the Justice Department cannot escape from sharing the responsibility. In our firm belief the National Council of Churches leaders stand today in the dazzling spotlight of opinion of all unbiased people as also being among those responsible for the tragedies. Remember the National Council of Churches made a nationwide appeal for outsiders to go to Alabama and march. A march that was against a Federal order. Standing in the brilliant sunlight of the midday sun are this group who played the big role in a highly exaggerated drama. We do not see how it is possible within the realm of commonsense application not to place responsibility where it belongs. This newspaper does not point the finger at the group with prejudice or an intolerant attitude. It is simply the heart rendering and breaking results of what we have for months and months predicted would take place when breaking laws at the State or local level are upheld by a few powerful officers in a powerful centralized government. Also when a man like Dr. Martin Luther King gains power, and has strong financial support the harvest is bound to be bitter fruit.

We have to this day never found out where the civil right fanatics—the ministers, the students, the paid agitators were a few months ago. Surely the incidents have not been forgotten, although they didn't near approach receiving the news coverage of the Alabama march.

We are talking about the riots and violence that were stirred up by a lawless Negro element in Harlem, Rochester, Buffalo, Philadelphia, Paterson, Elizabeth City, Boston and Cambridge, Mass., resulting in wholly unprovoked loss of lives and the destruction of millions of dollars of property? And we don't believe President Johnson made two or three nationally televised talks, and every daily newspaper used streamer headlines to play up his statements. Is suffering, the destruction of property, the loss of life—if it occurs north of the Mason-Dixon line and involves race insignificant? Why any more so than in the South? We still seek the truthful answer to the question.

The Enterprise has been deeply concerned over the warped, twisted and misleading picture one sees from the slanting of the news. The Dothan (Ala.) Eagle in an editorial—news story last week gives some first-hand information that should shock every reader * * * we hope somehow the true facts will penetrate into the shells of the politicians and the entire citizenry. The need for truths, not propaganda, was never as great as it is in the racial issues, and the political-motivated civil rights acts.

The Dothan, Ala., newspaper reports as follows:

"We have seen a letter written from on the spot by a State trooper, a true Christian sickened by the things and the people he has seen and heard at close range in the recent days he has been on duty in Selma. The letter was to his family because 'I wanted to tell you myself these things so you will not be misinformed by anyone or anything.' A couple of paragraphs are revealing:

" 'It's mostly just a gathering of rebellious Negro trash, homosexuals, beatniks, thieves, dope peddlers, addicts, and paid professional agitators,' said on paragraph. 'This is the bunch of people that L.B.J. is trying so hard to please. Mother, with the leadership this Nation has now I can't see how in the world this country can continue to exist as a free, God-fearing people.'

" 'Regardless of one's feelings about integration, voting rights, mixed marirages, whether for or against,' said another paragraph, 'this way is not the way to change it. I have seen Negro men and white women, white men and Negro women loving each other, holding each other, hands all over each other, right here in the middle of the streets in Selma, Ala. Bearded beatniks, filthy, dirty

young white girls dressed like men, so-called preachers in overalls and some priests in their suit with the collar turned backward, all are here, living, eating, sleeping with these Negroes, cursing Alabama and us. • • • People who live here are fed up to the point of desperation. This is what has migrated into the State of Alabama, with the protection and blessings of President Johnson, the Justice Department, and Supreme Court.'

"One of the most nauseating trappings about the stage—managed travail of Selma is the part—even leadership—taken by the invading clergy. At the urging of the National Council of Churches, ministers, preachers, priests, rabbis and self-ordained have swarmed to the center of agitation. Using a holier-than-thou attitude they have sought to cloak an evil outrage with the respectability of religion.

"The damage they have done thereby to the religious fabric of this Nation is beyond calculation."

The Dothan editor had used as caption for the editorial "The Devil Smiles." We would say that he is laughing loud and long by now.

Dr. Joseph Melnick, of Baylor University Medical School, Receives Modern Medicine Award for 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the modern war on disease, which is fought daily in research laboratories and clinics around the world, is most usually waged by men who remain anonymous to the outside world, filled with populations which owe their very existence to the dedicated work these men perform.

One such man is Dr. Joseph L. Melnick, chairman of the Department of Virology and Epidemiology of Baylor University Medical Center, in Houston. He has devoted his life to detecting and studying viruses, and has made significant contributions to the development of the polio vaccine.

Recently, Modern Medicine chose Dr. Melnick as one of its 1965 recipients of the magazine's Award for Distinguished Achievement. Nominations for these awards come from deans of medical schools, leaders of medical organizations, and members of the Modern Medicine editorial board.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, which was published in the January 1965, issue of Modern Medicine, on pages 96–98, naming the various achievements of Dr. Melnick, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF JOSEPH L. MELNICK, PH. D., CHAIRMAN, DEPARTMENT OF VIROLOGY AND EPIDEMIOLOGY, BAYLOR UNIVERSITY, HOUSTON

When Dr. Joseph L. Melnick, began studying viruses, the important ones could be counted on the fingers of two hands. "And those that we could work with in the laboratory we could count on one hand," he comments. Most of his career has been devoted to viruses, which had just been shown to be made of nucleoproteins when he received his Ph. D. from Yale in 1939. In 1941 he was awarded one of the first fellowships from the National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis and embarked on the work that helped prepare the way for development of the polio vaccines.

Always a superb technician, Dr. Melnick fathered many techniques for studying viruses, including a method for detecting polio virus that was 100 times more sensitive than previous methods. One of his first published works on polio, with Drs. James Trask and John Paul, dealt with detection of polio virus in flies. Whether flies give the virus back to people never has been definitely settled, but the researchers did prove that flies could contaminate food with the virus. Dr. Melnick and his early coworkers, Drs. Robert Ward and Dorothy Horstmann, found that a person may remain a carrier of the virus for 7 or 8 weeks. They also determined that monkeys infected with polio virus can support growth of the virus in tissues outside the central nervous system. This finding was one of the first steps toward a polio vaccine.

Between 1949 and 1954, Dr. Melnick, then associate professor of microbiology at Yale, and his associates made a discovery that "set off an explosion in the field of virology." They found that polio virus was not in a class by itself but actually belonged to a much larger group of viruses with similar properties, now known as enteroviruses. Because of this work Dr. Melnick was selected in 1955 to head the National Foundation Committee on Enteroviruses, which included John Enders, Albert Sabin, Gilbert Dalldorf, William Hammon, and Jerome Syverton. These outstanding virologists carried out a series of collaborative studies and fostered the ready exchange of information between laboratories that led to much of the present understanding of the new human viruses and to methods for studying them. Dr. Melnick headed a similar committee for the National Institutes of Health from 1960 to 1963, and he now heads a new NIH committee on the picornaviruses.

Dr. Melnick left the professorship of epidemiology at Yale in 1957 to head the virus laboratories of the Division of Biologics Standards at NIH. A year later he was asked to set up a department of virology at Baylor University College of Medicine in Houston, "the first virology department in any medical school in the entire country," he recalls. He maintained close contact with NIH, however, serving on the committee that helped set standards for live polio vaccine on the training grant committee for infectious diseases, on the board for viruses and cancer, and on the human cancer virus task force.

In 1960 Mr. Melnick and Craig Wallis found a means to stabilize live polio vaccine so that it could be kept for weeks without refrigeration. They discovered, while studying factors that influence growth of viruses, that magnesium chloride stabilized oral polio vaccine, so that it maintained its potency for long periods without having to be kept at freezing temperatures.

In 1949 Dr. Melnick and his colleagues obtained the first human virus in crystalline form, the human wart virus. He has since recognized that this is one of a family of tumor viruses, which he has named the papova virus group. Eleven years later his attention was turned inadvertently to the association of viruses and cancer when the SV–40 virus, a papova virus of monkeys that causes tumors in animals, was found in polio vaccines. Dr. Melnick and his colleagues have found that when SV–40 produces tumors, the virus disappears but the tumor cells contain a new intranuclear antigen. Recently they, together with scientists at NIH discovered that adenoviruses can be hybridized with SV–40 and that human cells infected with such hybridized adenovirus develop the SV–40 tumor antigen.

Durand Doctor Home After African Duty on SS "Hope"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VERNON W. THOMSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a recent article in the Eau Claire, Wis., Leader about a Durand, Wis., doctor, points out the success of Project Hope's philosophy of bringing proper medical facilities to developing nations for training purposes.

Under Project Hope, the world's first peacetime hospital ship—the SS *Hope*—sails to countries all over the world. On board is a modern American hospital. Taken aboard are doctors and nurses from the visited countries.

Instead of trying to reform outdated medical practices in the clinics and hospitals where the practices are being performed, Hope puts the medical personnel of these nations on board the SS *Hope* and has them work under ideal conditions.

The success of this theory is shown in the Leader article. As Dr. Joseph P. Stringer explains, midwives in Guinea, Africa, delivered babies in places riddled with cobwebs, birds, and rats. But after a few weeks aboard the *Hope* these midwives adopted modern sanitary practices.

Mr. Speaker, I include the Leader article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

AFRICAN DUTY ON SS "HOPE" OVER: DURAND DOCTOR HOME

DURAND.—Durand Dr. Joseph P. Springer has resumed his practice here after a 2-month interlude in Guinea, West Africa aboard the SS *Hope*.

As one of a team of 30 physicians and surgeons from Maine to California he had undertaken a stint with a people-to-people project launched in 1958. President Dwight Eisenhower asked a Washington, D.C., heart specialist to lead a project aimed at providing health opportunity for people everywhere.

Since that time aboard a 15,000-ton reconverted hospital ship which saw service in World War II and Korea, medical men have helped bring friendship, mercy, new therapies, medical texts, and equipment to Indonesia, Vietnam, Peru, Ecuador, and Guinea.

When the current tour is completed in Guinea the ship will be returned to the States for a badly needed overhaul—and continued service in the cause of humanity if enough supporters can be found to keep it going.

Dr. Springer flew in December from wintry, rural Wisconsin into summery, densely populated Africa aboard the gleaming white hospital ship.

He dusted off his college French, learning that language was a barrier at first in diagnosing cases, sometimes with the help of two or three interpreters to describe a patient's history and symptoms. Peace Corpsmen helped with some French would oblige by coming off the street to assist in untangling particularly difficult dialects.

His first patient was an expectant mother whose pregnancy had gone wrong and who had only one-eighth of her normal blood supply when he examined her, two grams of hemoglobin in a blood test which normally provides 15. Transferred from a hospital to the ship she received badly needed transfu-

sions and corrective surgery which led to her recovery.

His last was a lad of four with a hereditary blood defect, sycle cell anemia, which left him with a dangerously low blood count. Corrective treatment is available and was being given when Dr. Springer left for home.

Children fight an uphill battle for survival with only about one of four infants surviving beyond age 4. Malaria is the biggest killer. In between he helped Guinean Dr. Camara Komnos and Duila Ibrahima, a majeur, as they ministered to patients with elephantiasis, yaws, leprosy, and intestinal parasites all common to tropical regions. A majeur holds no medical degree but cares for many patients with routine ailments in a nation with a severe shortage of doctors.

Dr. Komnos, schooled in Dakar, is one of a handful of Guinean doctors attempting to care for the needs of two to three million persons. As an educated man the doctor has also been pressed into government service in the newly emerged nation which incensed General De Gaulle of France by accepting complete independence rather than to go along with his proposal to join a French commonwealth of nations to achieve independence gradually.

In a period in which the United States offered little aid, apparently out of a wish not to pique the French leader even more, Guinea looked elsewhere for help and found it in the Kremlin.

Russia built a hospital in the capital, Conakry, which was one of two in which Dr. Springer and his African partners carried on.

The Russian aid extended to supplying around 30 doctors under contract and technicians to assist in the Guinea medical program which provides state medical care.

Aboard ship the Guineans assisted Dr. Springer in surgery. On land, he was the doctor's assistant at the operating table.

A preliminary coolness to U.S. citizens when the SS *Hope* first arrived is yielding to fellowship in attacking the ever-present medical problems, Dr. Springer said.

He helped antidiphtheria and tetanus inoculation clinics in which children requested to bare their arms cheerfully stripped off every stitch and rarely squealed or yelled at the touch of the needle.

He followed in the footsteps of another general practitioner who had made the acquaintance of a group of midwives in training on shore in the hope they might come to accept the necessity for cleaning the cobwebs, excluding the birds and chasing the rats from the rooms where Guinea mothers give birth to their children.

Nobody marked on a calendar the day the trainees in midwifery began visiting the SS *Hope* to watch the maternity practices there.

But Dr. Springer's eyes sparkle a bit when he notes that since those visits to the ship the midwives are beginning to apply elementary practices of cleanliness they had known about for a long time but had probably never observed in practice before.

Now he's home with a few bright and deftly drawn water colors, some masks to hang on the wall, a deeper understanding of the vast complexity of U.S. commitments in Africa, and a new appreciation for the patience of many Africans.

What will he remember a decade from now when he thinks of Guinea?

He answers quickly, firmly, and without hesitation: "The people. I found them to be cooperative in every way, friendly, basically human, decent people.

He probably won't forget either, the night he boarded a dugout canoe with some native oarsmen and a Polish doctor holding the spotlight while he hunted crocodiles in the river near Conakry. But that's another story.

Pornography—Resolutions of Conference To Combat Obscenity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, this week a group of highly intelligent and dedicated persons from all parts of the United States, representing many civic and religious groups, met in Washington to discuss means of fighting the traffic in obscene publications and other materials.

At the end of a 2-day conference, during which many speakers outlined both the scope of the fight and some of the means used to halt the flow of pornographic materials, a set of resolutions was adopted.

I ask permission to have these resolutions reprinted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I wish to call special attention to two resolutions which I feel have an interest for Members of Congress.

The first is the resolution asking that something be done to clean up the newsstands in our Nation's Capital, where smut is made available in great quantities. The resolution points out that Washington is the capital of the world, that millions of people visit here every year, and that with such lewd displays we give a poor image of our country and, especially, of our seat of Government.

The second resolution which should concern Members of Congress. Proposes the appointment of a commission to study the means of combating the traffic in obscene and pornographic materials and alerting the public to the attendant dangers of such traffic. I was especially interested in this resolution, since I have pending in this session a bill—identical to a bill which was passed twice by the Senate—which would set up such a commission. The bill is S. 309. I believe that the enactment of this proposed legislation would do much to carry out the recommendations of the Conference To Combat Obscenity.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS OF THE CONFERENCE TO COMBAT OBSCENITY, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 22–23, 1965

We resolve,

We of this Conference To Combat Obscenity highly resolve to continue our efforts, as citizens and members of the organizations we represent, to halt the tide of obscenity and indecency in publications and entertainment in our Nation, in order to protect our children and youth from the clear and present danger of immorality and delinquency, which inevitably result from pornography, and to overcome this tragic sickness in society, which, unless healed, will quickly lead to the moral and physical decay of our Nation.

TO ALL OFFICIALS OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

We are alarmed to find that Washington, D.C., appears to be the smut capital of the Nation, in that there are numerous newsstands and retail outlets that display and sell the most obscene and indecent magazines and paperback books produced in America today. We are shocked at the flood of nudity, illicit love, homosexuality, lesbianism, and al other types of sexual perversion on open display. We reflect that our Nation's Capital is visited by many thousands of children and youths every season of the year, and that many of these, as well as those residing here, are exposed to the vicious, filthy literature on many of Washington's newsstands. We call upon the President and Members of Congress to investigate these conditions and apply appropriate remedies.

TO THE PRESIDENT

We respectfully suggest to the President that the forces of amorality in this country are so entrenched and so well organized that a sweeping investigation by the FBI might be in order.

We are reminded that the President of the United States has the great and honored responsibility to nominate, for life tenure, the Justices of the Supreme Court and other Federal courts. We respectfully request that in the filling of any vacancies in the future, and particularly in the Supreme Court, the President select jurists well known and respected by their fellow citizens as being favorable to upholding the standards of decency that have guarded and protected the public from the beginning of our Nation, and which standards are based upon the concept of the sacredness of every human being in the sight of God, and in the sanctity of marriage and the home.

NEWS STAND PROPRIETORS AND SELLERS

We urge citizens in every community of our Nation to appeal to newsstand proprietors and sellers of publications to refuse to accept from their publishers or wholesalers, and to refuse to handle, display or sell, such magazines, books, and other materials that appeal to prurient interest, glorify illicit sex, debase womanhood, and present obscenity in an attractive manner, and in such ways as to corrupt children and youth. We remind the distributors and sellers of publications that they have an obligation and duty to the communities which they serve to maintain and elevate the moral standards of the community.

ENTERTAINMENT

We call upon all producers and exhibitors of all forms of public entertainment to recognize their responsibility not to present that which violates the laws against obscenity, or offends the standards of decency established for the protection of the public.

With respect to the motion picture industry, we call upon its executives, officials, and all others to reestablish the Production Code, adopted in 1930 and revised in 1956. We urge the Motion Picture Association to withhold its seal of approval from any film that violates the Production Code and the standards of decency in our communities, and demand that such films be eliminated in the future.

We remind producers of television programs that children and youth comprise their greatest audiences, and that decent families will not tolerate the further drift toward obscenity in plots, situations, and dialogs, in TV entertainment.

LEGISLATION

We call upon citizens of our Nation, and especially molders of public opinion, to support legislation that will strengthen the laws of municipalities, States, and the Nation, against obscenity; and to enlist other concerned citizens in the crusade to outlaw the peddling of smut and filth in all their forms, particularly to the nation's youth.

We endorse the proposal to establish, either by action of Congress or by Presidential ap-

pointment, a commission to study pornographic materials of all kinds and to recommend to all agencies of the government courses of action to combat this national evil.

We urge that citizens make organized protests to proper authorities because of the display and sale of material objectionable for children and youth on property owned or controlled by governmental agencies.

THE U.S. SUPREME COURT

We commend the members of the Supreme Court who announced the majority opinion in the Roth-Alberts case in 1957, which established a working principle for ridding our communities of obscenity.

We deplore several recent decisions of the Supreme Court, which have overruled the decisions of many state courts in obscenity cases, this in effect making the highest court in the land a board of censors as to what constitutes obscenity, a responsibility which, as Chief Justice Earl Warren has declared, should be left to juries in lower courts. We deplore the fact that such decisions have significantly encouraged the traffic in obscenity.

INTERFAITH SEMINARS

We urge that responsible religious leaders in each city or community promptly hold interfaith seminars, to examine the effects of the new amorality among youth, resulting from pornography, and how to grapple with the problem.

LAW-ENFORCEMENT EDUCATION

We urge Mr. J. Edgar Hoover to use the facilities of the FBI to set up a training program for law-enforcement officers of States, counties, and cities, in uniform procedures to be followed in obscenity cases.

FUTURE ACTION

We recommend for the consideration of all church groups of all faiths, and all civic organizations interested in public morality, the formulation of a plan whereby a more united voice can be heard by all publishing and entertainment media; that the plan include the establishment of permament groups, particularly in New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles areas, to cooperate with law enforcement officials to combat obscenity, and to cooperate with producers of films for moving pictures and TV programs to see that films are not made and shown that violate the production code.

We ask that a copy of these resolutions be carried to the President, personally, at his convenience by members of this conference, and that copies be sent to each Member of Congress.

Goals of Farm Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I believe our colleagues will share my interest in the excellent statement prepared earlier this year for the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry by Prof. Varden Fuller, of Berkeley and the University of California.

Dr. Fuller, who is a distinguished professor of agricultural economics, has raised some very important questions regarding commodity markets, land values, and farm policy, and I commend his discussion to our colleagues for their attention:

GOALS OF FARM POLICY: A COMMENT ON COMPARABLE RETURNS TO FARM LABOR AND INVESTMENT AS A GOAL OF PRICE AND INCOME POLICY[1]

(By Varden Fuller[2])

We are now approaching a half century of numerous proposals and of many actions relating to the role of Government in the economics of agriculture; yet the ultimate goals of policy have remained persistently obscure and elusive. In the 1920's the slogan underlying legislative proposals was "Equality for Agriculture," reflecting the idea that tariffs protected industry but not agriculture and thereby caused unfairness as between the prices received by farmers and prices they paid for production and consumption goods.[3]

In the 1930's the focus shifted to "price parity." This concept was adopted by Congress in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933 and has been the foundation of price support programs throughout the following years.

Notwithstanding that price parity, as a concept of an equality goal and as a statistical measure of comparative disadvantage, has endured and has served as a foundation of price support programs, there have been many responsible expressions of doubt that price interventions are a satisfactory way to approach legitimate income goals. Congress reflected this concern in 1936 and again in 1938 by providing authorities for basing farm programs on "income parity." However, to make income parity the direct objective of the individual commodity price programs has never proved to be administratively practical.

Following the abandonment of the inspecific idea of "equality for agriculture," the recognition of the insufficiency of price parity, and the intractability of income parity to serve as effective bases for the achievement of ultimate policy goals, the center of attention in the search for a proper goal of public policy appears now to be coming into focus on another comparative income concept. This goal is stated in the 1964 report of the National Agricultural Advisory Commission, "Farm Policy in the Years Ahead" (p. 10), as follows:

"A level of farm income enabling efficient producers to earn returns on their labor and investment comparable with returns realized on similar resources outside of agriculture."

This, also, I suggest is an intractable and elusive goal. To begin with, there is the need to define "efficient producers"—what are the criteria to be applied: To the farmer as a manager? To the farm as an enterprise? To the area of production in which the farm is located? Defining and measuring "comparable returns" is also a job for which there are no objective criteria. Yet, if such a goal is to have precision, determinations must be made. But unfortunately, in the lack of criteria founded on reason and justice, arbitrary rules must be promulgated, thereby further compounding the regulatory abrasions already so notoriously associated with the administration of allotments and production controls.

There is, however, a still more serious question—of which the Commission's report takes notice but fails to give sufficient analysis. The Commission's report notes: "Computing returns on investment in land presents a difficulty, for in the long run land values themselves are considerably affected by the level of farm income. Thus in computing the comparable return for agriculture, land values might be fixed as of a recent date" (p. 10).

It is logically correct that the major influence on farmland values should be the level of income produced. The fact of the matter is, however, that since 1950 farmland values have risen sharply and continuously even though there has been no rise in farm income. Net farm income per acre has varied up and down in the postwar years but in 1963 was still at the same level as in 1950. In contrast, farm real estate values climbed year after year until by 1963 they had doubled over 1950. Further details are shown in table 1:

TABLE 1.—*Value of farm real estate and annual net income per acre,[1] United States (48 States), 1950–63*

	Per acre		Indexes (1950=100)	
	Value	Income [1]	Value	Income
1950	$65	$13.38	100	100
1951	75	15.54	115	116
1952	82	14.74	126	110
1953	83	12.81	128	96
1954	82	12.28	126	92
1955	85	11.50	131	86
1956	90	11.52	138	86
1957	97	11.71	149	88
1958	103	13.51	158	101
1959	111	11.57	171	86
1960	116	12.25	178	92
1961	118	13.05	182	98
1962	124	13.60	191	102
1963	130	13.37	200	100

[1] Based upon all land in farms. "The measure of net farm income used was total net income of farm operators, plus interest paid on farm real estate debt, and net rents paid to nonfarm landlords."

Source of value and income data: U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Given the income picture and the "cost-price squeeze" in agriculture, farm real estate values should logically have not risen in the years 1950–63. Farm real estate in ratio to income was not significantly undervalued in 1950. During the 1940's the average ratio of land values to annual farm income was 4.5. Net farm income per acre (all land in farms) averaged approximately $13 for the years 1942–49 as against $12.90 for 1950–63. In the latter 1940's the ratio of land value to annual farm income rose to a ratio of approximately five. Had this ratio been maintained, the national average value per acre of farm real estate in 1963 would have been $65 instead of the inflationary level it had attained of $130 per acre.

This inflationary spiral has occurred in all regions, but in different degrees. It has been far less severe in the Appalachian, Lake States, and Northeast regions. It has been the sharpest and most accelerated in the Pacific, Southeast, Mountain, and Southern Plains regions.

There are several important policy questions that are inherent in this inflationary manifestation. One of these, which relates directly to the immediate question, is whether society at large should assume an obligation to secure for farmers a comparable return on inflated land values, and if so whether this is not an elusive goal, incapable of attainment, since the policy goal and the inflationary spiral would apparently be reciprocally self-accelerating. The Agricultural Advisory Commission was apparently uneasy on this point for it noted that "in computing 'comparable returns' for agriculture, land values might be fixed as of a recent date" (p. 10).

These issues of policy suggest the need to examine the influences that have brought on the inflation, and what its impacts have been upon the earnings of other productive services, especially farm labor.

No one has offered a conclusive explanation of the spiral in land values. The American Farm Bureau Federation has suggested that "a need for additional land to increase farm size is one reason. Others include: "A hedge against inflation, expectation of further increases in values, and a hope that the farm income situation will improve." (AFBF Official Newsletter, Nov. 9, 1964, p. 179.)

There is the well-known propensity to capitalize income benefits that are realized

Footnotes at end of speech.

from Government price support programs. This shows up in the prices and rents of land having allotment rights as against the lower values of equally productive land which has no allotment right. Such capitalizations reduce the earnings of labor but they would not necessarily provoke an inflation of land values disproportionate to the income currently being realized. An inflationary trend of the order now being observed must be based upon anticipations that are not directly related to current income—that income will rise in the future, that the inflation will continue indefinitely, or that future benefits will be realized in some other form. Officials of the Farm Credit Administration believe that anticipated benefits of farm enlargement leads farmers to pay inflated prices. Deputy Director Bushnell has stated:

"The answer lies in the fact that the majority of farmers are not buying full-sized farms. They are buying land to add to existing holdings—in an effort to utilize their machinery and have a more economic, efficient operating unit. Having purchased their base units when farm prices weren't so inflated, they figure they can 'average out' their investment and still get a fair return on the enlarged units. So, farmers are forced to pay a higher premium each year for tracts they must add to their operating unit to stay competitive in a fast-changing industry. * * * The young man who wishes to buy on today's market by making a small downpayment, much as his city cousin does in purchasing a home, is out of luck.

"Even if he finds a lender who will finance him on that basis, the odds on his being able to carry his debt from farm earnings are stacked against him." (Farm Credit Administration advance release, Sept. 25, 1963.)

The desire to obtain additional land for purposes of farm enlargement is a major source of activity in farm real estate transfers. However, it cannot be identified as the sole influence in the inflationary spiral because farms are being bought by nonfarmers as well as farmers with the intent of their being operated as whole units.

Whatever the combination of influences, this inflationary momentum is unquestionably a major contributor to the cost-price squeeze in agriculture. Governor Tootell of the Farm Credit Administration, has commented:

"The land banks have a difficult problem of lending the farm family enough to be of service without contributing unduly to further land market inflation. * * * In many areas of the country farmland prices have advanced to where the rate of return on the price asked for most farms is less than the average farm mortgage interest rate. This is true even if only hired labor rates are allowed the owner-operator in figuring net returns. If a reasonable managerial wage also were included as a cost the rate of return on the land would be even less. Compounding the problem is the further fact that advancing land prices have brought higher real estate taxes for most farmers. * * * This is one of the main crosscurrents within agriculture that is complicating the efforts of lenders, such as the land banks, to adjust their lending programs to meet the needs of a rapidly changing agriculture. * * * Credit will supply an increasing proportion of capital needs because internal generation of capital (from farm earnings) is too low on most farms to meet existing needs. * * * As the current custodians of a farmer-owned credit system, we have more than a moral obligation to meet the legitimate credit needs of our farmer-members. After all, adequate but sound credit is necessary to keep control of farming in the hands of farm families." (Farm Credit Administration advance release, Nov. 24, 1964.)

MAGNITUDES OF INCOME OBLIGATION IMPLIED BY A POLICY GOAL OF "COMPARABLE RETURNS"

How far below "comparable returns" is the present level of farm income? How much additional burden is imposed if the policy is to obtain returns on investment which embraces land inflation? What is the impact of land inflation upon the residual earnings of labor? The writer has made some calculations relating to these questions.

In table 2 (cols. 1 and 2) are found the magnitudes which result from one method of imputing earnings to land at current (inflated) land values and also to nonland production investment. In both instances the earning rate applied is the average interest rate on outstanding farm mortgage debt. Earnings imputed to labor (col. 3) are based upon the estimated man-hours of labor (self-employed and hired) for all farmwork valued at the national average hourly earnings of production workers in manufacturing. These interest rates and wages are approximations of what might be defined as "comparable returns." As thus imputed, the total of comparable returns to labor and investment are found in column 4. Comparing these magnitudes with realized agricultural income, as indicated in column 5 of table 2, indicates the gap between the goal (as thus defined) and present reality. Percentagewise, recently realized agricultural income is running between one-half and two-thirds of the level necessary for the achievement of comparable returns. If an earning for management were imputed the gap would be wider.

TABLE 2.—*Imputed earnings at "comparable returns" to investment and labor in agriculture, United States (48 States), 1950–62*

[Dollars in millions]

Year	Earnings at "Comparable returns"				Realized agricultural income [4]	Ratio: realized to "comparable returns" (percent)
	Real estate [1]	Non land capital [2]	Labor [3]	Total		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1950	$3,251	$1,328	$21,797	$26,376	$18,175	69
1955	4,614	1,528	23,823	29,965	15,965	53
1956	4,838	1,504	23,455	29,797	15,905	53
1957	5,190	1,551	22,671	29,412	16,081	55
1958	5,565	1,718	22,256	29,539	18,131	61
1959	6,095	2,004	22,559	30,658	15,922	52
1960	6,496	1,940	22,205	30,641	16,613	54
1961	6,700	1,938	21,977	30,615	17,623	58
1962	7,147	2,028	21,713	30,888	17,976	58

[1] Computed by taking interest on current total farm real estate values at rates for all lenders on farm mortgage debt outstanding. (See table 5 for details.)
[2] Computed as above for aggregate values of production assets, including machinery and equipment, and inventories of livestock and feed.
[3] Man-hours of labor (self-employed and hired) estimated to be required for all farmwork valued at the average hourly earnings of production workers in manufacturing. (See table 5 for details.)
[4] Operators' net income plus interest paid on farm mortgage debt, rent paid to nonfarm landlords, and wages paid to hired farm labor.

Source: Basic date from U.S. Department of Agriculture.

It is to be observed that imputed earnings to nonland capital and labor remained relatively constant through the years 1950–62. For nonland capital this is true because total farm investment other than in land has not risen markedly, widespread impressions to the contrary notwithstanding. For labor, the relative constancy in imputed earnings is because the rise in "comparable return" (i.e., manufacturing) wage has been approximately offset by declining man-hours of farm labor required. (See table 5.)

Table 3 carries out two adjustments of imputed earnings. For farmland the imputed interest earning on investment is based upon a series of value magnitudes that reflect what total farmland values would have been if no post-1950 inflation in land values had occurred. This is done by holding land values in the same ratio to income as prevailed for 1949–51. For labor, imputed earnings are at 85 percent of the manufacturing wage, which reflects roughly the difference in purchasing power of income in rural as against metropolitan areas. The effect of these two adjustments is greatly to reduce the total imputed income representing "comparable returns." As may be seen in column 5 of table 3, the gap between imputed and realized income on this adjusted basis narrows to the range of one-third to one-fourth.

TABLE 3.—*Adjusted imputed earnings at "comparable returns" to investment and labor in agriculture, United States (48 States), 1950–62*

[Dollars in millions]

Year	Earnings at adjusted "comparable returns"				Ratio: Realized [4] to "comparable returns" (percent)
	Real estate [1]	Nonland capital [2]	Labor [3]	Total	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
1950	$3,487	$1,328	$18,528	$23,343	78
1955	3,109	1,528	20,249	24,886	64
1956	3,095	1,504	19,936	24,535	65
1957	3,125	1,551	19,270	23,946	67
1958	3,657	1,718	18,918	24,293	75
1959	3,176	2,004	19,175	24,355	65
1960	3,416	1,940	18,874	24,230	69
1961	3,729	1,938	18,681	24,348	72
1962	3,899	2,028	18,456	24,383	74

[1] Same computation as table 2 except that farm real estate value is held at the ratio to income that prevailed in the 3-year period 1949–51.
[2] Same as in table 2.
[3] Imputed earnings to labor are at 85 percent of the manufacturing wage rate.
[4] Same realized income data as in table 2 were used to compute the ratio.

LAND INFLATION VERSUS LABOR DEFLATION

In logical economic reasoning, the returns to farmland are supposed to be a residual—the remainder of income after labor (self-employed and hired) has been compensated at the levels of income that workers and farmers could have earned in other occupations and after the going rate of return has been earned on nonland investment. But the behavior of farmers, for whatever complex of motivations, appears to invert this relationship: they appear to be quite willing to buy land and to enter into mortgage obligations therefor, at prices so high in relation to realized income that only a depressed residual is left to compensate self-employed and hired labor.

Table 4 carries out an imputation which treats labor income as a residual. It compares labor income results when land is valued at current (inflated) levels as against the income results when land values are held at the 1949–51 ratio to farm income. Comparing the results in column 2 with those in column 4 indicates the substantial impact of land inflation upon labor earnings. In effect, the benefit of labor saving technological advances in recent years has been fully absorbed into land values. If land inflation had not occurred, the total dollar residual for labor would have been substantially constant through 1950–62; consequently, as man-hours of labor declined (see table 5) the earnings per hour would have significantly increased. In 1962, the inflated value demands of land were in effect costing some 36 cents per hour of labor earning.

TABLE 4.—*Residual earnings to labor with income imputed to investment under current land values and under stabilized land values, United States (48 States), 1950–62*

Year	Under current (inflated) land values [1]		Under stabilized land values [2]	
	Total	Earning per hour	Total	Earning per hour
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Millions		*Millions*	
1950	$13, 596	$0. 90	$13, 360	$0. 88
1955	9, 823	. 77	11, 328	. 88
1956	9, 563	. 80	11, 306	. 94
1957	9, 340	. 84	11, 405	1. 03
1958	10, 848	1. 03	12, 756	1. 21
1959	7, 823	. 76	10, 742	1. 04
1960	8, 177	. 83	11, 257	1. 15
1961	8, 985	. 95	11, 956	1. 26
1962	8, 801	. 97	12, 049	1. 33

[1] Total realized agricultural income (as defined in table 2) less interest imputation on total investment with land values at current levels.

[2] Same as above except that the real estate component is held at the ratio to income that prevailed in 1949–51, and hence avoids the effect of the inflationary spiral in land values.

TABLE 5.—*Appendix of data and sources*

Year	Farm mortgage interest rates [1] (percent)	Hourly earnings of production workers in manufacturing [2] (dollars)	Estimated man-hours of labor used [3] (million hours)
1950	4. 5	1. 44	15, 127
1955	4. 7	1. 86	12, 808
1956	4. 7	1. 95	12, 028
1957	4. 7	2. 05	11, 059
1958	4. 8	2. 11	10, 548
1959	4. 9	2. 19	10, 301
1960	5. 0	2. 26	9, 825
1961	5. 1	2. 32	9, 473
1962	5. 2	2. 39	9, 085

[1] Average for all lenders on loans outstanding; compiled by U.S. Department of Agriculture. (See Agricultural Statistics, 1963 and 1968.)

[2] Compiled by U.S. Department of Labor. (See Manpower Report of the President, 1964, p. 229.)

[3] Includes self-employed and hired labor used on crops, livestock, and farm maintenance. (Compiled by U.S. Department of Agriculture. See Agricultural Statistics, 1963, p. 493.)

It is often said that American agriculture is becoming evermore capital intensive—that the investment per worker is rising sharply. The unfortunate fact, however, is that most of the apparent capital intensity is really only inflation intensity. This writer interprets the facts analyzed above, together with the comments made by the administrators of farm credit to imply that the financial structure of agriculture is moving into a dubious situation.

The writer further states his belief that Government price support policies have been a major contributor to farmland inflation. With prices assured (at least on the supported commodities), farmers have anticipated income benefits that actually have not materialized. Moreover, and of no less importance, bankers and other mortgage lenders have derived a sense of security from the existence of price support programs, and possibly also from an expectation that levels of support will continue to be increased to cover rising costs. Consequently, they have made loans that otherwise would not have been made.[4] This augmentation of the supply of mortgage credit has in turn reinforced the demand for land and thereby been an influence to inflation.

The inflationary spiral in farm real estate has in effect miscarried what is broadly assumed to be the purpose of the price support programs because their effects have been realized in higher land values rather than in better returns on labor. At the present stage of affairs, price or income programs designed to give effect to a policy goal of comparable returns to labor and investment are not likely to overcome this miscarriage; rather, they apparently would add further to fueling the fires of inflation.

A further comment on the hypothesis of Deputy Director Bushnell (as contained in the quotation on p. 5) should be made. There is no doubt of the vigorous demand for land by farmers for the purpose of enlarging their units. And it is generally accepted that farm enlargement is necessary to efficiency, therefore meritorious. But it should not be accepted that land value inflation is an inevitable side effect, especially if the prospect is that the financial structure of agriculture may thereby be made more unsound. Rather than to be concerned with how Government might guarantee returns on land purchases which take place at unwarranted prices, an alternative concern of Government could quite properly center on how to avoid the inflationary side effects.

If there is warrant for a role of Government activity in commodity markets, the warrant should be no less for a Government role in real estate markets. Legislators may wish to consider the possibilities for such a role. In any event, legislators should be aware that price support programs which are supposedly designed to improve the welfare of those who work in agriculture are succeeding mainly in contributing a major influence toward provoking or at least encouraging economic anarchy in farm real estate markets.

[1] Prepared for the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, U.S. Senate, January 1965.

[2] Professor of agricultural economics, University of California, Berkeley.

[3] In the words of Peek and Johnson: "World price fixes domestic price of every crop of which we export a surplus. Industrial tariffs can and do protect prices of articles for which the crop is exchanged. The fair exchange value of the crop is thus reduced in proportion to the protection afforded industry. The protective principle is operated for the benefit of industry to the detriment of agriculture which can no longer afford to bear the burden." George N. Peek and Hugh S. Johnson, "Equality for Agriculture," 2d ed., 1922, p. 3.

[4] "Farm borrowing has been increasing at a substantially more rapid rate than capital requirements in the industry since 1950." (Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City, Monthly Review, September–October 1964, p. 7.)

Proposed Voting Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Times and Democrat, of Orangeburg, S.C., which is ably edited by Dean B. Livingston, has published in the March 25, 1965, issue an editorial which points up the concern of many people in the South that the President is giving more evidence that he is trying to put the people of the South through another era of Reconstruction. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, entitled "Like Reconstruction Days," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIKE RECONSTRUCTION DAYS

The situation in Alabama seems to be retrogressing to a feeling similar to those exeprienced by both Negroes and whites during Reconstruction days. Then, the exultant Negroes, spurred on by the carpetbaggers from the North, assumed unto themselves a blatant, braggadocio attitude.

The Negroes in Alabama, led on and supported by the hundreds of Negro and white supporters who flocked down from the North, are cocky and arrogant, according to news reports. The Reverend Ralph D. Abernathy, chief aid to the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., in the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, was quoted by the New York Times as saying:

"When we get to Montgomery, we are going up to Governor Wallace's door and say, 'George, it's all over now. We've got the ballot.' "

And the similarity of the situation increases with federalized National Guardsmen and regular Army troops and military policemen aiding and abetting in the ridiculous march from Selma to Montgomery, just as Federal troops protected the Negroes and carpetbaggers who took over the State capitol in Columbia after the War Between the States.

The situation will continue as long as President Johnson and his administration continue to support the Negroes in nonviolent actions that can only end in violence. Instead of urging Martin Luther King and his followers to obey the law and resort to the courts, the President is backing King and cohorts in flaunting the laws of the State of Alabama and is using Federal forces to do so.

While deploring the world reaction to events in Alabama, the President is at the same time pouring more and more fuel on the propaganda blaze that emanates from Alabama through the publicity-seeking actions of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, the Congress for Racial Equality, and other racial organizations.

It may be that Martin Luther King has laid a trap for President Johnson. If so, L.B.J. has fallen into it—and not for the good of the United States.

Ballot Box, Not Boycott

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, moderation and reasonable order must replace violence and emotion in the struggle for civil rights of all Americans.

The Chicago Sun-Times has been a strong advocate of effective civil rights legislation and its proper implementation. It, therefore, speaks in a honest and practical sense on this subject.

On Tuesday, March 30, the Chicago Sun-Times printed an editorial discussing the threatened boycott of Alabama. I believe this editorial to be an extremely logical and a sound discussion of the situation:

BALLOT BOX, NOT BOYCOTT

Riding on the momentum that has built up in the events of recent weeks, Alabama civil rights leaders now plan to bring pressure on the State legislature to impeach Governor Wallace and try to stage a national economic boycott of Alabama products.

The Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., proposed that civil rights groups bring economic pressure on the State until authorities allow at least 50 percent of qualified Negroes to vote and until Governor Wallace announces he and others are prepared to halt the "reign of terror" in Alabama.

There comes a time in any battle when a wise leader pauses to survey and consolidate his gains, before plunging ahead to new territory. He is not moved by anger at the enemy's atrocities to excesses of his own that might weaken his own cause.

We believe Dr. King is at that point now. His call for a national boycott of Alabama appears to overlook the tremendous changes that already have been wrought and are underway. A boycott would be a complicated matter. It would require stopping shipments of steel, textiles, and agricultural products. It would be an act in restraint of trade and interstate commerce.

The Alabama of Governor Wallace is outside of the union spiritually but it would be a formidable task to cut it off from the other 49 States commercially. There are many decent Alabamanians in the capital who are working for Dr. King's goals. Their work would be hampered by an attempt at economic boycott.

It is a weapon the use of which certainly at this time would be premature; it could do the civil rights movement more harm than good. The best weapons against the racists of the South are law and public sentiment.

The Nation's sympathy and indignation have been aroused by the struggle of Negroes in Selma, Ala., to be recognized as citizens and voters. Stubborn resistance to their attempts to register to vote has been compounded by violence and murder. Congress as a consequence is working on a measure that would put Federal registrars in places where local officials refused Negroes the right to vote, a measure that would have been considered impossible to pass a year ago but which now may win even the support of some southerners. Vice President HUMPHREY says the bill may be passed by May 1.

Governor Wallace's conduct has been shameful. It is in keeping with his flying the Confederate flag over his capitol but not the flag of the United States. It would be salutary if he could be impeached, the objective voiced by Rev. James Bevel, one of Dr. King's spokesmen. We hope it is true as Bevel said, that Alabama citizens, Negro and white, are fed up with Wallace.

But impeachment proceedings in the Alabama Legislature should not be forced by a boycott or threat of boycott, as Bevel suggests. Such force has no place in democratic procedures. There is a difference between boycotting a busline or a merchant and trying to stop intersate commerce. The best way to get rid of Wallace and his ilk is through the process that put him in office: through the vote.

That is why, if civil rights workers in Alabama put first things first, they will concentrate on getting the right to vote made universal. Not every section of Alabama is as benighted as Selma and Dallas County. In the capital, Montgomery, the voices of moderation already have been raised and many achievements in racial harmony are being made.

Committees composed of Negro and white citizens have been working together and have made civil rights progress in many areas including schools, restaurants, and hotels. In 4 years the number of registered Negro voters has doubled in Montgomery County; 40 percent of eligible Negroes are now registered.

In his story in this paper Sunday, Hoke Norris noted the professionalism and effort to cooperate shown by the Montgomery police toward marchers and the press. One Negro policeman has been hired, so far, a real breakthrough for the old South. There were no incidents or brutality in Montgomery during the march last week.

This is the sort of effort that must come, at the local level, if the racists of the South are to be conquered. Eventually those who have seen the light in Montgomery must prevail over the man who sits in the capitol in Montgomery. We believe this must come about by the ballot box rather than by boycott.

A Tribute to Oscar C. Dancy, Mr. County Judge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, at the age of 85, Oscar C. Dancy, of Cameron County, Tex., is the oldest county judge in our Nation, and in his many years on the bench, he has been an exemplary public servant. Pursuing his profession with devotion, dedication, and dignity, Judge Dancy is well known for his abilities and his well-respected accomplishments.

In the March 1965 issue of Texas Parade, on pages 14–16, there was published an article which describes Judge Dancy's many admirable qualities. I request unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. COUNTY JUDGE
(By Jack Galloway)

A Washington reporter once referred to him in a report of a committee hearing as "the country judge from Texas." His constituents dubbed him "Oscar, C. for Concrete" through his dedication to build long-lasting, concrete highways. He has been called "political patriarch," "a living legend," and a host of epithets ranging from "benevolent dictator" to "father protector," depending upon how the caller stood on the particular issue at hand. His craggy countenance and dogged perseverance are known and respected in official offices throughout the State of Texas and in the Nation's Capital. At 85 years of age, Oscar C. Dancy, of Brownsville, Tex., is the oldest county judge in the United States, with the longest tenure of office—42 years as county judge of Cameron County, and known throughout the country as "Mr. County Judge."

Oscar Dancy once called on President Truman at the White House simply because, as Dancy put it, "I wanted to meet the only county judge who had spent more money than I had." Truman had spent some $20 million in bond money as county judge of Jackson County, Mo.; Dancy, at that time, had spent a scant $10 million.

But the indefatigable Oscar Dancy is working on a public project to equal that amount in one combined bite at Federal and county purse strings: A massive $10 million drainage proposal to reclaim the rich but now salt-threatened delta land of the lower Rio Grande Valley of Texas.

He seems always to be stumping for one big issue or another, from highway paving proposals in the 1920's to flood control in the 1930's. He pushed for a water treaty with Mexico in the 1940's, and, most recently, lobbied effectively for the establishment of a National Seashore Area on Texas' long, coast-hugging Padre Island.

Oscar Dancy's vote-getting invincibility is a political fact of life in south Texas. He was defeated only once at the polls, in 1932. Dancy recalls with a chuckle, "I think they blamed me, along with Hoover, for the depression." A stanch Democrat and all politics, his sweetest and strongest victory came in 1962, when he defeated his first Republican opponent by a majority of more than 2 to 1.

The staggering prospect that faces any political opponent of Oscar C. Dancy is that nothing can be pinned on him, except his age. His 42-year record as county judge is marked by nothing but scrupulous honesty. Dancy is so unacquisitive that he does not even know how much salary he makes (it's $10,356 a year), and he refuses to accept $3,000 of it. Two separate acts of the Texas Legislature allocated annual salaries of $1,500 to county judges for establishment of juvenile courts; one act providing for counties bordering on Mexico, and a second for gulf coast counties.

Qualifying on both counts, Dancy says he does not believe that the legislature intended him to have "that extra money," so he sets the entire amount aside in a special fund, for accomplishing what he considers good for the county. The fund pays for lobbying trips to Washington and Austin, and for his favorite persuasive tactic of talky breakfasts and dinners; but he will not tap his "special fund" for campaigning.

A voracious reader and voluminous letterwriter, Oscar Dancy has acquired a special passion for education, admonishing all parents, as judge of probate and child adoption courts, to make sure their children receive at least a high school education—something that Dancy himself did not achieve. Somewhat wistfully the judge admits, "I had little better than a common school education, but we had McGuffy's Reader and the Blue Book Speller, and anyone who had those can't be classified as illiterate."

Dancy is a native of North Carolina. After serving a law office apprenticeship he was granted a law degree with only 4 months' study at a small Tennessee college. He was drafted as mayor of North Wilksbow, N.C. "I told them that I was going to raise taxes, and I did," resigning in 1909 to come to Texas. Dancy had planned to go into real

estate promotion, but changed his mind and passed Texas' first bar exam.

Judge Dancy now has a burning interest in Latin America, and he has taken three trips by plane and bus into Central America in the last 3 years, "* * * because I wanted to see communism firsthand. It's a wonder," Dancy says, "that the whole country down there isn't run over with them." He was especially distressed by a military takeover in Honduras in October of 1963, shortly after he had visited that Central American Republic. Dancy had been impressed with the country's progress. With a deep sigh he remarked, "It's a tragedy; they were doing so well."

Dancy himself is still doing well, and from the present outlook, he will continue to do so for a long time.

Asked whether he will seek reelection when his present 4-year term expires, Judge Dancy replied, "I'll cross that bridge on my 87th birthday: December 22, 1966."

"If I had to make the decision now," he added with a wink, "I'd join the Peace Corps. I would get $75 a month plus expenses, and I'd save some money."

Older Americans Act of 1965

SPEECH
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 31, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3708) to provide assistance in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons through grants to the States for community planning and services and for training, through research, development, or training project grants, and to establish within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an operating agency to be designated as the "Administration on Aging."

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, the increasing number of elderly people in our communities reflects a profound change in the composition of our population. In 1900, life expectancy at birth was 49 years; today, it averages over 70 years.

But, as President John F. Kennedy said:

It is not enough for this great Nation to have added new years to life—our objective must be to add new life to those years.

In establishing an administration within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, this bill recognizes the need for a high-level agency that will command the respect and pay full attention to the needs of our elderly, so that the social and economic problems of nearly 20 million aged citizens can receive the attention they deserve.

For many years, the office handling aging affairs has moved from one HEW department to another—with wasteful results. It will also be more efficient and less expensive to have two or three fewer levels of bureaucracy through which to pursue the useful aims of this program.

Among these aims are an adequate income; the best possible physical and mental health; suitable housing; full restorative services, opportunity for employment without age discrimination, retirement in health, honor, and dignity; pursuit of meaningful activity; efficient community services when needed, immediate benefit from proven research knowledge; the free exercise of individual initiative.

It would seriously handicap these programs to seek to operate them from a base subsumed under the Welfare Administration which is where current aging affairs are located. Old people dread being on welfare. They do not want to be led or served by the Welfare Administration—Federal, State or local—unless, as a last resort they have to go on old-age assistance.

The number of our citizens over 65 continues to increase at the rate of nearly 1 million a year. In the first half of the 20th century there were 3 million over 65, representing 4 percent of the population; today, the nearly 20 million represent 10 percent of the population; in 15 years, 1 in every 4 citizens will be 65 or over.

The provisions of H.R. 3708 will permit this House to take proper steps to meet the challenge of the future. This bill gives the problems of our older Americans a high priority within the Federal Government. It will enable us as a nation to build a better standard of life for our aged as well as enable them to achieve a useful and more meaningful role in a society which owes them much and can still learn much from them.

"Way Seen Easier for Dictatorship"—Article by David Lawrence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the distinguished news columnist and editor of U.S. News & World Reports, David Lawrence, has pointed out, in a recent news article, how easy it is now for the U.S. Government to be turned into a dictatorship. The article is entitled "Way Seen Easier for Dictatorship," and it was published in the Washington, D.C., Evening Star on March 25, 1965.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this article, which should be of concern to every Member of this Congress, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAY SEEN EASIER FOR DICTATORSHIP
(By David Lawrence)

Will the U.S. Constitution—now being arbitrarily transformed by Congress and the Supreme Court without regard to the customary amending process—be utilized someday by a future President to build a dictatorship within a centralized government in Washington?

All the provisions of the Constitution could be subordinated and rendered obsolete by a series of statutes passed by a majority of both Houses of Congress and signed by the President. Only three provisions of the Constitution, for instance, really need to be invoked allegedly to justify an assumption of power by the Federal Government which could diminish, if not altogether wipe out, virtually all the rights of the States. The three devices that are to a large extent in use already are as follows:

1. The phrase "to regulate commerce among the several States," as written in the Constitution, has been used by Congress to pass legislation controlling the business and economic affairs of the Nation, irrespective of State lines, as well as the social life of the people. This power is not only being asserted in housing, in education, and in employment practices, but is being enforced through the granting or withholding of Federal funds to particular localities.

2. The phrase "equal protection of the law" in the 14th amendment to the Constitution, already has been cited as authority for intervening in any State where a local statute happens to be disliked by any pressure group that, through demonstrations or threats of violence, is able to gain the support of a majority in Congress.

3. The 15th amendment to the Constitution, which declares that the right of citizens to vote "shall not be denied or abridged" by any State "on account of race or color," now is being construed as giving to Congress the power to control the whole election process by passing a few laws. This could mean the removal of all qualifications for voting except those that happen to suit the party in power.

These epochal changes are being put into effect in certain respects already, in disregard of the amending process prescribed in the Constitution. But the argument made is that the methods are in keeping with "the spirit of the times" and that "the end justifies the means" because the objective is a worthy one.

The present Supreme Court, composed of a majority with no previous judicial experience, has in recent years been approving this process of changing the Constitution. The big question is, When will public opinion insist on the use of the method prescribed in the Constitution itself for amending that document?

After the downfall of Hitler, this correspondent happened to be talking with a prominent professor of a German university who had lived in Germany throughout the whole period of the dictatorship. When asked why he and his fellow citizens allowed Hitler to come into office and extend his power by opportunistic interpretation of the constitution, the professor replied:

"We were indifferent, and didn't sense what was coming. We were too much concerned with our own affairs. We in the educational world were preoccupied with our own pursuits. We took it for granted that everything being done was for a worthy objective. We didn't realize what we were getting into until it was too late."

Today it would be relatively easy for an autocracy to emerge in the United States. The power of the Chief Executive permits him at his discretion to allocate large sums of the taxpayers' money to States that are cooperative and to refuse those sums to States that do not go along with the will of the Chief Executive.

Members of Congress are submissive because their own elections are controlled by pressure groups whose power is bound to be increased as all voting restrictions are about to be removed. President Johnson already has suggested that anybody over 18 years of age should be permitted to vote, irrespective of whether he or she can read and write.

Never in American history has so much power been concentrated in the Federal

Government, which is nowadays virtually directed by the one man who occupies the highest office in the land. He can insure his own reelection by bestowing favors on the political bosses of the large cities, especially now that electoral votes of most States can be controlled by a few persons with powerful organizations behind them. This has been made easier by the decisions of the Supreme Court compelling a reapportionment of the States, so that power will be lodged hereafter in the big cities and their bosses. It takes only a few such cities to control a majority of the electoral votes of the country.

Conference to Combat Obscenity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I and the distinguished members of the House Postal Operations Subcommittee have worked for over 2 years developing legislation that will protect the public from receiving obscene mail. Our subcommittee has reported a bill (H.R. 980) which I sponsored and which I consider one of the most effective pieces of legislation in this area in modern times.

During the development of this legislation one fact has stood out over all others—the American people are deeply alarmed over the traffic in smut and cesspool publications. This was evidenced again recently at the Washington, D.C., Conference To Combat Obscenity. Some 300 citizens representing every walk of life attended the conference and adopted the following resolutions. I commend these to the attention of every Member of the Congress:

RESOLUTIONS OF THE CONFERENCE TO COMBAT OBSCENITY, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 22–23, 1965

We resolve: We of this Conference To Combat Obscenity highly resolve to continue our efforts, as citizens and members of the organizations we represent, to halt the tide of obscenity and indecency in publications and entertainment in our Nation, in order to protect our children and youth from the clear and present danger of immorality and delinquency, which inevitably result from pornography, and to overcome this tragic sickness in society, which, unless healed, will quickly lead to the moral and physical decay of our Nation.

TO ALL OFFICIALS OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

We are alarmed to find that Washington, D.C., appears to be the smut capital of the Nation, in that there are numerous newsstands and retail outlets that display and sell the most obscene and indecent magazines and paperback books produced in America today. We are shocked at the flood of nudity, illicit love, homosexuality, lesbianism, and all other types of sexual perversion on open display. We reflect that our Nation's Capital is visited by many thousands of children and youths every season of the year, and that many of these, as well as those residing here, are exposed to the vicious, filthy literature on many of Washington's newsstands. We call upon the President and Members of Congress to investigate these conditions and apply appropriate remedies.

TO THE PRESIDENT

We respectfully suggest to the President that the forces of amorality in this country are so entrenched and so well organized that a sweeping investigation by the FBI might be in order.

We are reminded that the President of the United States has the great and honored responsibility to nominate, for life tenure, the Justices of the Supreme Court and other Federal courts. We respectfully request that in the filling of any vacancies in the future, and particularly in the Supreme Court, the President select jurists well known and respected by their fellow citizens as being favorable to upholding the standards of decency that have guarded and protected the public from the beginning of our Nation, and which standards are based upon the concept of the sacredness of every human being in the sight of God, and in the sanctity of marriage and the home.

NEWSSTAND PROPRIETORS AND SELLERS

We urge citizens in every community of our Nation to appeal to newsstand proprietors and sellers of publications to refuse to accept from their publishers or wholesalers, and to refuse to handle, display or sell, such magazines, books, and other materials that appeal to prurient interest, glorify illicit sex, debase womanhood, and present obscenity in an attractive manner, and in such ways as to corrupt children and youth. We remind the distributors and sellers of publications that they have an obligation and duty to the communities which they serve to maintain and elevate the moral standards of the community.

ENTERTAINMENT

We call upon all producers and exhibitors of all forms of public entertainment to recognize their responsibility not to present that which violates the laws against obscenity, or offends the standards of decency established for the protection of the public.

With respect to the motion picture industry, we call upon its executives, officials, and all others to reestablish the production code, adopted in 1930 and revised in 1956. We urge the Motion Picture Association to withhold its seal of approval from any film that violates the production code and the standards of decency in our communities, and demand that such films be eliminated in the future.

We remind producers of television programs that children and youth comprise their greatest audiences, and that decent families will not tolerate the further drift toward obscenity in plots, situations, and dialogs, in TV entertainment.

LEGISLATION

We call upon citizens of our Nation, and especially molders of public opinion, to support legislation that will strengthen the laws of municipalities, States, and the Nation, against obscenity; and to enlist other concerned citizens in the crusade to outlaw the peddling of smut and filth in all their forms, particularly to the Nation's youth.

We endorse the proposal to establish, either by action of Congress or by Presidential appointment, a commission to study pornographic materials of all kinds and to recommend to all agencies of the Government courses of action to combat this national evil.

We urge that citizens make organized protests to proper authorities because of the display and sale of materials objectionable for children and youth on property owned or controlled by governmental agencies.

THE U.S. SUPREME COURT

We commend the members of the Supreme Court, who announced the majority opinion in the Roth-Alberts case in 1957, which established a working principle for ridding our communities of obscenity.

We deplore several recent decisions of the Supreme Court, which have overruled the decisions of many State courts in obscenity cases, this in effect making the highest court in the land a board of censors as to what constitutes obscenity, a responsibility which, as Chief Justice Earl Warren has declared, should be left to juries in lower courts. We deplore the fact that such decisions have significantly encouraged the traffic in obscenity.

INTERFAITH SEMINARS

We urge that responsible religious leaders in each city or community promptly hold interfaith seminars, to examine the effects of the new amorality among youth, resulting from pornography, and how to grapple with the problem.

LAW ENFORCEMENT EDUCATION

We urge Mr. J. Edgar Hoover to use the facilities of the FBI to set up a training program for law enforcement officers of States, counties, and cities, in uniform procedures to be followed in obscenity cases.

FUTURE ACTION

We recommend for the consideration of all church groups of all faiths, and all civic organizations interested in public morality, the formulation of a plan whereby a more united voice can be heard by all publishing and entertainment media; that the plan include the establishment of permanent groups, particularly in New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles areas, to cooperate with law enforcement officials to combat obscenity, and to cooperate with producers of films for moving pictures and TV programs to see that films are not made and shown that violate the production code.

We ask that a copy of these resolutions be carried to the President, personally, at his convenience by members of this Conference, and that copies be sent to each Member of Congress.

Rev. Morton A. Hill, S.J., (Chairman, Resolutions and Action Committee), Secretary, Operation Yorkville, New York, N.Y.; Dr. O. K. Armstrong, (Chairman of the Conference), Chairman, Citizens Council for Decency, Springfield, Mo.; Arthur W. H. Magnusson, Essex County Sheriff's Office, Courthouse, N.J.; Mrs. Van Newkirk, Operation Moral Upgrade, Los Angeles, Calif.; Edward Rekruciak, National Vice Chairman, CDL, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. Charles Conn., Representative of Church of God, Cleveland, Tenn.; and Raymond Gauer, Chairman, Los Angeles County Commission Against Indecent Literature, Los Angeles, Calif., Resolutions and Action Committee.

"Selma Situation Oversimplified"—"Voting Bill Piles Wrong on Wrong"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have been very much impressed with two recent articles by the distinguished editor of the Richmond News-Leader, by James Jackson Kilpatrick. One article was published in the State, of Columbia, S.C., on March 18, 1965, and was entitled "Some Conflicts Pit Right Against Right—Selma Situation Oversimplified." The other article was published in the

Washington Evening Star of March 25, 1965, and is entitled "Voting Bill 'Piles Wrong on Wrong'."

I ask unanimous consent that both of these articles be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the State, Columbia, S.C., Mar. 18, 1965]

SOME CONFLICTS PIT RIGHT AGAINST RIGHT—SELMA SITUATION OVERSIMPLIFIED

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

Some years ago, Richmond Lattimore summed up in a trenchant line the difference between melodrama and great tragedy; the one pits right against wrong, he said; the other pits right against right.

In an emotional hour, it is all too easy to treat the news from Alabama as bloody melodrama, in which the Negroes are completely in the right and the whites completely in the wrong, Dr. King the handsome hero and George Wallace the surly villain.

Such a simplistic view has been accepted from Toronto to Berkeley. From one end of the country to the other, newspapers, preachers, students, and politicians are booing and hissing. It is a visceral response, and for some of the elements of this story—especially the brutal clubbing of the Boston minister—this furious reaction doubtless is justified in terms of elementary right and wrong.

Yet a quiet suggestion may be in order that the news from Selma transcends the melodrama of a violent week or month; it contains elements of great tragedy, too. It needs to be said—and perhaps it needs especially to be said at a moment when the rafters are ringing and the floor is shaking and the crowd is going wild—that this conflict also pits right against right; and we ought not to be responding with clenched fists and hoarse cries, but with reason and compassion and a deeply troubled heart.

Of course the Negroes have rights on their side. In the immediate context, those Negroes who live in Lowndes County, and are qualified by age and residence, most certainly have a right to vote. The demonstrators and marchers, resident and nonresident, have rights of free speech and peaceable assembly. They have a right not to be bullied or beaten. These rights are solid, massive, unarguable; and at whatever cost in Federal intervention, by troops or otherwise, these rights will have to be made secure.

Yet, still in the immediate context, there are conflicting rights that merit consideration too, and these have been obscured. The sincerity of this whole affair, viewed as an effort to register Lowndes County Negroes, stands gravely in doubt.

In January, when it was possible for Negroes to come and register, as ordinary citizens following ordinary procedures, they did not come.

Then, on signal, they came in unmanageable droves—hundreds at a time, to create conditions of deliberately contrived disorder. The prospective registrants included children, nonresidents, out-of-State sympathizers. At one point, the Negro leadership asked for a number system, by which each applicant would be given a number as if he were waiting for service at a bakery; but when this system was agreed to, the Negro leadership repudiated it out of hand.

The right of free speech, as the Supreme Court many times has made clear, is not an absolute right. Neither is the right of assembly. When circumstances suggest that "free speech" carries a clear and present danger of provoking riot or panic, public interest overrides a personal right. It is irrelevant, in this regard, that white southerners ought not to be provoked into violence by the taunts of Negro leaders. It is a fact that men may be inflamed, as it is a fact that wood burns; one cannot, in the name of free speech, cry "fire" in a crowded theater.

As an abstract proposition, to pursue the immediate context, any man has a right to walk from Selma to Montgomery. But this is not a right that can be multiplied by a thousand straggling marchers, by night and day, effectively usurping the use of a public highway and denying its safe and peaceful use to others.

Finally, to make one more immediate point, law-abiding men have a right to expect that the orders of a Federal district court will be obeyed, and that no man may arrogantly put himself above them. Procedures exist, as recalcitrant Southern Governors have learned, by which such orders may be promptly appealed and set aside. But Dr. King "can't wait." Where in the name of ordered liberty does he find a right to put himself above the law?

It is not the immediate context that matters. This is a tragedy of generations, or of eons, and not of turbulent hours. The rights of the Negro people (not merely their legal rights, but their rights as human beings) cry out for vindication; and God knows the white South carries a terrible burden of guilt for its sins. Yet today's white southerner also has rights both legal and human—rights to public order, to legal process, to domestic tranquility; and he has certain elementary rights of political self-preservation that he cannot be blamed for invoking against the obliteration of property values he largely has created.

These are terribly hard times for the Negro, but they are harder than they need to be. Last week's uproar registered no voters, proved nothing, gained no lasting peace; the various "marches" served only to put new pressure on the Congress for the enactment of more laws of doubtful wisdom. In this effort, Dr. King understandably feels that all the rights are on his side; but there are those of us, fully supporting his people's right to vote, who say: not all the rights; not all of them.

[From the Evening Star, Mar. 25, 1965]

VOTING BILL "PILES WRONG ON WRONG"

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

With so many interesting and pleasant things to write about—spring, Julie Andrews, Whitey Ford's arm—it is a pity, truly it is, to have to beg once again for a calm and thoughtful look at President Johnson's "Voting Rights Act of 1965." Yet this is a bad bill—bad in ways that need to be understood if something precious is to be preserved—and the lighter topics can wait, if Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., can't.

This precious something is a system of government obedient to a written Constitution. If the Congress sacrifices this high principle to the pressures of a turbulent hour, the Congress may succeed in redressing some palpable wrongs, but a fearful price will be paid in the loss of ancient values.

Under our Federal system, the power to fix qualifications for voting clearly is lodged with the States. Article VIII, section 2, of the Constitution, spells it out:

"The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each States shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature." In the whole of the Constitution, no more explicit provision can be found.

Time after time, the Supreme Court itself has emphasized this reservation of power to the States. Just 6 years ago this spring, in the Lassiter case from North Carolina, the High Court expressly reaffirmed an unbroken series of opinions to this effect.

"The States have long been held to have broad powers to determine the conditions under which the rights of suffrage may be exercised, absent, of course, the discrimination which the Constitution condemns. * * * The right of suffrage is subject to the imposition of State standards which are not discriminatory. * * * We do not suggest that any standards which a State desires to adopt may be required of voters. But there is wide scope of exercise of its jurisdiction. Residence requirements, age, previous criminal record, are obvious examples indicating factors which a State may take into consideration in determining the qualifications of voters. * * *"

In the particular context of Johnson's bill, we should note carefully what this unanimous Court went on to say. "The ability to read and write likewise has the relation to standards designed to promote intelligent use of the ballot. Literacy and illiteracy are neutral on race, creed, color, and sex, as reports around the world show. * * * In our society, where newspapers, periodicals, books, and other printed matter canvass and debate campaign issues, a State might conclude that only those who are literate should exercise the franchise."

In the final paragraph of this 1959 opinion, the Supreme Court condemned those trumped-up literacy tests that have been employed in some cases as a device to make racial discrimination easy. But no such charge could be fairly brought against North Carolina's requirement that a prospective voter "be able to read and write any section of the Constitution of North Carolina in the English language."

"That seems to us," said the Court, "to be one fair way of determining whether a person is literate, not a calculated scheme to lay a trap for the citizen."

This whole body of long-established law would be violated by the President's bill. This is a bill to establish, by Federal law, new qualifications for voting in certain States. The system contemplated under this bill would not be limited to registering those Negroes who might have been denied the franchise by reason of their race. The provisions would apply to any person. Neither would the bill apply to Federal elections only; it would apply, on its own terms, to "any Federal, State, or local election." Section 3(A) of the bill spells this out. In the half a dozen affected States, "No person shall be denied the right to vote in any Federal, State, or local election because of his failure to comply with any test or device." In section 3(B), "test or device" is defined to mean any requirement that a prospective voter "(1) demonstrate the ability to read, write, understand, or interpret any matter, (2) demonstrate any educational achievement or his knoweldge of any particular subject, (3) possess good moral character."

In brief, the bill undertakes to prohibit in these States the imposition of those very qualifications, when used without discrimination, that the Supreme Court repeatedly has approved.

It is said that no fewer than 80 Senators, including some good and able men, are ready to howl their approval of this destructive scheme. To say that "Alabama has brought this on herself" is both wrong and irrelevant. This bill is the work of Johnson and the Congress. On them lies the burden of piling wrong upon wrong. And they do it, incredibly, in the name of "rights."

The Best Education Is Where You Find It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. TENO RONCALIO

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, the April issue of the Atlantic carries an

article in a section called "Our Best High Schools" dealing with the high school in Green River, Wyo.

Green River is a city with a population of approximately 5,000 and its high school has achieved a national reputation for its teaching in science. The reasons for this proficiency are very clearly explained in the article by John V. Bernard, the superintendent of schools at Green River since 1948, and a recipient of a doctorate in education from the University of Wyoming at Laramie, Wyo.

I commend this article to my colleagues and am pleased to call it to their attention and to the attention of all in America who are interested in unusual accomplishments of educational institutions.

The article follows:

OUR BEST HIGH SCHOOLS—SCIENCE IN THE SMALL SCHOOL; GREEN RIVER, WYO.

(By John V. Bernard)

The most improbable place one might expect to find an outstanding high school would be in the Green River area of Wyoming—a relatively isolated, sparsely populated country, 180 miles from Salt Lake City, the nearest metropolitan area, and a region more noted for the abundance of rainbow trout, antelope, deer, and elk than for people. Here a high school exists which has been rated as one of the top 10 in the Nation in the teaching of physics. It has consistently won superior ratings in science and industrial arts fairs, in National Forensic League performances, in music festivals and art exhibits, and in athletic events.

What has produced this fine high school? Nearly a decade ago, the school administration decided that special emphasis should be given to the teaching of science and mathematics in order to meet the rapidly increasing demands of modern technology in a nuclear and space-conscious world. Science classes soon took on a new importance and dimension. The science club was revitalized. To spend time outside school working on new, challenging science projects became the accepted practice for students. In January 1958 a Green River High School student fired a rocket to such heights (approximately 4,000 feet) that he received nationwide publicity. Students vied with each other in making plants and rats radioactive. The Southwest Wyoming District Science Fair was organized, and later it become an annual event, with Green River High School the host school and one of its science teachers the permanent director.

In April 1960 a student project, the Downfall of Parity, took first prize at the Wyoming State Science Fair and was a finalist at the National Science Fair in Indianapolis. An outstanding entry in the Colorado-Wyoming Bi-State Science Fair at Boulder in April 1962 was a project on nuclear magnetic resonance—the work of a Green River freshman. In 1963 two Green River entries, aerodynamic design of road vehicles and a study of matrix algebra, won in State competition and were exhibited at the bistate fair at Boulder.

The population of the school district is approximately 5,000, and its great distance from other centers of population creates a high community interest in local enterprises, especially the school and its activities. This healthy interest is dramatically shown by the fact that the voters have never defeated a school bond issue, the most recent having been passed by a vote of about 5 to 1.

High community interest and spirit are responsible for the excellent caliber of school board trustees. Being a member of the school board in Green River is looked upon as a great honor and a serious responsibility, and competition for school board posts is often very keen. The axiom that good schools are synonymous with good school board members is reflected in the progressive school policies of Green River.

Although Wyoming is primarily an agrarian State, this district is to a great extent industrial. It is an important division point of the Union Pacific Railroad, and now is recognized as the largest trona mining area in the world. Development of these trona mines and refineries has occurred within the last 15 years. Three chemical mine-refinery complexes are now in operation. An effective public relations program aimed at local industries and their employees has resulted in energetic support for the school program.

The chemical plants actively encourage young people to study science. A scholarship is awarded each year to the outstanding senior at Green River High School by one of the trona companies. These companies furnish judges for the Southwest District Science Fair, and together with several business people and business houses, give generously to help finance an excellent science fair in the local area. Their personnel are made available as judges at fairs or as lecturers at the high school. The companies donate their time freely in showing the students their processes and new developments. By witnessing production and talking with scientists in action, students can obtain valuable basic data. Thus, a fertile climate for scientific interest is established through the help of practical scientists in industry.

Conventional techniques are still used in teaching all phases of science at Green River, where a strong emphasis of fundamental concepts has always been stressed. Every attempt is made to avoid prosaic patterns, principally by involving the students in purposeful experimentation and by challenging them with advanced work to the limit of their ability.

In the fall of 1962, the National Association of Biology Teachers selected as the outstanding biology teacher of Wyoming a teacher from this high school. This teacher has written a manual entitled "Laboratory Guide to Experimental Rat Surgery."

To make biology an exciting subject, an atypical approach is used. In the initial course, required of all students, instead of emphasis on a great mass of detail and theory, the accent is placed on guided elementary experimentation to provide the student with a basic understanding of living processes. Student projects have ranged from training a rat to walk on a tightwire, to inducing beriberi in rats through strict dietary control, and to rat surgery. Typical of the experiments is one in which sophomore students successfully removed the pancreas from a pregnant rat. Until the birth of the baby rats, the mother failed to show any signs of diabetes, but shortly afterward, diabetes became apparent, demonstrating that even in the embryonic stage, the supply of insulin from the young rats was sufficient to maintain good health in the mother. In addition to the usual biological apparatus, the students have had a miniature zoo, consisting of an alligator, monkeys, snakes, rats, aquariums, and desert terrariums to entice their interest.

Since last September, the biology department at Green River High School has been taking part, along with 70 other high schools in the Nation, in an experimental program developed by the Biological Sciences Curriculum Study Group, Educational Committee of the American Institute of Biological Sciences, supported by the National Science Foundation. The courses differ from traditional courses in that they place greater emphasis on molecular and cellular biology; they stress investigation and principles—the universal rather than the applied aspects of biology. The teacher does not supply the student with the answers. He discovers them for himself through thought-provoking questions.

When a vice president of a major corporation indicates that more than 40 percent of the products it now sells were not even in existence 10 years ago, it is apparent that 4 years of high school is too short a time to acquire the basic knowledge needed in the world today. This fact has been recognized, and a continuous curriculum study committee made up of teachers from grades 1 through 12 has been established. The programs in science, math, English, music, and other subjects are a continuation and development of courses presented in the elementary and junior high schools.

The elementary teachers have found that the new math has helped prepare children for higher math, since it uses techniques and terminology that do not have to be unlearned but rather are carried on to the higher grade levels. The basic skills are stressed thoroughly as in the past, since they are an essential part of any math program.

As curriculum changes have been made from year to year, the faculty has carried on a program of parent orientation, making for the ready acceptance of changes. For example, night classes were organized in the new math to keep parents abreast of the program and to eliminate the always present resistance to change.

The program of accelerated modern math is continued in the junior high (seventh and eighth grades). Algebra I, usually given in the ninth grade, is offered to eighth-grade students who show exceptional aptitude in math. Selection is based on the students' grades and teacher recommendations, as well as a prognostic examination, the Iowa Aptitude Test, given at the end of the seventh grade. The student who takes algebra in the eighth grade has the opportunity to complete 5 years of high school mathematics before graduation.

In the science field, as in mathematics, there exist both horizontal and vertical correlation of subject matter and techniques. The elementary school science program is aimed at the understanding and interpretation of the world and an appreciation of the total environment. Students are introduced to the scientific method and to the steps in problem solving. At this age more than at any other, the wonder, excitement, and thrill a younngster has from a discovery of his own, and the values he attaches to his findings, leave lasting impressions and awaken desires to probe further into the ever-advancing perimeters of science. In their zest for knowledge, the youngsters have absorbed so much that their parents, many of whom are college graduates, are amazed. Things are now included in the elementary science program which were not in their course of study until high school.

The same philosophy is the basis of the junior high science program, which stresses the stimulation of as many sensory receptors as possible. Taste, for example, was used in a chemistry experiment that surprised some pupils. Applying the elementary knowledge of mixing hydrochloric acid and sodium hydroxide until neutral, pupils produced common table salt. At this age they were skeptical of the result until they tasted the final product. On making salt the students became aware of the presence of atoms, molecular weights, and elementary chemical equations.

Chemistry is the senior high school is based on imaginative thinking about the question of the how and why of facts. The course is presented as a historical compilation of facts and events rather than as a known and inflexible body of knowledge. It was planned to incorporate some of the best points of the Chemical Education Materials Study (CHEM), a group appointed by the American Chemical Society, and the Chemical Bond Approach (CBA), a small group of

chemists financed by the National Science Foundation, but to keep the course within the capabilities of the high school student. In the laboratory, students are given fewer instructions in more advanced experiments, and in some cases, none. One of the students is currently trying to extract alkaloids from sagebrush (abundant in the area); another is trying to determine the effects of various factors on the rate of crystal growth. The better students are encouraged to do research on their own in projects which coincide with their own interests.

The most up-to-date presentation of physics, the Physical Science Study Committee physics course, is used in the high school. The text is Physics, written by the committe, which is financed by the National Science, Sloan, and Ford Foundations. Students soon realize that physics is not static but continually evolves from basic research and inquiries. These concepts are developed by thorough exploration in the laboratory and analysis of the text. For example, the development of a model is used to explain the behavior of light. From this laboratory experiments and study of the text, the student first assumes that light is similar to particles. Information is then presented in a series of experiments which show that the particle model is not satisfactory in every respect, and that a wave model can better explain most of the phenomena associated with light. This type of physics study simultaneously heightens a student's interest in higher mathematics because it demonstrates that physics is the application of mathematics to matter in action.

The Green River High School Science Club is affiliated with State and National organizations and has a branch organization within itself, the Junior Engineering Technical Society. Currently utilizing methods learned in the physics courses, the club is building a gas laser. The laser is perhaps one of the most important inventions of recent years and is certainly one of the most active areas of scientific research. The students' working model has been financed by the science club.

The annual science fair has continued to create an ever higher degree of interest, and has had to move from the school gymnasium to a larger exhibit hall. Projects can be in any field of science, engineering, or mathematics and can be the work of either a single individual or a group; however, only exhibits submitted by individuals are eligible for scholarship awards. The University of Wyoming has been very cooperative in such ways as supplying information and furnishing judges for the science fairs.

In addition to equipping students for everyday living, the mathematics curriculum of the high school strives to prepare the potential scientist for college work. Recognition of new subject matter, such as logic, probability and statistics, topology, and modern abstract algebra, has created new needs in math curriculum. The recommendations of the School Mathematics Study Group, an NEA affiliate, and the Commission on Mathematics, appointed by the College Entrance Examination Board, have been followed in planning this course of study.

It must not be construed from what has been said that an inordinate emphasis has been placed on the science program to the detriment of the rest of the curriculum. This facet of the curriculum has been stressed, since it reflects the public interest in science during the past few years. The rest of the program is considered to be equally important. A similar balance of training in the fundamentals teamed with allied activities has produced much that is worth while.

In the field of English and speech, Green River High School was given the National Forensic League award for outstanding work in 1958—one of the smallest schools in the United States to receive it. The speech program has ranged from the solid core of debate to the production of such plays as "The Robe," "Bye-Bye Birdie," and "Finian's Rainbow." The latter two combined the resources of both the English and music departments.

Students at Green River High School have excelled in other activities. Since 1958, the high school annual has been rated first in its class in 5 out of 7 years, and one year, best in the State in all classes. Directly correlated with social studies, English, and speech was the innovation of an annual student-legislature assembly, in which students from the entire southwest area of Wyoming participate. The school was one of two in the State which was asked to participate in Project Talent, a test sponsored by the U.S. Commission on Education to explore the utilization of human talents.

The industrial arts program is geared to the demands of local industry and to the needs of the students not planning to attend college. As an example of the interest in this field, the department originated the State Industrial Arts Fair, another annual event, now held at various schools throughout the State. In the 1964 model-car competition sponsored by the Fisher Body Craftsman's Guild, one student designed and built a model of such excellence that he won the senior division first-place award for the State of Wyoming.

Green River recognizes that the classroom teacher is the keystone in the educational organization. The selection of outstanding teachers is a continuing and intensive procedure. Salary scales, physical plant, supplies, and climate are some of the factors that attract teachers to a community, but Green River believes that the reputation established by a school is equally important in getting good teachers. The high regard in which the school is held throughout the State and among student teachers and university placement centers has been of tremendous assistance in the job of recruiting. Prospective teachers are aware of the educational climate. In commenting on why he chose Green River, a teacher new to the system said that he had heard of the rapport between administrators and teachers and of the board-minded community not fearful of intellectual freedom.

Green River has a strong nucleus of capable teachers who have remained in the system. It is also part of the procurement policy to secure young, dynamic teachers who are working on their higher degrees, even though they will stay with us only a few years. While we have them, the students reap the benefit of their most energetic and productive years. This combination of old and new has avoided the development of a parochialism in ideas and methods.

The administration must assume the responsibility to see that good teachers are stimulated so they continue to be good teachers. The closeness of personal contact between administrators and teachers facilitates the recognition of each teacher as an individual and underscores the importance of his day-to-day work. It promotes the development of pride in being part of a good school. For teachers to do their best work, they must have good classroom equipment. In addition, the administration of the salary scale is tempered by an awareness that quality teaching cannot be measured solely by the amount of training and years of experience.

In essence, what has been achieved here is the outgrowth of an educational philosophy developed by the citizens and school personnel. Even though children are taught in groups, learning is an individual process. With the ever-increasing acceleration in learning, it still must be crystal clear that children are not small adults; they have a psychology of their own. Enthusiasm for knowledge and learning must be transferred from teacher to student, who in turn develops his interest through work and with effort. A hundred years ago, Horace Mann said, "A teacher who is attempting to teach without inspiring the pupil with a desire to learn is hammering on cold iron." This is still true. A teacher must also have freedom from harassment and freedom to teach differently.

It is our belief that education in a democracy gives everyone the equal right to become unequal as rapidly as his natural ability and determination will allow. Within the framework of excellent teaching and administrative guidance, the students at Green River are consciously provided the means to develop in this manner.

Proposed Voting Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I call to the attention of Senators a very impressive editorial from the March 25, 1965, issue of the Savannah Evening Press, of Savanna, Ga. The editorial is entitled "Shifting Minds and Promises Kept." I ask unanimous consent that this excellent editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Savannah Evening Press, Mar. 25, 1965]

SHIFTING MINDS AND PROMISES KEPT

When he spoke to the Congress and the Nation on March 15, President Johnson said of his voting rights legislation: "While I have proposed to you other measures to serve the strengthening of our free society and the happiness of our free people, I regard action on the measures proposed in this message to be first in priority. * * *"

Since that time the legislative wheels on Capitol Hill have emitted the definite sounds of gears being meshed together against their natural motion. Arm twisting is definitely the order of the day, so much so that the Members of Congress have been told by the leadership that they will get no recess for Easter unless the voting rights bill clears the decks.

This type of attitude flies into the face of the best tradition of the Congress, particularly the Senate which is regarded as the slow, deliberative body. Additionally, no worthwhile legislation has ever materialized as the result of the ramrod process.

This is not the first time that a proposal for Federal election registrars has found its way to the floor of Congress. In 1891, the House passed a bill offered by Representative Henry Cabot Lodge, the Massachusetts Republican, which called for the appointment of Federal officials of both parties on election boards in any congressional district upon the petition of 500 voters.

The Senate debated the bill for 46 days, at the end of which the majority attempted to put through a cloture resolution requiring only a majority vote. Four days of continuous session without adjournment followed but it failed to break the filibuster. The proposal of a force bill was then abandoned, never to be taken up again in the Senate.

The ironies of politics are indeed strange. Two years later when he was a Member of the Senate, Lodge made historic use of the filibuster himself. Thus, we see that shifting minds in politics are not unusual, although the issues at times make it difficult to square one's conscience.

President Johnson is getting praise from some civil rights organizations for his proposal of Federal intervention within the States to assure voting rights for Negroes.

Yet it is not so long ago that Mr. Johnson had a totally different view of the propriety and constitutionality of any attempt by the Federal Government to intrude in State and local elections and to take from the States their rights under the Constitution to qualify voters.

On May 22, 1948, in Austin, Tex., Johnson said: "This civil rights program, about which you have heard so much, is a farce and a sham—an effort to set up a police state in the guise of liberty. I am opposed to that program. I fought it in Congress. It is the province of the State to run its own elections."

We are told that consistency is the bane of small minds. A man who was a 100 percent segregationist up to 1957, and 66 percent segregationist between 1957 and 1960, as judged by his rollcall votes in the Senate, has accomplished a complete somersault. As one Washington news report put it during last year's presidential campaign, "Johnson saw his presidential chances in 1964 severely limited by his southern identification." So he sloughed off that old skin for a new image.

But there is more involved than just the changed image of the man who currently occupies the White House.

We hold to the belief that numerous sections of the Johnson proposed legislation are clearly unconstitutional and that the Congress would do well to think long and hard about enacting such a measure.

Let us assume, however, for the purposes of discussion that the provisions are constitutional. This concession and enactment of legislation will not mean that peace and tranquility will prevail in the Nation—from a racial viewpoint.

James Farmer, national director of the Congress of Racial Equality, has already served notice in Washington—at judiciary square—that quick passage of the President's voter registration bill will not end civil rights demonstrations. "To relax pressure now would be to relax progress," his audience was told.

Herbert Woods, Washington director of CORE, spelled out seven immediate demands upon the Federal Government:

"That the Federal Bureau of Investigation stop taking notes and start arresting people; the FBI enforce present civil rights laws; that brutality, intimidation and murder in connection with civil rights demonstrations be made a Federal offense; that the FBI investigate on a day-to-day basis instead of only when sensational events happen; that Congress pass quick voter legislation; that Congresmen be unseated where large percentages of voter discrimination occurs; and that new elections be held within 9 months after discriminated voters have been registered."

The threat made by Farmer is no idle one; we need only recall events in various parts of the Nation prior to the election last year.

There were lots of loud pronouncements that passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 would bring an end to the various racial demonstrations. Events certainly proved the predictions wrong; but not the promises of some civil rights organizations.

It is an open secret that leaders of these organizations agreed to a truce during the critical period of the presidential campaign so as not to embarass their candidate, the man from Texas. Had the demonstrations been waged with preconvention fury, a larger segment of the public presumably would have voted for Barry Goldwater and these groups feared the Arizona senator.

The passage of time has proven this point: when the civil rights leaders promise to demonstrate, that they will.

With the vow already in the record, it brings us to this question: Why the rush to pass the voter registration bill? It apparently will solve nothing and deter not one single demonstration.

If President Johnson has any sincere wish in his dreams of a Great Society, he had best put on his thinking cap and devise some method of bringing these demonstrations to a grinding, screeching halt. Lacking this action, there soon will be no society left to be great or otherwise.

The leaders of some of the so-called civil rights groups have openly declared war on all the legal concepts of this Nation and the several States. It cannot continue and especially with the open or implied sanction of the Nation's Chief Executive.

The President must recognize the nature of his enemy for what and who he is. Tomorrow may be too late.

Al Yemen—Cold War Crossroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, the March 22 issue of Washington Report carries a very interesting article written by DeWitt Copp, managing editor, which I recommend to the Members of Congress. The text of the article follows:

AL YEMEN—COLD WAR CROSSROADS

Al Yemen means "the right hand" in Arabic. The country of Yemen takes its name from its location in respect to the Holy City of Mecca, and not from its geographic position. If it did, it might be called the Heel of the Arabian Peninsula. It is a heel washed by the Red Sea along 250 miles of coastline, extending from the strategic strait of Bab el-Mandeb, Saudi Arabia's southwestern tip.

With a population of something less than 5 million living within an area of 75,000 square miles, this tiny land of antiquity has been, since September 1962, the scene of conflict. It is a conflict which presently involves over 50,000 Egyptian troops committed to outright aggression through the political ambitions of President Gamal Abdel Nasser. But underlying this fact, there runs a line of direction from Moscow to Cairo which antedates the attack on Yemen and which reveals an overall plan of action more subtle and devious than is generally known.

SOVIETS AID YEMEN

At the time of the Sucz crisis in October 1956, Yemen's monarch, Imam Ahmed, armed with Soviet weapons, began sporadic warfare along his country's ill-defined southern border against the forces of the British protectorate of Aden.

The British resisted, however, and by March 1957, had temporarily put an end to the Imam's plan. The British then reported to the United Nations that Yemen had gotten her arms from Nasser and the Soviet bloc.

By August 1957, Imam Ahmed was ready to try again. He had received six shiploads of arms from the Soviets, including T–34 tanks. The British responded in kind and once more put an end to his efforts. But Soviet technical and military aid continued to flow in.

In early 1958, while Nasser and Ahmed were dickering over the jointly formed United Arab States, Yemen's Crown Prince Saif al-Islam al-Badr was making a grand tour of the Communist countries. He returned home with trade agreements from 10 of the same, including Red China.

By the middle of that year, Soviet technicians were at work at Yemen's major Red Sea port of Hodeida with plans first to transform it into a modern base and then to staff it with their own people.

In 1961 Ahmed withdrew from Nasser's union, totally disenchanted with Egypt's leader. A year later, in September, he died and was succeeded by his well-traveled son, Mohammed al-Badr. Al-Badr's rule lasted exactly 1 week. At dawn, on September 26, 1962, his newly appointed chief of staff, Col. Abdullah al-Salal, supported by pro-Nasser elements in the army utilizing Russion-built tanks and weapons, attacked the royal palace at San'a and the walls came tumbling down. The wily al-Badr, however, had escaped into the mountains. Upon seizing power, al-Salal declared himself Prime Minister, and it took just 4 days for the Soviets to grant official recognition.

AL-BADR BEATS NASSER

On October 7, 1962, came the first report of al-Badr's escape. Nasser announced that his 3,000 troops already in Yemen, would finish the job al-Salal had bungled. Shortly thereafter, as world attention became riveted on the Cuban missile crisis, al-Badr counterattacked and full-scale war developed. Nasser rushed in Soviet guns, tanks, jets, and 20,000 of his men. The King's barefoot fighters, Zaidi Moslems, of the fiercely faithful Shi'a sect, drove back and demoralized Nasser's elite warriors. With supplies from Saudi Arabia and Jordan, al-Badr's guerrillas actually began to move forward.

In December 1962 the U.S. Government agreed to recognize al-Salal's rule on the promise that Nasser would withdraw his troops. Instead of living up to his end of the bargain, Nasser reinforced his troops and, through the winter months and into the early spring, the fighting continued.

Following a factfinding mission by U.N. Under Secretary Ralph Bunch, U.S. diplomat Ellsworth Bunker came up with a plan to bring peace to Yemen. Under it, Nasser again agreed to withdraw his forces if Saudi Arabia promised to halt its aid to the Royalists. To make sure the promise was kept, U.N. observers would patrol a strip 12 miles wide along Yemen's border with Saudi Arabia. Once again Nasser was taken at his word, the worth of which he proved by replacing the troops he withdrew from Yemen with fresh ones.

RENEW FIGHTING IN YEMEN

In May 1963, al-Badr announced the Egyptians had not lived up to their pledge and began a new offensive. The fighting became heavy and sustained. Its echoes began to reverberate through the United Nations, and the Security Council finally got down to a serious discussion of the situation. On June 11, 1963, it passed a resolution 10 to 0, with the Soviets abstaining, to send a 200-man observation team to Yemen for 2 months on condition the cost would be paid by Saudi Arabia and Nasser's United Arab Republic. The team was to have three purposes: (1) To supervise the withdrawal of 28,000 Egyptian troops; (2) to end Saudi Arabian aid; (3) to demilitarize the already mentioned strip along the Yemeni-Saudi border.

Heading the truce team was Sweden's Maj. Gen. Carl (Bull) von Horn. A veteran of the Gaza strip and the Congo, he had gone to Yemen in April and had predicted the war

could go for 10 years. Not so his commander in chief, U Thant, who saw the finish "within 2 to 4 months." Between July and the end of October 1963, the U.N. team generally accomplished two-thirds of its assigned mission. However, the most important condition for success, the removal of Egyptian troops, it was unable to bring about.

General von Horn quit in disgust (reportedly over a lack of equipment and supplies) and by October 30, U Thant's earlier optimism was gone as he announced the observation team was to be withdrawn. The reason he gave was Saudi Arabia's refusal to pay any more of her share of the cost. He admitted she had lived up to her part of the bargain and the Egyptians had not. At the last moment, the Saudi Arabians agreed to continue to help finance the U.N. observation team.

ARABS HOLD CONFERENCE

In the latter part of January 1964, Nasser held a summit conference of Arab leaders. Thirteen nations were represented. When the meeting concluded, it was announced that progress on the Yemen issue had been made, but hardly a week had passed when, on February 4, Saudi Arabia announced it had not come to any agreement and had not even met with any of the Yemen Republic's leaders.

And there the matter stood for some months—President al-Salal in his shaky capital at Sana, his determined opponent, Mohammed al-Badr, tenaciously perched in the mountains and, back at the pyramids, Nasser, trying to figure a way out of a very expensive mess which by that time had cost him over $150 million in hard cash and a lot of Soviet-furnished military equipment, not to mention thousands of his troops killed and wounded. As for the United Nations, its mission remained in Yemen until September 1964, observing.

In October 1964, a second all-Arab summit meeting took place in Cairo and in November it was announced a "cease fire" had been arranged with a proposed all-Yemeni conference to take place in December. This meeting failed to materialize.

On March 7, 1965, an Associated Press report from Yemen told of Egyptian forces launching an assault in northern Yemen. The attack appeared to be the opening of a spring offensive.

Nasser's original miscalculation in believing he could make an easy conquest of Yemen has cost him mightily, and his prestige is on the block. But the Soviet investment in Yemen is so considerable and of such long standing that it will not be lightly forfeited. While the fighting has been raging in the mountains, the Soviets have completed work on the Port of Hodeida. This port, which Soviet technicians now operate, will accommodate Soviet trawlers whose real purpose is well known.

Just north of San'a, an 11,500-foot airstrip has also been completed under Soviet supervision. It is the longest airstrip in the entire Middle East, and a glance at the map will show its geographic-military importance with regard to the Mediterranean, Africa, and points east. While the Soviets have concentrated on shipping and aircraft facilities, their Chinese comrades have built a modern highway to connect Hodeida and San'a. In fact, investigation shows that for nearly a decade Yemen has been a point of intense Communist interest and activity for reasons that have nothing to do with bettering the social and economic welfare of the Yemeni. Al-Badr, like his father before him, wooed the Communists and then was betrayed by them because they put their rubles on Nasser. This is a reality he has learned the hard way.

Nasser has been able to finance his venture in Yemen partially because he has received approximately a billion dollars in various forms of U.S. foreign aid since 1953. The hot sands of Middle Eastern politics are shifting and the United States must decide if it is to influence these shifts or simply be a spectator in the high-priced seats. A positive change could be started with the reevaluation by the Congress and Administration of foreign aid for Nasser's Egypt.

Discriminatory Features of Proposed Voting Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the National Observer of March 29, 1965, includes an editorial which warns against the discriminatory features contained in the President's proposed voting rights legislation. The editorial is entitled "A Punitive Bill." I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PUNITIVE BILL

Emotions—even in a highly educated, 20th century, automated democracy—can run so high that men fear to speak their minds.

So it has been for almost a month, as the voting rights heat has built ever higher. Most of those voices who assert that men should be denied a vote because of the color of their skins were stilled long ago. The only question for most citizens has been how to bring about Negro suffrage in those places where it is denied.

But so high has the heat been built, so pell-mell the push to accommodate the marching thousands, that sensible questions are being overlooked. This is so even in the Congress, that body created to deliberate over the drafting of the laws, to deliberate so that correcting one injustice does not sow others in its place.

The voting bill now before Congress is plainly punitive legislation. If that is the intent of the Congress and the Nation, even under emotional duress, so be it. But let there be no mistake that this is what it is.

It is directed against six States: Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Virginia. The record of these States on Negro voting is bad indeed, viewed over the past 100 years. But Georgia, Virginia, and South Carolina have been moving to liberalize, slow though the movement may sometimes be. And in each of the six States there are citizens who do not oppress, citizens who in scores of quiet ways work to keep southern society together as a segment of American society—including increasing the Negro vote. That aside, what is the intent—to get the Negro his vote or to punish for the sins of the past?

It is understandable that there should be a desire to punish, particularly among Negroes, particularly among the more emotional, both Negro and white. But what of the bulk of the population—is that its intent? Does it know what this voting bill provides?

For one thing, in effect it provides these six States can have no literacy qualifications for voting, whereas the other States can if they so wish.

And there is no doubt that this is aimed specifically at these six States; a complicated formula has been devised to make it so. If 50 percent or more inhabitants of voting age in a State have been voting, Federal authorities will stay out.

The voter himself is put under strictures, apparently to force him to vote. For if a person once registered to vote in these States fails to vote "at least once during 3 consecutive years while listed," he is stricken from the register. This may be the politician's dream, but it is hardly in the mainstream of the Nation's democratic history.

One essential reason the Nation is in an uproar—a belated uproar—over voting rights is that what can be denied a Negro in South Carolina can perhaps be denied a Swede in Minnesota or a Jew in Kansas or an Anglo-Saxon in New York. Thus the drive to equalize the vote, everywhere.

But if six Southern States can be made to conform to unusual voting standards, why not Minnesota and Kansas and New York? And why, some sad day, limit this punitive conformity to mere matters of the vote?

Hon. Bradford Morse Speaks on Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, at a memorial meeting on Boston Common for the Reverend James Reeb, of Boston, who was so cruelly slain in Selma, Ala., the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman F. BRADFORD MORSE, summed up in two short phrases the very heart of the civil rights struggle today.

In commenting on the need for Federal legislation and pledging his support for a bill that will guarantee, once and for all, that basic right of citizenship—the right to vote, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman MORSE, said:

So long as there are second-class citizens, there can be no first-class citizenship.

This conviction that all Americans are involved in the current struggle for voting rights is also reflected in the Congressman's declaration that "those who march in Selma march for us." It seemed to me that these two phrases reflect the fundamental understanding that this is a truly national issue. Until it is resolved in favor of equality, our country will be infected with hatred and bigotry.

The brief remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman MORSE, spoke volumes about the century-old battle for equality.

His statement rang true for the thousands of people massed on Boston Common that Sunday and I wanted my colleagues to have the benefit of his thoughts by inserting this reference to the Congressman's address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Propaganda Fiasco of the Year?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD RUMSFELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the following editorials from the Chicago Daily News and Look magazine, respectively, remind us again that the Communists are ever alert to use any incident to discredit the United States. We have had sufficient evidence in the past of the effectiveness with which the Communists will use propaganda, and it is difficult to understand why we continue to give them openings to discredit us. The responsibility for our recent ineptness in connection with the use of nonlethal gas in South Vietnam rests squarely with the administration. Regrettably, it will take many years to erase the memories of this serious propaganda defeat.

The editorials follow:

[From the Chicago Daily News]

PROPAGANDA FIASCO OF THE YEAR?

The U.S. Information Agency is said to be so concerned over the destructive psychological impact of disclosures of employment of even a mild kind of gas warfare in Vietnam that it is demanding such tactics be halted at once.

That would be the crowning irony of a story replete with irony. For the fact remains that the United States, in its bumbling, bighearted way, was only trying to take a little of the savagery out of the savage business of war. It was trying to substitute such things as tear gas for bullets and bombs where possible, especially where civilians might be intermingled with enemy soldiers. The difference between this and the bombing of Hiroshima is manifestly the difference between day and night.

And yet this relatively kindly enterprise was undertaken with such fantastic ineptness that Communists could plausibly cry "gas warfare!" and "chemical warfare!" and "the same old American butchery."

The fact of the employment of the disabling gases was allowed to burst upon the world so suddenly that the Communist accusations preceded any U.S. explanations. And the explanations, when they came, sounded embarrassed and defensive.

There is no indication, indeed, that the agency whose assigned job is to understand and predict the impact of policy decisions upon people's minds—the USIA—was ever consulted in the matter. Moreover, it must be inferred from official statements that the field commanders had been delegated the right to employ the disabling gases whenever they saw fit. And that is to suggest that the people in charge in Washington had not the slightest idea of the volatility of the idea of gas warfare when unaccompanied by careful definition and explanation.

The affair may well go into the books as the propaganda fiasco of the year. We hope there will be none such in the future.

[From Look magazine]

GAS: NOBODY'S MISTAKE BUT L.B.J.'S

Nonlethal gas may indeed be as humane as the Pentagon claims, but its use in Vietnam was a political blunder. Even more so was the surreptitious way in which its use was introduced. Had a calm announcement of our readiness to use "riot control agents" in certain situations been made beforehand, the bad propaganda effect could have been minimized. Instead Secretaries Rusk and McNamara had to weigh in late with a defense of the decision which sounded like a post hoc rationalization.

Certainly these gases themselves are not especially horrifying. Tear-inducing and nauseating chemical agents have been employed to break up riots in the United States and elsewhere. Their use in battle, however, recalls their antecedents, World War I's phosgene and mustard gases, giving them a symbolic importance out of proportion to their comparatively innocuous character. Military men may call this reaction irrational. Nevertheless, logic is unlikely to alter public objection to the use of gas.

The decision for Vietnam appears to have been reached without adequate consideration. The White House disclaims Presidential responsibility; Press Secretary Reedy says it is "not the sort of thing" that comes up for high level approval.

As Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, the President is of course responsible for any act undertaken by the military. Moreover, whether or not the actual decision was his, it should have been. The United States has an uphill task winning international approval for our defense of Vietnam. Such understanding as we have gained ought not be dissipated to such small purpose, especially without plenty of serious thought on the part of our President about the political consequences.

Is the President Moving Too Slowly for ADA?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, the country will probably learn next week whether the President is moving along with a tempo fast enough to suit the designs of Americans for Democratic Action. The occasion will be the annual convention of that organization which has no small amount of influence in shaping the policies of this administration.

Columnist Lyle C. Wilson has written an article entitled "ADA Readies a Shock," which contains some food for thought. It follows:

ADA READIES A SHOCK
(By Lyle C. Wilson)

Big business and industrial supporters of the Johnson-Humphre administration are due for a shock next week when they learn what L.B.J.'s leftwing sponsors are planning for the Great Society.

Americans for Democratic Action meets here next week in annual convention. ADA comprises the administration leftwing, a powerful ally on whom L.B.J. placed most of his blue chips last August when he tagged HUBERT H. HUMPHREY to run for Vice President. H.H.H. was a founding father of ADA. Mr. Johnson's final choice was between Mr. HUMPHREY and Senator EUGENE L. MCCARTHY, also of Minnesota, another ADA star. Mr. Johnson's presidential campaign of necessity was to appease ADA. He remains stuck with that necessity.

ADA is neither Communist nor classically Socialist. Welfarism under a wholly centralized national government is ADA's political religion. This is a high-cost, cradle-to-grave Federal welfarism with ever-increasing centralization of power, planning, and control in Washington and, more specifically, in the Office of the Presidency. Socialism and this centralized ADA welfarism are not identical but they could live together.

ADA's enormous influence in Government comes of its triumphant infiltration of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations. ADA also helps to make law in the judiciary and to make policy in the Congress. But the executive department is ADA's special field. ADA entered the Kennedy and Johnson administrations as water enters a sponge.

There is right now in ADA publications, however, a note of disenchantment with President Johnson. ADA seems to feel that Mr. Johnson talks big about a Great Society but is dangerously committed to economy in Government, perhaps, even, to a balanced budget at some future time. Although Mr. Johnson has accomplished not much in the area of Government economy, it has been enough to alarm ADA spenders. That is because ADA's patent medicine for all social ills consist of Federal money, much of it borrowed.

ADA looks hopefully to a Government spending budget of $150 billion in 1969. That is the year in which ADA expects Mr. Humphrey to succeed Mr. Johnson as President. This hope is based on an implied commitment from L.B.J. to put his No. 2 man in the White House when he is through with the place.

That is what ADA has been shooting for—an ADA President. Who needs Congress if he has the White House and $150 billion annually to spend? ADA regards the current Johnson spending rate of near $100 billion a year as a "chintzy" program which will not do what ADA wants done.

For example, ADA wants to spend $40 billion in 10 years on education. Edward D. Hollander, chairman of ADA's executive committee, has set 1967 as a deadline for full employment and 1970 for abolishing poverty. ADA believes in thinking big.

ADA pressure undoubtedly will tend to move Mr. Johnson further and faster on the path to centralized welfarism, a goal which appears to be wholly compatible with the administration's programs as outlined so far.

Honor Roll of the Gemini Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in any great American undertaking such as the Gemini manned space flight program, certain key leaders' names become household words and gain the admiration and respect of the American people. Names such as Chris Kraft, Chuck Mathews, Bill Schneider, Deke Slayton, General Davis, General Funk, and Mr. McDonnell are such leaders. Their names are known to all America as leaders in our Gemini program which has started our great new series of manned space flights as a forerunner to the Apollo program. Behind these leaders and the astronauts are the true heroes of the Gemini program. Their work represents days, months, and years of sacrifice and dedication to assure the success and safety of our astronauts in this effort. For the benefit of all people it is my privilege to list an honor roll of key personnel participating in the Gemini program. They represent personnel of NASA, industry, and of the military establishments, who have worked so successfully together to fulfill our national space program objectives:

Name	Organization	Area
R. McFarland	Martin Co	Airframe/Structures.
T. Shiokari	Aerospace Corp	Do.
J. MacDonald	Martin Co	Vehicle propulsion.
R. G. Olander	Aerospace Corp	Do.
L. D. Wilson	Aerojet	Engine.
G. M. Forslund	Aerospace Corp	Do.
J. Llewelyn	Martin Co	Flight controls.
E. Mitchell	do	Hydraulics.
L. Jackson	do	Flight termination.
R. E. Ringe	Aerospace Corp	Do.
J. Folberth	Martin Co	Electrical system.
R. C. Weaver	do	Malfunction detection system.
H. S. Siegel	Aerospace Corp	Do.
J. Atkinson	Martin Co	Instrumentation.
R. H. Dickinson	General Electric Co	Ground guidance.
H. Nonken	Burroughs Corp	Ground guidance computer system.
C. W. Pittman	Aerospace Corp	Guidance equations.
A. Chambers	do	Do.
L. Bush	do	Performance status.
J. W. McCurry	do	GLV development status.
R. A. Hohmann	do	Design certification, GLV.
Col. R. C. Dineen	U.S. Air Force	Do.
KEY PERSONNEL, GEMINI PROGRAM OFFICE		
Eldon Hall	National Aeronautics and Space Administration.	Systems engineering.
D. Cain	do	Reliability and quality.
L. Day	do	Test.
J. Edwards	do	Mission operations.
J. P. Field	do	Program control.
D. R. Collins	do	Design criteria, environment and mission sequence.
W. J. Blatz	McDonnell Aircraft Corp	Do.
W. F. Hoyler	National Aeronautics and Space Administration.	Spacecraft structure.
W. B. Engelbart	McDonnell Aircraft Corp	Do.
R. L. Frost	National Aeronautics and Space Administration.	Environmental control system.
H. Imster	McDonnell Aircraft Corp	Do.
R. R. Carley	National Aeronautics and Space Administration.	Guidance and control system.
L. M. Warren	McDonnell Aircraft Corp	Do.
H. J. Overal	do	Propulsion and retrorocket system.
N. R. Schulze	National Aeronautics and Space Administration.	Do.
C. M. Jackson	do	Communications system for Spacecraft 3.
R. E. Perkins	McDonnell Aircraft Corp	Do.
J. W. Good	National Aeronautics and Space Administration.	Instrumentation system.
L. R. Blanke	McDonnell Aircraft Corp	Do.
P. S. Miglicco	National Aeronautics and Space Administration.	Electrical system for Spacecraft 3.
G. J. Weber	McDonnell Aircraft Corp	Do.
K. F. Hecht	National Aeronautics and Space Administration.	Landing and escape system.
S. H. Simpkinson	do	Pyrotechnics.
KEY PERSONNEL, GEMINI PROGRAM OFFICE—continued		
F. J. Smith	McDonnell Aircraft Corp	Pyrotechnics.
R. M. Machell	National Aeronautics and Space Administration.	Crew station.
A. J. Wiegand	McDonnell Aircraft Corp	Do.
J. V. Correals	National Aeronautics and Space Administration.	Gemini pressure suit and GFAE.
L. T. MacMillan	McDonnell Aircraft Corp	Spacecraft production test summary.
W. H. Douglas	National Aeronautics and Space Administration.	Reliability estimates for crew safety and mission success.
D. A. Defreece	McDonnell Aircraft Corp	Do.
Walter F. Burke	do	Gemini spacecraft design certification.
Charles W. Mathews	National Aeronautics and Space Administration.	Do.
Howard W. Tindall	do	Mission planning.
Carl R. Huss	do	Do.
Vearl N. Huff	do	Trajectory design.
Louis D. Allen	do	Flight crew equipment.
Warren J. North	do	Do.
James W. Bilodeau	do	Do.
James J. Donnegan	do	Computer support.
R. D. McCafferty	do	Mission simulator.
Hal Parker	do	Do.
Jeremy B. Jones	do	Flight plan integration.
K. M. Nagler	Department of Commerce	Weather forecasting.
Lt. Col. John G. Albert.	U.S. Air Force	Launch director.
Charles Ciccherti	Martin Co	Chief launch vehicle test conductor.
Frank X. Carey	do	Launch vehicle test conductor.
G. Merritt Preston	National Aeronautics and Space Administration.	Spacecraft test.
George F. Page	do	Spacecraft test conductor.
John D. Hodge	do	Flight control.
Eugene F. Kranz	do	Do.
Clifford E. Charlesworth.	do	Flight dynamics.
Charley B. Parker	do	Do.
Arnold D. Aldrich	do	Guidance and navigation.
Charles A. Berry, M.D.	do	Medical monitor.
Capt. Robert B. Sheridan.	U.S. Air Force	Chief network controller.
Maj. L. Gordon Cooper.	do	Cape capsule communicator.
Robert F. Thompson	National Aeronautics and Space Administration.	Recovery support.
Col. J. E. Warren	U.S. Air Force	DOD support.
Donald E. Stullken	National Aeronautics and Space Administration.	Recovery support.
Rear Adm. D. W. Sarver.	U.S. Navy	Recovery.
Rear Adm. D. M. White.	do	Do.
John C. Stonesifer	National Aeronautics and Space Administration.	Carrier recovery team.
Col. T. P. Tatum	U.S. Air Force	Air rescue.
Capt. J. W. Guidry	U.S. Navy	Recovery control.

Oregon Sees Need for Educational Income Tax Credits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, the ever-increasing need for tax credit relief in order to offset educational expenses which hobble the average wage earner is rising at an alarming rate. Potential college students are being denied an opportunity to further their academic pursuits because of the taxload on the average American. Taking income tax money, deducting bureaucratic overhead costs, and passing money on does not offer sufficient help to higher education. Some sort of tax credit should be given in this field.

My State of Oregon, Mr. Speaker, is wealthy in educational opportunity as compared with the great majority of her sister States. However, many cannot take advantage of these opportunities under existing tax structure. An editorial in the McMinnville, Oreg., News Register on March 24, 1965, is particularly well worded in the presentation of the problem. My good friend, Philip N. Bladine, News Register editor and publisher, should be congratulated for his editorial stand, which I would like to share with Members of the House:

SCHOLARSHIP AID NEEDED

Magnitude both of the existing resources and urgent need in Oregon's scholarship program for college and university students was shown in a recent plea for aid by officials of the Oregon State Scholarship Commission.

David D. Johnson, executive secretary of the commission, reported that on March 1—the deadline date for high school students to apply for scholarships awarded by the commission to private and State system schools in Oregon—in excess of 5,000 applications had been received.

Only a quarter of these students, who need an all-important helping hand in obtaining higher education, can be helped from resources now available. Johnson said funds available to the commission from private and public sources both for scholarships and work-study programs will allow grants for only 1,200 of those 5,000 applicants.

The commission director said, "The large majority of youngsters who apply for scholarship aid are not looking for a handout but just cannot undertake full financing of their educational costs, which now are some $1,650 a year at State schools, more at private institutions."

He went on to emphasize, "If those who are contemplating establishment of scholarships and work-study programs could only see some of these many applications and realize the capabilities and determination of these young people, they would realize the tremendous importance of doing all in their power to see that this precious human resource is not let go to waste."

Average scholarship awarded by the commission, which receives and screens nearly all applications by students both from Oregon and other States for assistance in Oregon schools, is $250. Often this helping hand is the difference between high school graduates obtaining a college education or not. Officials of the commission are urging that business, industry, civic and social groups act promptly if they are considering contributions to the scholarship program, either in private schools or in the State system.

Many scholarships would not be needed if legislation contemplated in the Congress should come into effect offering income tax credit for educational expense of family members. Many families with children who now need help to meet the cost of college could meet these costs within the family income if they had some offsetting tax credit. Certainly this seems far more effective an approach than to regularly increase Federal

expense and taxes to collect money in Washington which then can be returned in Federal aid to education.

Greatest benefit of such an approach would be to keep Uncle Sam's fingers out of local educational processes where they are now dipping with greater and greater frequency.

Voting Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege today of presenting to the House Judiciary Committee my testimony regarding a responsible approach to the complex and important matter of voting rights legislation. I asked first that we view recent events with reason and with full posession of significant facts. Second, I urged an unemotional and thorough consideration of the legislative proposal presented to us by the President. And third, I suggested that we proceed in a responsible manner to deal effectively with unequal application of any State's voting qualifications while acting in accord with the Constitution to provide that each State retain its rightful power to establish its own voter qualifications. Following is the testimony I presented:

A RESPONSIBLE APPROACH

(By Congressman JACK EDWARDS of Alabama)

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the committee for this opportunity to present my views with regard to H.R. 6400 and the general subject of voting rights legislation.

As we all know, the subject has been one of real concern to the Congress for several years, and justly so, since it involved one of the most fundamental concepts of our democratic system of government.

The 15th amendment to the Constitution guarantees to every American citizen the right to cast a ballot. This right is basic to representative government. I believe in this right of every qualified citizen to register and also to cast a vote on election day. Anything less than a full and equal opportunity to vote by all qualified citizens presents our country with a problem which must be corrected.

And I want to make it very clear, Mr. Chairman, that I join with other citizens from all parts of the country in regretting the violence which has broken out in recent weeks over this issue. It has been a tragic series of events, not only for Alabama, not only for the South, but for the United States. I know that we all concur in the need to bring an end to violence, and to bring men of good faith together in the interests of advancing harmony and progress.

We, in Alabama, also regret that the issue has been presented to the Nation in a vastly oversimplified manner based on incomplete information. We would ask that events in Alabama be judged on the basis of demonstrated facts, and according to the same standards used to judge events elsewhere. With this kind of approach, concerned persons everywhere will reach conclusions reflecting a realistic combination of understanding and indignation.

For example, if law-enforcement officers in Washington, D.C., or Rochester, N.Y., find it necessary to forcefully eject demonstrators from public buildings and streets in the interests of community order, then perhaps it is conceivable that law-enforcement officers in Southern States can act in similar ways to maintain law and order in their own communities without bringing down the wrath of the Nation. Alabama citizens are also concerned with order in their communities. And these are sentiments which I believe we hold in common with other respectable people throughout the Nation.

All of us will agree that the key to the American right of peaceful demonstration and protest is responsibility. Reasonable men assume that a demonstration by individuals acting responsibly is to be honored. But how easy it is to lose sight of the distinction between responsibility and irresponsibility when we are far from the scene. And how quickly the distinction becames clear when one's own freedom to move through a hallway or along Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington is affected.

And, if I may add, gentlemen, how easy it is for citizens around the country to divert their attention from unsavory social and economic and political conditions in their own cities and towns in order to join in what has evidently become the popular activity of pointing an indignant finger at an easy target.

Without question, many of the individuals engaging in demonstrations in Alabama have been motivated by a sincere desire to see voting rights extended to all citizens. Unfortunately, others have sought to becloud the facts so as to exploit the good intentions of many other Americans for their own purposes, to encourage the setting of a double standard of values, and to arouse emotion both in Alabama and elsewhere.

What are some of the facts which have been effectively submerged?

1. On February 4, 1965, in Mobile, Federal District Judge Daniel H. Thomas issued an order, acting under the civil rights laws of 1960 and 1964, requiring the board of registrars in Dallas County, Ala., where Selma is located, to receive and register all persons who submitted applications.

Further, he ordered that if the requested registrations could not be completed by July 1965, the Federal voting referee would receive and process applications.

I want to submit, Mr. Chairman, that the officials of Dallas County, though not pleased with the order, were going about the business of complying with it. Further, they were taking pains to let the country know of the actions they were taking and planned to take. But this real evidence of progress toward expansion of voting rights made no difference to the professional demonstrators. The agitation work was begun, and senseless violence erupted, even though the avowed goal of the demonstrators had already been achieved through the courts.

2. In Alabama, we do not have the oversimplified voting participation pattern that some would have the Nation believe. We have approximately 115,000 Negroes registered to vote in the State, more than 20 percent of the vote cast in the 1960 presidential election.

In other words, today's objective in Alabama is not a complete reversal of direction. Rather, we have made some good beginnings, and we have been moving ahead. The intrusion of demonstrations, carrying with them the heated emotions of both extremes, has served not to aid progress in Alabama, but to retard it.

3. Just 5 years ago, on March 18, 1960, there was a proposal made in the U.S. Senate to enact legislation establishing Federal voting registrars to serve as enrollment officers in cases where voting registration discrimination existed against a particular race or class. That proposal, offered as an amendment by Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, was weaker than H.R. 6400 in that the machinery for Federal voting registration would be set in motion by the complaints of 50 persons instead of only 20 as in the current proposal.

The amendment was defeated on a vote of 53 to 24 when Senator DIRKSEN, of Illinois, and the then Senator Lyndon Johnson, of Texas, opposed it, along with others who raised constitutional questions. Among those voting against it were Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, and the present majority leader of the other body, Senator MANSFIELD, of Montana.

Surely the reasons which these distinguished gentlemen had for opposing a system of Federal registrars in 1960 cannot have changed so drastically that now in 1965 the same gentlemen and others will allow themselves to be swept along in the tide of emotional popular feeling created in part by demonstrators for a goal which has already been reached.

In 1960, the Congress acted in this matter as a coequal branch of Government, as it should. It felt itself capable of giving thoughtful consideration and intelligent evaluation to a serious legislative proposal.

In 1965, are we in the Congress to enthusiastically abrogate our responsibility as a coequal branch of Government? Are we prepared to cast away our legitimate function as an effectively independent national legislature as the result of widespread emotional turbulence? Have we relegated ourselves to the status of a rubberstamp?

Or do we feel that we are a responsible body capable of evaluating conditions and facts, and then taking deliberative action to provide sound legislation with a view to orderly progress? We are a coequal branch of Government made up of elected representatives of the people and charged with the lawmaking function. Perhaps the real question today is whether we understand that function and are willing to exhibit courage to fulfill it, or whether we have failed our responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, in order to fulfill our constitutional responsibility as the National Legislature, we should consider very carefully the bill that the President has recommended to us despite his urging that we enact it against an early deadline and with no compromise.

The bill would, in general, eliminate literacy tests in any State or country where less than 50 percent of those of voting age were registered or voting in the presidential election of 1964.

Let us consider for a moment the question of literacy tests. The Supreme Court has on several occasions defended the right of States to establish literacy tests as a voter qualification. As recently as 1959, in the Lassiter case from North Carolina, the Court said:

"The ability to read and write likewise has some relation to standards designed to promote intelligent use of the ballot. Literacy and illiteracy are neutral on race, creed, color, and sex, as reports around the world show."

The Attorney General has indicated that the President's proposal would not flatly abolish literacy tests. But it certainly would outlaw them for a period of 10 years in the few States and counties affected by the bill. We should consider whether or not the country is prepared to set aside constitutional provisions for a temporary period of whatever duration.

Literacy tests themselves are not evidence of discrimination. The application of them can be. And so corrective legislation should not be aimed at literacy tests unless we are ready to prohibit them everywhere in the country, and unless we disregard constitutional principles.

With regard to other deficiencies of the bill, the Honorable HOWARD H. CALLAWAY, of Georgia, presented testimony to this committee on March 29. I want to associate my-

self with his remarks. Mr. CALLAWAY ably demonstrated the problem which is presented in attempting to segregate States where the 1964 presidential vote or registration was more than 50 percent of the persons of voting age from those States where the vote or registration was less than 50 percent.

He pointed out the factors other than discrimination which may lead to a low voting percentage in a general election or to a low registration. He demonstrated that in States with a history of political domination by one party, the vote may be greater in primary elections than in general elections, or the registration may be low because of the lack of contested elections. And he showed that substantial numbers of persons of voting age may not register to vote for reasons having nothing to do with discrimination: transients, noncitizens, military personnel, or persons who simply want nothing to do with voting for personal reasons.

And he brought out the vast opportunity this bill would provide for a politically oriented Attorney General to apply provisions of the bill for partisan political gain.

The bill gives the Attorney General power to appoint Federal examiners simply on the basis of "his own judgment." And it prescribes no tests or rules for selection of the examiners and specifies no methods of operation. It gives the examiner power to register voters as he sees fit.

There is nothing in the bill to prevent an Attorney General from appointing a county political party chairman as voting registrar with power to register or refuse to register voters as he wishes. This would be an extraordinary authority.

How can we justify the feeling that punitive Federal action must be taken against States which record a voting registration or participation of less than 50 percent while we pay no heed to places where the percentage might be 51 or 60 percent. Surely in the light of cool analysis some months in the future this arbitrary proposal will appear to be artificial and contrived to many who may not see it now. How soon would the Congress again be called on to enact new voting legislation all over again?

And if this kind of action can be taken against a few selected States, then it appears that some other punitive action can be taken against some other group of States for some other apparently worthy objective. But we should consider that a central government with this kind of authority can proceed another time with less regard to the real or suggested merits of the objective, and with less regard to an informed popular will.

This is how the national Socialist movement of the Germany of the 1930's was brought to prominence: greater government authority on a wave of emotional fever followed by the loss of individual political expression. The stage preceding acquisition of absolute power by Adolf Hitler was the period during which the national legislature allowed itself to be intimidated by executive authority into putting its stamp of approval on measures eliminating the potence of representative government. Today's popular demand for centralization of power is tomorrow's dictatorship.

If we now are to approve voting rights legislation we should do so in the light of cool analysis and reason, not on the basis of emotion. We should not put the Federal Government in the position of dictating a State's voting laws on the basis of arbitrary percentages in an arbitrarily selected election.

What we should do is retain State authority to determine its voter qualifications in accord with the Constitution, but assure that each State's qualifications are applied without discrimination to all individuals regardless of race, color, religion, or national origin.

I wonder if many Members of Congress today do not fear within themselves that many persons feel so strongly in favor of a voting rights law that just any voting rights law will do without regard to its real merits. I have the distinct impression that it takes courage today in a Northern State to publicly declare oneself in favor of taking a close look at the President's bill or to suggest that there may be improvements that can be made. In that connection, I want to make note here of some of the comments we have seen recently in nationally respected newspapers.

1. Arthur Krock, in the New York Times, March 16, 1965:

"The administration's bill * * * would reverse precedents deeply embedded in the constitutional and political history of the United States. And care must be taken lest the backswing prove too wide for the conscience of the Supreme Court and the obligation of Members of Congress to the people of the several States."

2. Arthur Krock, in the New York Times, March 22, 1965:

"The more time that is allowed to point out the flagrant Constitutional and procedural flaws in the draft submitted by the administration, the more plainly these flaws will be exposed."

3. Richard Wilson, in the Washington Evening Star, March 24, 1965:

"The question that the advocates of the [President's] new voting rights bill have us yet failed to answer adequately is this: Why should literacy tests as a qualification for voting be perfectly all right in 45 of the 50 States, but invalid in the other 5? This is another example of the devious legislative tactics in the Johnson administration to achieve results by legal circumlocution. Literacy requirements have validity both in reason and in law. It makes sense that a voter should have at least an elementary ability to read and write the language of the country in which he resides. It hardly needs to be argued, also, that a Federal law should apply equally to the citizens of all States. The strange, awkward and unequal nature of this new legislation shows how wrong it is to try to legislate on such complicated matters in an atmosphere of violence-provoking public demonstrations. The Johnson administration was rushed into the presentation of a law that has so many obvious flaws that it can immediately be challenged in the courts."

4. John Chamberlain, in the Washington Post, March 25, 1965:

"The law should be limited to sending in registrars to provide even-handed justice in enforcing any given State's own election standards. The Federal Government has no right to substitute standards of its own. What impresses honest and decent southerners about all this is that it [the President's proposal] actually denies equal protection of the law under the pretense of providing this protection. It penalizes the just along with the unjust. So let's have a Federal law that will guarantee fair enforcement of local election laws without telling States what their own standards shall be."

5. James Kilpatrick, in the Washington Evening Star, March 25, 1965:

"This is a bad bill, bad in ways that need to be understood if something precious is to be preserved. This precious something is a system of government obedient to a written Constitution. If the Congress sacrifices this high principle to the pressures of a turbulent hour, the Congress may succeed in redressing some palpable wrongs, but a fearful price will be paid in the loss of ancient values. The bill undertakes to prohibit in these States the imposition of those very qualifications, when used without discrimination, that the Supreme Court repeatedly has approved."

6. David Lawrence, in the Washington Evening Star, March 25, 1965:

"The 15th amendment to the Constitution * * * now is being construed as giving to Congress the power to control the whole election process by passing a few laws. This could mean the removal of all qualifications for voting except those that happen to suit the party in power. Never in American history has so much power been concentrated in the Federal Government which is now virtually directed by the one man who occupies the highest office in the land."

Finally, Mr. Vermont Royster, in the Wall Street Journal for March 25, 1965, writes of the mood in Congress for hasty action on the bill—a mood set by ultimatums for this committee to complete its work by a certain date.

He writes:

"In such a mood, who but a brave man could stand up and say, 'Wait. Let us see what we are doing before we do it.' Who but a brave man could ask now about Constitutionality or propriety or the wisdom of the means to a wise end. What weighs heavily on the mind is that men in Congress should have doubts and fear to speak them."

Mr. Chairman, in my judgment, Congress has the choice today of acting in a responsible fashion, or allowing itself to be propelled into an irresponsible act. I join with many others in hoping that our choice will be the former. Thank you, again, for permitting me to present my views.

The Week That Was

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Mr. William J. Coughlin has woven together several significant events in space in his editorial of March 29 in Missiles and Rockets magazine. Mr. Coughlin recounts the magnificent achievement of our manned Gemini flight and the achievements of Ranger IX providing additional pictures of the Moon as well as the success of *Voskhod II*. Against this background he evaluates the skills developed in our space effort against their background of application in solving problems here on Earth, particularly those pressing problems faced today by the Department of Defense. He accurately notes that the practical precision of our space program is helping us to solve problems of immediate concern to our national defense.

THE WEEK THAT WAS
(By William J. Coughlin)

CAPE KENNEDY.—As this is written, Astronauts Gus Grissom and John Young are in orbit, the cheers of Moscow crowds still are ringing in the ears of Cosmonauts Pavel Belyayev and Aleksei Leonov, Ranger IX has concluded a successful midcourse maneuver en route to the Moon, and Mariner IV is racing Zond II toward Mars.

One might say without much fear of contradiction that the space race is warming up.

Although still some distance behind the Russians, the United States, after a faultless Titan II liftoff, definitely is back in the race. There was more than the usual tension at the cape as the countdown proceeded for GT–3. In addition to the strain associated with any manned flight was the realization that after long months of drought, the

United States was opening a new period of manned space operations.

There was a great deal riding on the performance of GT–3.

The Russians already had scored a neat bit of oneupmanship with the 17-orbit, 26-hour flight of *Voskhod II*, during which Leonov stepped out into space. It was a performance still more than a year away on the U.S. schedule. Furthermore, it raised the significant question of whether it might be a step toward assembly in orbit—an indicator of the direction the Soviet lunar program might be going. If so, the Soviets may have decided to make their lunar effort with their present booster—thereby bypassing an expensive development program for a new launch vehicle.

All of this increased the tension at the cape over the start of the manned Gemini-Titan series. A string of windy, cloudy days, which threatened to delay the launch, did nothing to ease things.

Tuesday, however, dawned clear, warm, and calm in Florida, even as the Russian cosmonauts were receiving their acclaim in the Soviet capital.

T–135: Start stage 1 oxidizer surge chamber adjustment. Verify all airborne hatches and doors are secure.

As Gemini control droned through a list of what the two astronauts had for breakfast, downrange weather reports indicated fair weather in the landing areas. The communications network was in a go condition around the world.

T–120: Start first guidance command test in conjunction with three-axis reference system (TARS) programer test. Verify guidance command test complete.

From California, Jet Propulsion Laboratory relayed details of the progress of the Ranger midcourse maneuver then underway. Astronauts Grissom and Young concluded their short bus ride to complex 19 for their longer ride in *Molly Brown*. Complex 19, a significant one in the Titan program. It was from this pad that Titan I made its first successful 5,000-mile flight. Now its successor was making its debut as a manned booster.

T–60: Start white room evacuation. Start TARS drift test.

The biomedical team was standing by at the forward medical center. While the astronauts were running through preflight checks in their spacecraft, Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY was visiting the control center.

T–35: Start lowering erector. Start range telemetry readout.

Indication of an oxidizer leak in stage 1 of the booster was checked out during a hold. Meanwhile, down came the erector. The count was resumed. Helicopters took their positions over the abort recovery area.

T–5: Start range telemetry recorders. Arm stage 1 destruct arm switch and range safety switch to internal.

All eyes, all cameras now on the missile.

T–1: Stage 1 flame bucket water pressure check. Verify flight control programed sequence test is complete.

Liftoff.

Titan II pushed its Gemini payload into orbit in a flawless launch.

Why have we gone into such detail on the by-now-familiar routine of a manned launch at the Cape? Because there is a very definite connection between the perfection with which this complex task was carried out and the theme of this special issue. It is precisely these skills which the Department of Defense is seeking to put to work on the problems of limited warfare. Though the space race continues, so do the problems of Vietnam. If one can hit an orbit in space with such precision, there must be an answer to the problem of hitting a tank just across a ravine.

There must be command and control techniques of value to armies in the field. There must be advanced materials available to deep-submergence vehicles. There must be sensors capable of detecting enemy troops hidden from aircraft by foliage. There must be electronic gear capable of order-of-magnitude improvements in submarine detection.

It is these problems which this issue seeks to spell out—and it is this industry from which DOD seeks the answers. There remains much to be done here on earth as we reach for the stars—even in such a notable week as this.

Independence of Senegal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, April 4, 1965, marks the fifth anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Senegal. On this memorable occasion, we wish to extend warm felicitations to His Excellency Leopold Sedar Senghor, President of the Republic of Senegal; and to His Excellency Ousmane Soce Diop, the Senegalese Ambassador to the United States.

This occasion provides us with the opportunity to commemorate the independence of one of the most stable and progressive states of the African Continent.

As early as the 17th century, at the behest of one of the most famous and talented of French politicians, Cardinal Richelieu, France established its first African settlements in what has become known as Senegal. It was here that the first real town, named after the French monarch, Louis XIV, was built—Fort St. Louis, which still stands. As the headquarters of the Government General of French West Africa until 1902, it became and has remained a thriving port for the produce and commerce of the Senegal River hinterland. Further south, however, another city was established. Built on a small islet called Goree, once used as a major base for the slave trade, and then moved to the mainland for the purpose of expansion, this little hamlet grew in size to become one of the most magnificent cities in all of Africa today, Dakar. It occupies very nearly the most westerly point in Africa with one of the best natural harbors on the continent. Its position astride the main trade routes between Europe, America, and Africa has made it the major port in west Africa as well as its most important air terminal.

The economy of Senegal is based upon agriculture, and primarily upon peanuts as a cash crop. The sandy soils in which the peanut thrives were first put to use by the French, who introduced it early in the 19th century. Fully aware of the problems associated with a single-crop economy, the Senegalese have undertaken and encouraged the development of other industries. Many plants are engaged in processing and distributing locally produced raw materials from textiles to sugar.

After an extended study of the economy of the country, the Senageles Government propounded a 4-year development plan, under the terms of which other sectors would be promoted and expanded. This included the phosphate industry, the fishing and fish-canning industries, and the diversification of the textile industry. In addition, new ones would be established: a fertilizer and chemical industry, a petroleum refinery, as well as smaller factories in rural areas in order that the population movement to the larger cities will be reduced.

This plan is an indication of the rational and farsighted means by which Senegal is going about solving its economic problems. Rather than resorting to unattainable projects in order to fill the mind, the government of Leopold Sedar Senghor has conscientiously outlined programs which will, when effected, provide tangible and meaningful results for the portions of the population which most need such assistance.

Under the leadership of their poet and scholar President, the Senegalese provide us with the hope that an African society will be able to peacefully synthesize the best elements of African and European cultures, and become a model for other African states in the future.

A New Kind of Murder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, last year frequent appeals were made to the President and the State Department to bring pressure upon Russian authorities and assert the distress of all America at the suppression and oppression of the million Russian Jews.

A recent editorial in the New York Herald Tribune hits the nail on the head:

A NEW KIND OF MURDER

Persistent official Soviet anti-Semitism continues to be documented by testimony before the United Nations Human Rights Commission, meeting in Geneva. As Justice Haim Cohen, of Israel's Supreme Court, pointed out, Soviet officials have oppressed the 1 million Jewish believers in the Soviet Union even more than they have oppressed other religious communities.

The Russian Orthodox Church and the Baptists have been permitted to retain a church, monastery, or convent for every 2,000 believers under the restrictive Soviet regulation of all religions. But there are only 90 synagogues left in the entire Soviet Union, Justice Cohen reported—only 1 for every 15,000 believers. Furthermore, unlike other faiths, the Russian Jews are not allowed to organize on a nationwide basis or remain in contact with synagogues outside the country.

These are charges the U.S.S.R. can hardly shrug off as the acts of irresponsible people or as mere misunderstandings. They go far beyond the bureaucratic harassment of matzoh bakeries and snafus in the distribution of books in Yiddish. Only an actively pursued anti-Jewish national policy emanating from the Kremlin could be responsible. Nazism popularized the word "genocide." Will communism be the cause for creation of a new word to describe the murder of a religion?

Law To Prevent Strife

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced in the House of Representatives a bill that I regard as an effective instrument with which to put an end to the racial troubles now shaking the entire Nation. This bill is identical to the one I introduced in 1963. Had it been reported out of committee and acted upon by the Congress, we would have been spared much of the strife which has ensued. Also, several lives would have been saved.

The proposed legislation would bar any person, irrespective of his race, creed, or color, from crossing a State line for the purpose of demonstrating in violation of law or otherwise fomenting lawlessness or inciting to riot.

The country vitally needs this legislation and the public generally approves it. I hope that my bill may be favorably considered in the Judiciary Committee, of which I am a member and to which committee I am sure it will be referred.

Although the President of the United States and his Attorney General may now be concerned over the current outbursts of law defiance and disorder in many places throughout the North and South, it seems to me that they display a strange blindness as to the essential causes of these riots and acts of law violation.

When I consider the disgraceful concerted defiance of law which has occurred in communities such as Danville, Va., which is in my own congressional district, and the disgraceful conduct of these invaders and agitators in Alabama and other places, it is perfectly obvious that the participants are responding to incitation from outsiders. These people have no interest in the welfare of the States they invade. Their main purpose is to foment strife and discord and to create a cleavage between the races. As most everyone should know by now, many of these agitators are believed to be Communists. Even the theme song they chant, "We Shall Overcome," was written by a person alleged to be a Communist. In this motley crew are such characters as Peter Seeger, Carl Braden, and Frank Wilkinson, who are incendiaries of the worst order and whose records are well known in the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives, as well as in the courts of the country.

For various motives, these persons and organizations from afar have been stirring up the people to fever pitch and are working incalculable mischief. This situation is being reenacted in many places. In virtually every case the disobedience to law has been shown to have been methodically inculcated into what were ordinarily peaceful and peace-loving people. If we are to avoid a major tragedy on a national scale, these uprisings and organized floutings of law must stop.

The way to stop them is to prohibit outsiders from invading States where they have no business except to stir up disorder, or from conspiring to do so.

The law I have in mind would have equal application to everyone. It would apply to the Ku Klux Klan and any kindred organizations; it would apply to the NAACP, or to CORE and SNCC, as well as to the Communist Party. In short, it would apply to all persons who travel in interstate commerce for this sinister purpose. My bill is clearly within the purview and intent of the Constitution, and is something that is needed for the protection of the great bulk of our population, the law-abiding public that bears the responsibility of our industry, our government, and our religion.

There is nothing strange or novel about my bill when viewed against the background of existing law. Since 1910, when Congress adopted the Mann Act—18 U.S.C. 2421—this legislative body has enacted a substantial number of criminal laws to free interstate commerce of corruptive influence and to aid the States in law enforcement.

The Mann Act was aimed at the suppression of the white slave traffic. It prohibited the transportation of female persons across State lines for immoral purposes. Later, in 1919, Congress made it a Federal offense to transport stolen automobiles in interstate commerce—18 U.S.C. 2312—and this was later expanded to cover other kinds of stolen goods—18 U.S.C. 2314.

In 1934, Congress enacted the Fugitive Felon Act, prohibiting interstate travel to avoid prosecution for crime, and this enactment was expanded in 1960 and 1961—18 U.S.C. 1073, 1074. Clearly, if it is sensible to penalize interstate flight to avoid prosecution, it makes even better sense to prohibit interstate travel which is undertaken with the intent of violating the law. Such an enactment has the effect of deterring wrongdoing at its very inception.

Congress has seen the wisdom of this approach. In 1961 it enacted a law prohibiting travel in interstate commerce with the intent to carry on, or commit, any crime of violence to further any of a number of specified activities—18 U.S.C. 1952.

My bill merely carries this approach to its logical conclusion by penalizing travel across State lines with the intent to riot or violate State law.

The legislation I propose would have prevented some of the riots and community outbursts which have bothered the Nation at times for generations. Even the famous Hatfield-McCoy feud of the last century, with all its sadness and family suffering, might never have happened if such a law had been in existence.

Without exception, I feel that States are capable and desirous of enforcing the law on a local basis. This can be accomplished if they are protected from the vicious outside influence which snub our laws and ignore our community mores, resulting in the chaos prevalent among us today.

It is a sad day in America if our local and State officials are deprived of exercising their police power. This power historically rests with the localities and with the States.

I would beg the Department of Justice and others to keep their agents at home and leave the enforcement of law to local officials and not send these agents into the States and localities unless requested so to do by the governor or legislature of the State involved. Unfortunately, some of these agents appear to advise and consort with the lawbreakers and impede the local police in suppressing public mischief.

I believe the law I propose is one that the right-thinking people of this Nation deserve. It will protect the sound, taxpaying, law-abiding element from the lawlessness and threat of riot and violence brought in by outside agitators.

The language of my bill is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) Congress finds that the recent and increasing practice of certain persons and organizations, with diverse ulterior motives, to enter States, Territories, Commonwealths, or possessions of the United States, of which they are not residents, for the purpose of fomenting disobedience to their laws has led and leads to violent disorders gravely disrupting the peace and threatening the welfare of the entire Nation.

(b) It is hereby declared to be the policy of this Act to promote the general welfare and assure peace and order by prohibiting in interstate commerce, or from conspiring to do so, where the purpose of such travel is to incite to riot or to engage in the violation of any law.

SEC. 2. (a) Title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding after Chapter 53 the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 54—INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, TRAVEL IN FOR UNLAWFUL PURPOSES

"Whoever moves or travels in interstate commerce with the intent (1) to incite to riot or to commit any act or engage in any conduct which would tend to incite to riot, or (2) to violate any law of any State, Territory, Commonwealth, or possession of the United States shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"(b) If two or more persons conspire to violate subsection (a) of this section and one or more such persons do any act to effect the object of the conspiracy, each of the parties to such conspiracy shall be punished as provided in said subsection (a).

"(c) Nothing in this section shall be construed in anywise to limit the exercise of jurisdiction by any such State, Territory, Commonwealth, or possession over any crime or offense committed therein or cognizable under the laws thereof."

Good Judgment, Constitution Used by Wallace in Crisis Over March

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial written by David Lawrence. I wish every American could read this excellent article:

GOOD JUDGMENT, CONSTITUTION USED BY WALLACE IN CRISIS OVER MARCH

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—For the first time since Federal troops were mobilized in connection with racial disorders—in Arkansas in 1957, in Mississippi in 1962, and in Alabama in 1963—the President of the United States has acted in full conformity with the Constitution. For in the present instance the Governor of a State has made a formal request for the help of Federal forces—something which was absent on all previous occasions.

CLEAR

The Constitution is explicit on the point. It says that Federal troops are to be supplied as protection "against domestic violence" only when the Governor or the legislature of a State requests military force. Oddly enough Governor Wallace of Alabama in May 1963 specifically called this to the attention of the White House and later sought a ruling from the Supreme Court of the United States pointing out that neither he nor the legislature had made any request for the use of Federal troops to deal with the racial disturbances or to carry out school-desegregation orders in his State. The reply made at the time was that the troops were merely mobilized as a precautionary warning. Since the troops were not actually called to the scene of the potential trouble, the Supreme Court refused to rule on the question of constitutionality.

Most Americans are unfamiliar with the fact that in 1957—and in 1962 and in 1963 and today—the Chief Executive has been forbidden by law to use Federal troops even to enforce a Federal court order. For Congress in August of 1957, by unanimous vote, repealed the statute which had authorized a President to use Federal troops "in the execution of judicial process." Senator WILLIS ROBERTSON of Virginia, in a speech to the Senate on October 14, 1957, pointed out that this had previously been "the only express authorization" in law for the use of Federal troops in carrying out a court order. He declared that, when the law was repealed, anyone who wilfully used troops for such a purpose was subject under another statute to a jail sentence as well as a fine.

The erroneous belief that Federal troops can legally be used to enforce a court order has long prevailed, but the President of the United States is obligated to utilize only Federal marshals to "execute the judicial process." U.S. marshals can arrest anyone interfering with the carrying out of a court order. If arrests are resisted and "domestic violence" results, even if a State is then unwilling or unable to give immediate protection to the marshals, it is nevertheless deemed necessary that reliance on the processes of the court be continued—namely, contempt proceedings and jail sentences.

Under the Constitution, the Federal Government can send whatever military forces may be needed into any of the States to "protect each of them against invasion." Whenever there is "domestic violence," the Constitution authorizes the President also to provide protection—which could include the calling out of the State militia or use of Federal forces—but this applies only "on application of the legislature, or the Executive when the legislature cannot be convened."

Governor Wallace last week wisely transferred to the Federal Government responsibility for maintenance of public order in Alabama in the present circumstances. He was acting in accordance with the Federal Constitution in doing so. President Johnson plainly didn't like the transfer and showed his irritation over it at his Saturday press conference. But the fact is that the Alabama Governor was taking a course which he believed would avert a possible loss of life or injury to citizens.

For as long as the Alabama authorities were using their own police, the chances of incitement to violence and of disorder that could get out of hand were greater than would be the case with Federal forces in charge. While the Alabama Governor spoke of monetary considerations as having motivated his request and that of the State's legislature, it is obvious that Alabama did not want to undertake either the responsibility or the expense of protecting thousands of marchers over a 50-mile stretch of highway when there was actually an "invasion" by thousands of citizens from other States who were bent upon showing their scorn for the people and the authority of the State of Alabama.

Past experience has shown that there were possibilities of serious disurbances arising out of the march from Selma to Montgomery. However much the Governor of Alabama or the President of the United States may dislike the fact that troops have had to be mobilized, it was the only solution in the circumstances.

For what the Nation is dealing with today is the problem of "domestic violence" incited by street demonstrations and "marches" which are described by their supporters as "nonviolent" and "peaceable" but which, in the face of the bitterness of feeling now existing not only in the South but in other parts of the country, have already resulted in death and serious injury to innocent persons.

Reverend Turesdell Alleges That His Reasons for Leaving the Alabama Freedom March Were Misrepresented

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. CULVER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, in a speech before the House of Representatives last Tuesday, March 30, 1965, Mr. DICKINSON, of Alabama, stated that the Reverend Norman C. Turesdell, of Dubuque, Iowa, left the Alabama freedom march in disgust with the immoral conduct of the marchers. The Reverend Dr. Turesdell has informed me that this was definitely not the case, and I have asked him to prepare a statement for the RECORD in order to clarify this matter. His statement follows:

STATEMENT OF REV. NORMAN C. TURESDELL, OF THE WARTBERG THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, AT DUBUQUE

Congressman DICKINSON, in his speech on the floor of the House, Tuesday, March 30, stated that I, Norman C. Turesdell, left the Alabama freedom march in disgust at the alleged immorality among the marchers. This is a blatant lie. I saw no evidence of this alleged immorality in my participation in Selma and Montgomery. I left Alabama to return to my studies at Wartberg Theological Seminary. I was not disillusioned, but inspired by the freedom marchers' responsible Christian conduct as they demonstrated for human rights.

The Proposed Voting Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in Monday's Wall Street Journal, March 22, 1965, which has been printed elsewhere in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, unjustly criticizes the administration's proposed voting law. I have written the Journal commenting on the editorial.

The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 31, 1965.

EDITOR,
Wall Street Journal,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: Your editorial of March 22, labeling the administration's voting rights bill "an immoral law," seems to me to indicate a lack of understanding about the facts surrounding literacy tests and the proposed law.

The editorial apparently assumes that the literacy test has been applied fairly to white voters in the areas under question and unfairly only against Negroes. Thus, all we would need to do is eliminate the unfair requirements applied to Negroes. However, the Attorney General testified before the House Judiciary Committee that highly literate Negroes have been refused the right to vote by use of literacy tests, while totally illiterate whites have been allowed to vote.

Thus, in a very real sense, this bill would require the same standard for both Negro and white in the affected States; i.e., no literacy test. This seems reasonable since poorly qualified whites have been voting for years in State and Federal elections, and the States have raised no objections. To now insist on a "fairly administered test" contradicts their own practice over the years. It is true that many States have literacy tests. The number is 18, including my State of Connecticut as well as New York. It is also true that 32 States, almost twice the number, seem to function satisfactorily without such tests.

The editorial suggests that the law would abolish literacy tests in the affected States. It would not do so. First, no literacy test would be suspended unless (1) the Attorney General certifies that it is being used to deny the right to vote because of race, and (2) voter registration on November 1, 1964, or voting in the 1964 presidential election was below 50 percent. Following this determination, literacy tests would be suspended during registration by examiners. After 10 years free from racial discrimination, the suspension could be terminated upon petition to a Federal court in Washington, D.C.

The editorial also suggests that use of a concept of 50 percent of the voting-age population opens the whole matter to manipulation. This assumes that the 50-percent figure will be used for future elections. It will not. It will be used only in connection with registrations as of November 1, 1964, or voting in the presidential election. It will be rather difficult, even for ingenious men, to manipulate those figures.

One other factor apparently ignored is the voting rights sections of the Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960, and 1964. These laws permit the Government to bring suit in cases of discrimination no matter what the percentage of the vote or registration. No State or locality is free to deny the Negro the right to vote.

It is suggested that these States are being penalized unfairly, and some charge that this is ex post facto legislation. If this legislation does penalize the affected States, the penalty is not for violating a 1965 law in 1964, but for violating the law of the land for 95 years; ever since the ratification of the 15th amendment to the Constitution in 1870.

Sincerely,

DONALD J. IRWIN.

Leonard Horn Named Colorado State University Stockman of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I call to the attention of the House that one of my friends and constituents, Leonard Horn, of Wolcott, Colo., who has spent his entire life as a rancher in his home area, was honored by Colorado State University on February 23, 1965, during its Livestock Days, as the Colorado State University Livestock Man of the Year.

The annual award is made by the university to a stockman who has obtained National or State recognition through his ability as a leader, his capacity as a stockman, and his service to his community and State. I know from personal observation that Mr. Horn is worthy of the honor that has been bestowed upon him. In his ranching operations, Mr. Horn has emphasized range improvements and cooperated with others.

Leonard Horn has served on many local, State, and National groups concerned with ranching and the use of public lands. It is fitting that he receive the recognition that has been given to him and we shall always be reminded of the example that he set by the portrait of Leonard Horn which will be hung in the Animal Science Building of the Colorado State University campus at Fort Collins.

I offer to Leonard and his wife, Dorothy, who has worked so closely with him, my congratulations on this outstanding recognition of their efforts.

Under permission previously granted, I include with my remarks the text of a release detailing Leonard Horn's ability and accomplishment that led to his designation:

HORN NAMED STOCKMAN OF THE YEAR

Leonard Horn, Wolcott, Colo., cattle and horse producer, has been named Colorado State University's Stockman of 1965.

Horn has pioneered range improvement projects throughout Colorado which have won him national recognition. He serves on three national committees concerned with land use.

Horn was selected for the Colorado State University honor by a committee representing various phases of the State's agricultural industry. He was cited for a long list of contributions to the livestock industry and agriculture at the local, State, and National levels.

The Eagle Valley rancher was honored during the awards banquet held at Colorado State University, February 23. The banquet, was attended by livestock producers and agricultural leaders, held during Colorado State University's annual Livestock Days program.

Horn has spent his entire lifetime ranching in the Eagle and Colorado River Valleys in the central Colorado Rockies. He and his wife, Dorothy, operate the V Eleven Ranches, which consist of 2,000 acres of deeded land plus grazing permits on Bureau of Land Management and National Forest Service lands.

They run about 500 producing cows and yearlings plus 200 extra yearling cattle to be put on summer pasture, and breed and train quarter horses. He has served on the Colorado Agriculture Commission for the past 9 years.

His capabilities in range management have won him a number of leadership positions at the State and National level. In April of last year he was named by Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman to the Secretary's Special Committee on the Mutliple Use of National Forests.

In addition, Horn has served the past 8 years on the National Advisory Board Council of the Bureau of Land Management. He also heads the public lands committee for the American National Cattlemen's Association.

At the State level, Horn is a member of the State advisory board to the BLM, serving as vice chairman for the past 4 years, is cochairman of the Public Lands Committee of the Colorado Association of Soil Conservation Districts, and heads the Range Improvement Committee of the Colorado Cattlemen's Association.

As chairman of the CCA committee, he has actively participated in production of a range improvement educational film in cooperation with the National Forest Service and Colorado State University. The film depicts several range improvement projects, showing the increase in forage production for both cattle and wildlife.

Horn is a nationally recognized judge for American Quarter Horse Association approved shows. He has judged many Colorado shows, the Wyoming State Fair, and at numerous other events in neighboring States.

A native of McCoy, Colo., he is the son of the late Arthur L. Horn, a pioneer rancher in Colorado, and Lulu Horn, who now resides in Glenwood Springs. Young Horn received his elementary and high school education in McCoy.

With money earned from a trapline, Horn began in the cattle business while in grade school, developing a small herd of cattle. In his late 20's he was put in charge of his father's cattle operations, continuing until the herd was dispersed after his father's death in 1934.

In 1931, Horn homesteaded 640 acres adjacent to his father's ranch. This was used as a cow camp in connection with his father's cattle operations. He used the homestead as his headquarters until 1938 when he purchased his present ranch just west of Wolcott.

During the years he has added other pieces of land and ranch property to make up the V Eleven Ranches. Applying his range improvement program he has doubled his per-acre hay production and increased productivity of some land by 400 percent. These gains were accomplished with new irrigation systems, new grass and legume varieties, fertilization and other practices recommended by Colorado State University, the Soil Conservation Service and others.

Horn also has improved the public lands he uses. In a cooperative BLM range rehabilitation program, he developed 25 stock water ponds, cleared sagebrush and reseeded 300 acres, and improved 900 acres of juniper type rangeland.

On national forest lands, he has cooperated in a range demonstration improvement program, developed stock water facilities, erected fencing for rotation grazing and conducted range improvement programs.

Cattle from the V Eleven Ranches regularly top the market at Denver, reflecting the high quality and reputation of the present beef herd. Quarter horses from the ranch have consistently won shows and performance contests throughout the West.

Horn is a past member of the Colorado Cattlemen's Association Board of Control, the Rocky Mountain Quarter Horse Association, Western Slope Quarter Horse Association, American Quarter Horse Association, National Cutting Horse Association, and the American Society of Range Management.

He has been a member of the district advisory board for the BLM for 10 years and served as chairman for the past 2 years. He is past president of both the Eagle County Cattlemen's Association and the Eagle Valley Roping Club.

Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, Jo Ann Hardee, one of the brightest and most able of Detroit reporters, has recently written a series of five articles on the poverty program. The first of these most informative articles, which was published in the Detroit News, follows:

WAR ON POVERTY: IS IT BOON TO POOR—OR ILLUSION?

(By Jo Ann Hardee)

WASHINGTON, March 13.—Is the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 the first shot in a war on poverty?

Or is it a cruel illusion that promises hope to the poor but benefits only politicians?

President Johnson called it "the first time in all history that a great nation is able to make and is willing to make a commitment to eradicate poverty among its people."

Administration officials have repeatedly stated that poverty can be virtually eliminated in 10 years.

Critics have called the act, with its $727 million appropriation, "a rehash of New Deal programs that couldn't get through Congress on their own merits" and "a potential political boondoggle."

What is the Economic Opportunity Act?

First, it is not yet a war on poverty. Six months old, it is largely in a reconnaissance stage.

MODEST SUM

Officials of the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) admit that they are still learning the extent of the problem and still experimenting with means of meeting it.

They candidly agree that the $727 million budgeted through July 1 is a very modest sum in relation to the $40 billion spent by the Federal Government alone on antipoverty programs such as unemployment compensation job retraining, vocational education, and welfare.

They also agree that few of the estimated 34 million Americans classified as "poor" will be touched by the OEO effort this year.

For example, the Job Corps enrollment goal is 40,000 by July 1. But an optimistic goal for that date is to have 77 Job Corps conservation camps open with maximum capacity of 7,700 youths.

If the full Job Corps total were reached, together with the 150,000 goal of enrollment in the Neighborhood Youth Corps, that will still mean nearly 800,000 unemployed, out-of-school youths will not be touched by these programs during this fiscal year.

"Our greatest problem," said one OEO official, "is that people may expect too much, too soon."

But he denied that the flood of publicity about the war on poverty coming from the White House and the OEO might lead the public to such expectations.

Edgar May, Deputy Director of the VISTA program, the so-called Domestic Peace Corps, put it this way:

"Asking us how soon we will wipe out poverty is like asking President Roosevelt, on the day of Pearl Harbor, how soon we would win the war."

Senator PHILIP A. HART, Michigan Democrat, added:

"When the enemy is powerful, it's small wonder there is confusion when the attack begins."

But President Johnson, in an effort to speed the war on poverty, already has asked a doubling of the original budget request, pared by Congress, to $1.8 million in the next fiscal year.

Second, the antipoverty effort is not a new dole.

It will not immediately increase the income of those now classified as poor. The Council of Economic Advisers said last year it would cost $11 billion annually in direct grants to raise income for every American family above $3,000 and for every individual above $1,500.

LEAVE ROOTS UNTOUCHED

The report, foundation of the Economic Opportunity Act, concludes:

"But this 'solution' would leave untouched most of the roots of poverty.

"It will be far better, even if more difficult, to equip and to permit the poor of the Nation to produce and to earn the additional $11 billion and more."

This is the premise of the OEO, which has as its goal remedying lacks in health and education, especially among the young, that prevent them from being fully productive.

Critics claim that this goal could have been better served by expansion of vocational education or the manpower development and training program.

SENT BILL BACK

It should be noted, however, that many Republican legislators who advocate these alternatives voted to send the Vocational Education Act of 1963 back to committee.

It is true that the bulk of OEO's program is familiar:

The Job Corps and Neighborhood Youth Corps are similar to the Civilian Conservation Corps and National Youth Administration programs of depression days. Bills to establish them died in 1963, before becoming part of the antipoverty package.

Urban skills centers were part of the 1963 vocational education bill, but were never funded.

Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA) is a new name for the National Service Corps which was bottled up in committee before it was added to the Economic Opportunity Act.

Community action programs were evolved from the problem-ridden Juvenile Delinquency Control Act of 1962 and the privately financed Ford Foundation projects, both of which created coordinated services from existing social agencies.

ADMISSION OF FAILURE

But OEO officials say the vital element in the act is the mobilization of all methods of combating poverty, rather than a program-by-program, piecemeal approach.

They also state that the current antipoverty effort is a frank admission that the ordinary means to economic advancement have failed one-fifth of the Nation.

As one report states:

"The poverty that persists appears to be of a kind that is immune to the influence of general economic growth and to that of welfare programs designed specifically to relieve want and destitution."

RESHAPING IS GOAL

No one in the OEO believes that $727 million, or even $1.8 billion, can do, by itself, what hundreds of billions in expenditures have failed to do over the years.

The goal of the act is to use Federal seed money to reshape existing agencies and programs.

It was designed to provide communities with 90 percent Federal funds for 2 years, then reduce Federal aid to 50 percent, hopefully encouraging the reduction of programs that did not actually meet the needs of the poor.

But President Johnson has already asked Congress to extend the period of 90 percent Federal aid for 10 additional months, to June 30, 1967.

SOME LACK RESOURCES

"If we do not do this," he said, "many communities, especially those in rural or isolated areas and which lack the resources to get underway quickly, will be unable to qualify before the cutoff date."

Critics have called the program an intrusion of Federal Government upon localities, the introduction of a new Federal bureaucracy.

But some advocates of the Opportunity Act say one of its chief weaknesses is its reliance upon local initiative which has already failed to meet the problem.

Critics also say there is potential for misuse of funds and politically motivated programs designed more to gain votes than to provide true economic advancement.

OEO officials are painfully aware of this potential.

OTHER WATCHDOGS

They are now developing auditing systems to insure proper expenditures.

And there are other watchdogs.

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce has its own task force studying poverty. The House Republican conference has established a committee, headed by New Jersey Representative PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, who introduced his own antipoverty bill last year.

This committee will not only watchdog the antipoverty program but will attempt to prepare its own economic opportunity package, affecting the middle class as well as the poor.

In addition, the House Education and Labor Committee has set aside $50,000 for a watchdog operation.

SHRIVER ANSWERS CRITICS

Finally, the antipoverty effort has been called a gigantic public relations campaign. Critics have stated that it is designed less for direct assistance to the poor than to arouse the public to the need for action.

OEO Director Sargent Shriver flatly denies this:

"Our real purpose is a total recommitment of resources. Perhaps some of the traditional agencies resent this and perhaps some of them haven't moved as rapidly as they should.

"But our purpose is not public relations, it is a shakeup of the entire system of services that have served the poor."

HERE TO BREAK CYCLE

Another poverty official said:

"We are not here to make the poor more comfortable. We are here to break the cycle that produces poverty out of poverty.

"To do this, we must change traditional piecemeal approaches and gain a coordinated program, especially for the young. We must find the poor who have not been reached by traditional agencies and we must follow up to see that those who have escaped poverty do not slip back.

"Really, the title of the act is more accurate than the term 'war on poverty.' What we aim to provide is, precisely, economic opportunity."

Older Americans Act

SPEECH

OF

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3708) to provide assistance in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons through grants to the States for community planning and services and for training, through research, development, or training project grants, and to establish within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an operating agency to be designated as the "Administration on Aging."

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, the bill, H.R. 3708, introduced by the gentleman from Rhode Island, Representative JOHN FOGARTY, is one of the most all-inclusive and satisfactory pieces of proposed legislation in the field of aging to come before this House.

I rise to support H.R. 3708 because I believe this proposed legislation takes a major step in moving the sometimes ponderous bureaucracy of the Federal Government toward efficient management and practical programs in the field of aging affairs.

There are plenty of things about the attitude of all elements of our communities toward the elderly which cannot be legislated. Their place and participation in society, for example, and their health and dignity.

But isolation and misery can be prevented or reduced. We can provide the opportunity and means for proper food, clothing and housing, for productive employment or voluntary service, for insuring that society can catch up with science.

All levels of government have the responsibility—in cooperation with private organizations and individuals—to act vigorously to improve the lot of our aged.

This bill encompasses many programs to pursue these goals, but most significantly it starts out with investing the entire program with proper dignity by setting up a special Administration on Aging within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

This will be of enormous help to the Secretary of the Department, it will add great prestige to concept of serious programs of benefit to our older people. Our urbanized and industrialized way of life has often removed useful and satisfying roles which the elderly played in the smalltown family life of an earlier American era.

But we must see to it that the skills and talents of our older people are not discarded. The bill H.R. 3708 will help older Americans toward a more meaningful life.

New Phase in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, for the past several days, the New York Times has had some excellent lead editorials on the developments in Vietnam.

I agree with the views set forth by the Times, and under leave from this House I have been taking the liberty of inserting them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Today's editorial once against points out that retaliatory bombings and escalation of the war will certainly not bring about unconditional surrender on the part of North Vietnam; nor can it guarantee that overtures will be made for negotiation, unless this great country of ours will lead the way in proposing peaceful solutions rather than utilizing its force and might to enlarge military operations.

I am including that editorial in these remarks, and hope that each and every Member of this House will read the article seriously and objectively:

NEW PHASE IN VIETNAM

The American predicament in Vietnam now is one for which the French have a word. It it "engrenage," which roughly translated means getting caught in a massive set of moving gears.

The limited air war against North Vietnam having thus far failed to persuade Hanoi to halt its aggression—as the attack on the American Embassy in Saigon confirms—President Johnson reportedly now faces a proposal to increase the pressure. And Ambassador Taylor evidently has returned from Saigon to help him decide how much to step up the raids.

The attacks theoretically can be escalated in various ways. They can be heightened in frequency or in intensity. They can be broadened in target choice, adding economic installations to the military ones struck so far. And they can be stepped up in geographical sensitivity, in proximity to North Vietnam's control center and capital, Hanoi.

To escalate the attacks in frequency or intensity or in choice of targets offers little, especially if they continue to be limited largely to the southern third of North Vietnam. Between the 17th and 19th parallels, there simply are not enough targets.

That was one reason it was suggested to the President last year that the operation begin with small scale, semiclandestine attacks, as in Laos. That way it was thought there would be enough targets for a year and yet Moscow would not be put on the spot and Hanoi would not lose face in gradually making quiet peace overtures.

But the publicly announced mass raids decided on in February seem not only to have forced Soviet arms shipments and a stiffening of position in Hanoi, but to have assured that the target list would be exhausted in 2 or 3 months. That eventually is now on the horizon, although efforts are being made to postpone the inevitable by reducing the size of the attacks.

The fact is that escalation by going north of the 19th parallel is the only practicable way to increase the pressure. The first question that must be decided here is whether it is feasible to prevent installation of a Soviet air defense system of surface-to-air missiles and jets if, as reported, this equipment is on its way. The recent attacks on the radar links in North Vietnam's air warning and ground control system suggest that this may be the American intention. It could lead to a direct confrontation with Russia.

Attacks on military and industrial installations in the Hanoi-Haiphong area, moreover, would risk conflict with China—not only in the air but on the ground, which would mean another Korea. Even so doughty a government as the military regime in Thailand, which now is virtually a cobelligerent alongside the United States, has warned that the Red River valley region surrounding Hanoi and Haiphong is the beginning of the high sensitive Chinese periphery.

Even if these dangers do not eventuate, the number of significant military and industrial targets north of the 19th parallel is not extensive. North Vietnam is a primitive agricultural country with only about 150,000 industrial workers and miners in its 17 million population. The North Vietnamese Communists undoubtedly would not enjoy losing the few dozen small factories they have built or restored over the past decade. But they simply do not have much to lose.

It seems clear bombing will not bring about Hanoi's unconditional surrender. It may not even produce a negotiation, unless the United States makes persuasive peace proposals that both rally world opinion and offer Hanoi a more attractive route to viability than reunification of Vietnam by force.

In Defense of the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. FLYNT, JR.
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Speaker, each year the American Legion sponsors the American Legion national high school oratorical contest. The Legion's oratorical competition, developed primarily to instill a keener knowledge and appreciation of the Constitution of the United States on the part of high school students, has been approved since 1943 by the National Association of Secondary School Principals.

The contestant that we of the Sixth District of Georgia are proudest of is John B. Mostiler, the son of Mr. and Mrs. John L. Mostiler, of Griffin, Ga. Johnny, a senior at Griffin High School, has as his speech coach Miss Julia Elliott of the Griffin High faculty.

Johnny has hurdled the first levels on the long climb to the grand prize awarded to the winner of the national contest. He began by winning the local oratorical contest sponsored by the Griffin American Legion, Post 15, then went on to win the Sixth District contest, the area contest and the State contest at Athens, Ga.

On March 29, 1965, he competed with State champions from Florida, Alabama, and South Carolina, and was selected as the regional winner. Johnny will go to the area semifinals in Houston, Tex., April 5, to compete against other regional champions. If his luck, and his voice, hold out, he will then continue to Portland, Oreg., for the final competition for the grand prize.

In his speech, entitled "In Defense of the Constitution," Johnny challenges the American people "to give our Constitution a fair trial, let's judge it now in the light of its criticisms." "If we pause and look at our Constitution constructively rather than critically," as Johnny does in his speech, we too may come to the same conclusions as he does: The Constitution is the blueprint of our Federal Government. "We must now assure the world that we shall maintain it. It shall be sustained."

It is with pleasure that I include in the RECORD Johnny Mostiler's winning speech:

IN DEFENSE OF THE CONSTITUTION

("There never was an assembly of men, charged with a great and obvious trust who were more pure in their motives, or more exclusively and anxiously devoted to the object committed to them than were the members of the Federal Convention of 1787."—James Madison.)

What was the "great and obvious trust" of which Mr. Madison was speaking?—Molding 13 unorganized States into 1 strong indivisible Nation. From May until September these men met, facing questions of representation, aristocratic rule versus rule of the people, and a strong central government versus a weak one. The debates were long and tedious, for each man knew that he was not only deciding the type of government under which he preferred to live, but he was also deciding the fate of a nation. The debates ended and the Constitution of the United States of America was drafted. The Founding Fathers were proud of their work. George Washington referred to the Constitution as, "That precious depository of American happiness." Thomas Jefferson called it, "The ark of our safety." Thus our Constitution has stood—barrier against tyranny, temple of liberty, and cornerstone of our American way of life.

Recently, our barrier has been bombed, our temple violated, our cornerstone chipped. Our Constitution has been barraged by disparaging and vilifying remarks. Cries of "Our Constitution is obsolete. Let's revise it"—"No, let's rewrite it" have been heard throughout our Nation. As a thinking people, we find ourselves facing this question—"Is our Constitution obsolete? Should it be scrapped and a new one written?"—A searching question, isn't it? And one which we must answer. Therefore, in order to give our Constitution a fair trial, let's judge it now in the light of its criticisms.

First, there is the charge that the Constitution is too narrow in scope—that it is too inflexible to allow the Government the carte blanche power it needs to rule effectively. In answering this question let us first decide whether or not we want our Federal Government to have carte blanche power. Hitler had it, Napoleon had it, Mussolini had it and the Russian Communists have it—Do we want our Government to have it? This was the very thing our Found-

ing Fathers guarded against. Have our ideals so radically changed? As for its inflexibility, President Woodrow Wilson had this to say. "It vests executive power in a single chief magistrate, for whose election and inauguration it makes carefully definite provision, and whose privileges and prerogatives it defines with succinct clarity; it grants specifically enumerated powers of legislation to a representative Congress, outlining the organization of the two Houses of that body * * * ; and it establishes a Supreme Court with ample authority * * *. Here the Constitution's work of organization ends, and the fact that it attempts nothing more is its chief strength. For it to go beyond the elementary provisions would be to lose elasticity and adaptability." An intensive study of the Constitution will bear out President Wilson's statement. The Founding Fathers definitely outlined the role of the Government in the federal system. By not going into detail, and saying exactly which laws the Federal Government could or could not pass, they allowed for changing political situations. Article I, section 8, clause 18 was inserted to add flexibility. It allows the Government "To make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers [those expressly delegated to it]." Granting the President extensive powers during wartime is another way the Founding Fathers prepared for changing conditions. Is the Constitution too narrow in scope? Judge for yourself.

Another criticism has been leveled at the amending process. It is too slow and cumbersome, some say. Are we to understand that it is too cumbersome to allow the people to decide yes or no on major changes in the federal system? Abraham Lincoln called democracy "government of the people, by the people, and for the people." Thomas Jefferson said that ours is a system of government in which "the supreme power is lodged in the people." Are the people to be left out? Has our Government grown so large as to have no room for the individual and his opinion? The prohibition amendment may have been a mistake, but it was the mistake of the people and not Congress. The wheels of democracy grind slowly, but thoroughly. "We the people of the United States of America" are sacred words. Let's not violate them by changing a necessary implement of individual freedom.

The Supreme Court has also come under fire. Why should we allow nine men supreme authority in constitutional interpretation? Why shouldn't we? A constitutional interpreter is as necessary to our longevity as a free nation as a referee is necessary to the orderly continuation of an athletic event. Someone must interpret the rules, why not delegate that responsibility to a body free of political pressure? The very fact that politicians are dedicated to the principles of certain political parties is the chief stumbling block to allowing them the power of constitutional interpretation. The conflicting opinions presented by politicians would lead to chaos in our Government. This is what our enemies are waiting for and therefore, the very thing which must not happen. We must, at all costs, keep politics out of constitutional interpretation.

The Bill of Rights has been attacked. One of the amendments under criticism is the fifth amendment, which states that a person may not be made to testify against himself. Since this is a stumbling block in the prosecution of Communists in our Nation, many have called for its repeal. The 1st and 14th amendments have come under similar criticism.

Is this just? Our forefathers established a government of principle, not expediency. When we convert to a government of expediency, we will have lost the very essence of democracy. Our Government will become tyrannical. Principles never change. They have been written indelibly in the hearts of men by the blood which has so freely flowed in their defense. Principle is the factor which has made our Nation great, and since the Bill of Rights is a statement of principle, it should remain unaltered to insure our greatness.

If we pause and look at our Constitution constructively rather than critically, we will be like the man from one of Stephen Vincent Benet's poems who said:

"I guess I haven't thought about it much.
I been too busy. Way I figure it
It's this way * * *
There's a buried thing in all of us,
Deeper than all the noise of the parade
Out of the flesh, out of the minds and hearts
Of thousands upon thousands of common men,
Cranks, martyrs, starry-eyed enthusiasts,
Slow spoken neighbors, hard to push around,
And men with a cold passion for mere justice.
We made this thing, this dream.
This Land unsatisfied by little ways,
Open to every man who brought good will.
We made it and we make it and it's ours.
We shall maintain it. It shall be sustained."

Benjamin Franklin sounded the challenge when he said, "Gentlemen, we have given you a federal government, if you can keep it." Mr. Franklin was speaking of the blueprint of our Federal Government, our Constitution. We must now assure the world that, "We shall maintain it. It shall be sustained."

Catholic Paper Calls for Return to Reason in Alabama Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES D. MARTIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, although their voices are few, there are those in the country who sense the danger of the mass hysteria which has been generated against Alabama. I am proud of those newspaper writers and editors who have the courage to issue a word of caution in accepting as a new messiah, the self-styled savior of the Negroes in America. There are those who dare to say that Martin Luther King may be a rabble rouser. There are those who ask for a return to the American virtue of fairplay and in fair reporting of the news and who are against the biased and one-sided reporting that has been such a marked part of the Alabama demonstrations.

In this connection I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues and to the clergy who rushed so eagerly to Alabama, the following editorial from the Wanderer, national Catholic weekly, published at Madelia, Minn.:

KING "HOLLERING FIRE"

The civil rights leaders are now standing on the theater, as the President put it, "hollering fire." With the battle for voting rights apparently won, they press on, exposing themselves to danger, needlessly upsetting law and order in southern communities and contributing, some think, to such tragedies as the ugly racial incidents at Collinwood High School in Cleveland.

The point having been made, and dramatically, and with national sympathy at its highest peak on the subject of civil rights, there is the feeling here that Martin Luther King, a Nobel winner, should begin to act more the statesman than the leader of a mob.

Instead we hear from all points there is going to be more. An Episcopalian priest comes to St. Paul to predict a blood-soaked summer in the South. A prominent Negro author lectures in Minneapolis along the same line. King promises more demonstrations in other Southern States.

While this goes on, there has been the near riot in Cleveland, where the Negro does have the vote, and in Detroit a Negro minister found it necessary to try to end Negro picketing of a small grocery store whose owner, a white, gunned down a Negro thug who was attempting a robbery.

King now will march on Montgomery, a court order in hand. His ends have been served repeatedly by other favorable decisions, and now the Congress is turning to help serve another. But it is King's feeling that a higher moral law gives him the right to disobey court orders he does not approve, and possibly there is some other high moral law at work that compels him to continue demonstrations that are no longer so heroic as they are dangerous and disruptive.

We wonder, though, if he is leading, or if the competition among Negro civil rights leaders is not in fact pushing him into extreme positions containing seeds of revolutionary peril. The enactment of a new Civil Rights Act, for example, is likely to come as an anticlimax.

The philosophy is afoot that some swift change makes all change inevitable and swift. With one example of victory—already practically won—the forces he and the others are leading may find any delay on any other troublesome problems frustrating and impossible to accept. Many responsible Negroes, for example, contend that any official restraint upon a Negro is discriminatory and constitutes brutality. Many are getting the idea that every flaw of society can be solved if enough prone or upright bodies block the public thoroughfares.

But it is time there was understanding that this can't be a Government ruled by ultimatum. This would not be a democracy much longer if the President were to respond to every demand for Federal troops whenever there is trouble. Yet, we have men of the cloth, the moral leaders of the Nation, handing down ultimatums, ordering the President to produce the troops. This freedom the Negroes say they want would be a peculiar sort of freedom indeed if it were achieved on these revolutionary terms.

Worse yet, there is good reason to fear that the continued examples of demonstrations by civil rights advocates and the predictable responses by southern redneck sheriffs are going to have an influence in the northern Negro slums that will make last summer's rioting in Harlem and Philadelphia seem as safe and harmless as a dance about the maypole. Some of the lesser leaders, in fact, directly encourage such looting and brutally, either for its shock effects on the villainous "Whitey" or because of the cynical determination to lead and thereby exploit. There is no reason to believe that this last is limited to the low level of leadership.

But the main danger to these whipped-up frenzies lies in their promise, to the emotions, of the nonattainable. No law or pronouncement, no ultimatums, no broken bodies are going to make the poor suddenly prosper, teach the illiterate to read or make

astute political scientists of sharecroppers or slum dwellers. Nor will any law make palaces, with running water and maid service, out of rundown shacks or rat-infested apartments. Laws don't make the ignorant wise, the shiftless ambitious, nor do they force any human to like any other human.

There is a long, hard haul ahead for the Negro. It is time for his leadership to stop leaping up and down in the limelight for attention and buckle down to the much more difficult job ahead.

Military Pay Increase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, a statement by Mr. Robert A. Means, the national secretary of the Fleet Reserve Association is the most succinct and comprehensive statement of why we need a substantial military pay increase that I have seen thus far.

I believe every Member of Congress who is interested in seeing to it that our military personnel are treated as first-class citizens should read Mr. Means' statement. I, therefore, commend it to the attention of the entire membership:

ENLISTED GROUP ENDORSES REPRESENTATIVE RIVERS' MILITARY PAY BILL

(By Mr. Robert A. Means)

Mr. Robert A. Means, national secretary of the Fleet Reserve Association, stated today, "The Secretary of Defense's reported action of the past 3 weeks to subvert the military pay proposal of Congressman L. MENDEL RIVERS is a heinous effort to relegate career military personnel to a future of poverty and second-class citizenship."

Mr. Means' statement came after the Fleet Reserve Association, an organization composed of more than 61,000 active duty and career enlisted men of the U.S. Navy and Marine Corps, learned of the Secretary of Defense's reported tactics in his offensive to kill the military pay raise proposal. The proposed pay bill, H.R. 5725, was introduced on March 3 by Representative L. MENDEL RIVERS, Democrat, of South Carolina, chairman of the House Armed Services Committee. The committee, comprised of 25 Democrats and 12 Republicans, feels so strongly in favor of the measure that 33 Members joined Mr. RIVERS by introducing identical companion bills.

Mr. McNamara opposes the measure which will give an average 10.7-percent raise to all active duty personnel. As a member of the President's current Federal Pay Panel he has recommended a 3-percent across-the-board pay raise for servicemen.

The Secretary of Defense is using every means at his disposal to wage an all-out war to defeat Mr. RIVERS' bill. To accomplish this he is doing the following: (1) stressing the fact that the military has received two pay raises in the past 2 years; (2) controlling all news emanating from the Pentagon on this subject; (3) monitoring the testimony of Defense Department witnesses appearing before congressional committees; (4) downgrading and refuting comprehensive studies of the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps which positively prove the deleterious manpower problems of the services and the crying need for a substantial military pay raise; (5) discouraging and discrediting congressional support of the Rivers pay bill, and (6) he has selected personnel to serve on yet, another Department of Defense pay study to delay action on the Rivers bill.

The above action is shocking in the light of his recent testimony before the House Armed Services Committee during his defense posture report for 1966. At that time, he said:

"We cannot compensate the man in uniform for the unique hazards of the military profession but we can and should see to it that he at least shares with the civilian population the rising American standard of living."

The following chart, taken from the House Armed Services Committee's study, graphically shows how the American serviceman has fared in salary increases in comparison with his civilian counterpart since 1952:

Military pay increases have not kept pace with those of other groups, 1952–64

	Percent
Military officers enlisted over 2 years' service	36.6
Civil service	46.3
Production worker (manufacturing) [1]	52.7
Professional and technical workers [2]	56.2
Clerical and kindred workers [2]	62.1
Army-Air Force wage board	66.7
Motor-truck drivers [1]	70.4

[1] 1952–63, actual; 1964, estimated.
[2] 1952–62, actual; 1963–64, estimated.

The Secretary of Defense is deprecating the total cost of the Rivers pay measure which is slight by more than $1 billion. Let's break this total figure down and see how much of a monthly increase it will be in the pockets of the enlisted man:

	Grade and rating	Percent increase	Actual dollars
E-9	Master chief petty officer	10.4	$54
E-8	Senior chief petty officer	8.8	38
E-7	Chief petty officer	15.3	58
E-6	Petty officer, 1st class	12.4	41
E-5	Petty officer, 2d class	12.4	33
E-4	Petty officer, 3d class	8.8	18
E-3	Seaman	18.7	19
E-2	Seaman apprentice	13.7	12
E-1	Seaman recruit (over 4 months' service)	13.0	11
E-1	Seaman recruit (less than 4 months' service)	13.0	10

Mr. McNamara in extolling the two pay raises of the past 2 years knowingly fails to state that the findings of his 1963 military pay study showed that military pay lagged 26 percent behind comparable civilian pay and that the pay increases of 1963 and 1964 fall far short of overtaking that 26-percent disparity.

He also fails to tell the American public that on the heels of the 1963 pay raise he changed the eligibility requirements for foreign duty and proficiency pay nullifying the effect of the raise for scores of thousands of military personnel.

The Secretary of Defense stresses the importance of the "fringe benefits" enjoyed by servicemen. The "value" of these benefits are mushroomed out of proportion. The truth of the matter is that while fringe benefits in civilian industry are growing at a rapid rate, the military's fringe benefits are declining year by year. In 1959 the military's fringe benefit cost was 28.68 percent of the military payroll costs while the civilian fringe benefit cost was only 24.9 percent of the civilian payroll costs. In 1964 the military fringe benefit cost dropped to 27.9 percent of the military payroll costs and civilian fringe benefit costs rose to 28.8 percent of the civilian payroll costs.

A recent Air Force study of its 719,000 personnel reveals: (1) 5,000 Air Force personnel have received relief benefits; (2) 55,000 more are technically eligible but are too proud to accept them; (3) 169,000 personnel receive basic pay below the Government poverty standards; (4) 148,000 personnel "moonlight" (work in civilian jobs in their offduty hours) to supplement their military pay; and (5) 180,000 wives of Air Force personnel work to help support the family. These shocking facts are not unique to the Air Force, the other services share these statistics proportionately.

Moonlighting among military personnel is causing growing concern among our military leaders. The Secretary of Defense explains the problem away by saying that the serviceman moonlights to provide luxuries and frills for himself and his family. A Defense Department study of the practice states that one major cause of moonlighting is the luxurious desire of military personnel to provide higher education for their children.

When the plans for the administration's Job Corps were announced it was learned that the underprivileged young boys participating in this program would receive up to $105 a month. In comparison, a seaman with 2 years of service in the Navy receives only $99 per month. The Department of Defense endeavored to refute this comparison but it boils down to the fact both boys receive room and board, medical care, etc., and yet the boy serving in the Armed Forces of his country receives $6 a month less in wages.

What does this proposed military pay raise mean to the American taxpayer? The House Armed Services analysis of their pay proposal states:

"As consequence of the failure of military pay to keep pace with increases provided other workers in the economy the military departments have experienced a serious inability to attract and retain high quality personnel. This problem reflects itself in constantly recurring training cost expenditures by the departments and a loss, in some instances, in actual operational readiness."

These constant recurring training costs are being borne by the American taxpayer. For example, the total cost of the training an enlisted radar electronic specialist is $23,000. The Navy's overall reenlistment rate has dropped from 25.3 percent in 1962 to 20.3 percent for the first 6 months of fiscal year 1965. This means that 79.7 percent of naval personnel, trained at great expense, leaves the Navy at the end of their obligated service. They are replaced by untrained recruits who in turn receive the costly training. This expensive and wasteful cycle is repeated year after year. Would it not be wiser to invest a portion of the recurrent training cost in adequate military pay and help to solve the services' biggest problem—the retention of personnel?

What is President Johnson's position on this issue? During the recent presidential campaign, on August 21, he addressed a joint session of the National War College and Industrial College of the Armed Forces at Washington, D.C. He told his audience, "I very much want our uniformed citizens to be first-class citizens in every respect. I want their wives and children to know only first-class lives."

At that time he pledged "at the earliest possible moment," to take "whatever steps both human equity and national defense may require to enhance the standing and morale of those who defend us."

Now, 7 months after that address, the President's silence condones the Secretary of Defense's action to negate his pledges of last August.

The need for a substantial military pay raise requires no more study. The Department of Defense conducted a thorough study of military compensation late last summer. It was completed in October 1964 and still lies on the desk of the Secretary of Defense awaiting release. Congressman RIVERS' mili-

tary pay proposals appears to be based on the findings of such a study.

The Fleet Reserve Association does not contend that passage of Mr. RIVERS' bill will cure all the ills of the services' personnel retention problem. But it will surely be, in the words of a high-ranking naval officer, "a step in the right direction."

Mr. Means finished his statement by saying, "The Rivers military pay proposal is a fair and equitable measure to aid in raising the serviceman to an acceptable, comparative standard of living in relation to his civilian counterpart. The Fleet Reserve Association is squarely behind it and urges the American public to support it by writing their representatives in the U.S. Congress demanding their support."

The Fleet Reserve Association was formally chartered in 1924 and gains its name from the Fleet Reserve components of the U.S. Navy and Marine Corps which allows personnel to transfer to an inactive status, subject to 24-hour recall, upon completion of 20 years of active service.

During the past 41 years the Fleet Reserve Association has represented the enlisted man in military legislative matters on Capitol Hill and interceded in his behalf with the Defense Establishment and other Government agencies. Through its watchful and temperate approach the rights of the enlisted man have increased and the association has become the voice of the enlisted man.

For further information contact Robert W. Nolan, editor, Naval Affairs.

Allis-Chalmers: Company on the Comeback

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, the Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., one of the Nation's oldest and largest corporations, was the subject of an article which appeared in the March 15, 1965, issue of Forbes magazine.

The article described in some detail the gains which this firm made in 1964, after a previous period of decline. It focused on the work of Mr. Robert Stevenson, president of Allis-Chalmers, in lifting the company's earnings by 88 percent last year.

The dramatic comeback of Allis-Chalmers is of great significance to the people of my congressional district, where the company's headquarters and many of its facilities are located.

As the Forbes article points out, Mr. Stevenson concentrated his efforts at improving the firm's present plants rather than scrapping them to build new ones in areas where wages are lower.

That decision by Mr. Stevenson vitally affected the people of Milwaukee County, and indeed, of Wisconsin. It is, therefore, exceedingly gratifying to us to watch the financial upturn which Allis-Chalmers is experiencing.

In order to acquaint my colleagues with some facts on this important American corporation and its hard-working president, I am inserting the Forbes article at this point in the RECORD:

NOT YET PROVEN

(Bob Stevenson, of Allis-Chalmers, knows that yesterday's goat can be tomorrow's hero. But after lifting earnings 88 percent last year, he isn't in either role yet.)

Allis-Chalmers racked up some of the best gains in U.S. industry last year. Sales of $629 million set a new record, 16 percent over 1963's $543.9 million and even breaking the 1956 alltime high of $547.4 million. Earnings of $1.37 per share rose 88 percent over 1963's dismal 73 cents, though they were still far below the old $2.42 to $3.60 range of the midfifties.

CRITIC'S CHOICE

For Chairman Robert S. Stevenson, the gains brought a smile to a face that has known all too many lines of worry. Under Stevenson, this great Milwaukee company had lost much of its old earning power. Unable to increase its market share against General Electric and Westinghouse, A–C had to get out of steam turbine generators in 1962, take a $40 million writeoff. Over a period of years, Stevenson was forced to slash the dividend from $2 to 50 cents.

In desperation, Stevenson assumed the role of corporate critic. When his newest plant also proved to be his most inefficient, he closed it, and embarked on a thorough plant modernization program at others. Aided by outside consultants, he tackled the job of reshaping Allis-Chalmers' old-fashioned organizational structure. He changed 9 product-oriented divisions into 10 operating divisions aimed at specific markets.

Despite last year's spectacular gains, Stevenson readily admits he deserves no medals yet. He judges his company by return on equity; and while its return of 4.2 percent last year was double that of 1963, it was still wretched compared with the 10-percent-plus average of U.S. industry in general. Stevenson's only claim is that the direction is right: "We're taking a lot of routes toward a better result," says he.

SOURCE OF HELP

Much of the improvement at A–C last year came from added volume, but some did come from the extensive changes Stevenson has made at the 118-year-old company. "The organizational structure is completed and should last for many years," he said. "You could see the results in certain selling divisions over and above the effects of the boom. Before, to sell a system we had to put a task force together and put it under an independent manager.

"Now each division can borrow what it needs from other divisions and run the show. It has really helped."

As usual, A–C's three tractor divisions—farm equipment, engine and materials handling, and construction machinery, which yield some 60 percent of sales—set new highs. "In total, the tractor group will set another record in 1965," predicted Stevenson. And what about A–C's lag in profitability behind the leader in each of these fields—Deere in farm equipment, Caterpillar in construction, Clark in materials handling? "I'd say the gap could be closed some," he answered.

Stevenson also had good news about two other groups, industrial equipment and utilities, which in 1963 accounted for about 40 percent of sales and a lot of red ink. "It was a sick business and it's not sick any more," said he. "Some of our improvement did come from the electric utility side."

Last year A–C also made some hidden gains. Export sales broke all records to reach $72.3 million, up 7 percent over 1963. The company also ended last year with a backlog of $261.5 million, the largest in its history.

FURTHER PROGRESS

Stevenson also has grounds to hope the improvement in profitability will continue. The production rearrangement he began over a year ago in his massive West Allis works, which makes heavy electrical equipment, won't be finished until the end of the current quarter. The Norwood, Ohio, plant, which makes pumps, motors, and generators, won't be in shape until the year's end, and the Pittsburgh plant, which produces distribution transformers, not until some time next year. "We didn't get too much advantage from plant reorganization last year," said Stevenson. "It doesn't constitute a miracle. We're still going to have to go through a shakedown period. If it's any good at all, the benefits will increase gradually as time goes by."

In fact, many at Allis-Chalmers feel that the proof of the pudding will come in 1965 and 1966. Then the results of all this plant rearrangement will show whether Stevenson should have spent his money as he did on his old plants or scrap them to build new ones in low-wage areas. Only then will Stevenson finally qualify for the gold medal or the donkey's tail. But Allis-Chalmers' longtime stockholders are already beginning to feel a bit better about the direction of things.

Horton Questions American Aid to Nasser

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK J. HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc., has put in my hands the text of a letter its respected membership recently sent to Secretary of State Rusk.

The letter touches on an issue of grave concern to millions of other Americans; namely, whether it is in the best interests of the United States and the preservation of world peace for our Government to provide assistance to the United Arab Republic.

For the many reasons I have cited previously in remarks made from the House, I do not believe American aid should continue to Nasser. So strong is this belief that I joined a majority of my colleagues in the House earlier this year in voting to restrict the sale of surplus agricultural commodities to the United Arab Republic.

The sad fate of that restrictive amendment is known to all of us. It was stricken by the Senate and a subsequent attempt to replace it here in the House failed, even though I again voted for it.

Threafter, I introduced H.R. 4781 which calls for the end of all aid to Nasser.

Mr. Speaker, in support of my bill, I take pleasure in sharing the contents of the letter which the Society for the Prevention of World War III addressed to Secretary Rusk.

I might add that the type of information this letter seeks can be compared to that which I feel would be made available to our colleagues if the House were to adopt House Resolution 266. This resolution, which I sponsored recently, would amend the rules of the House to permit the Secretary of State to appear before us and respond to inquiries involving matters under the jurisdiction of

his Department and about which Members of Congress should be informed in greater detail.

The letter follows:

OPEN LETTER TO THE SECRETARY OF STATE, THE HONORABLE DEAN RUSK

SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION OF WORLD WAR III, INC.,
New York, N.Y., March 15, 1965.

DEAR SECRETARY RUSK: It was most depressing and indeed alarming to read press reports that unnamed U.S. officials insist that American aid to Egypt must go on despite recent Egyptian provocations (Washington Post, Jan. 6, 1965). It is only natural that Americans should express outrage over the continuation of multimillion-dollar subsidies to a regime which only recently insulted our people and contemptuously lampooned the Statue of Liberty—the symbol of freedom everywhere.

However, of even more fundamental concern to security-minded Americans are the persistent efforts on the part of some State Department officials to conceal the anti-U.S. policies pursued by President Nasser, aiming at the destruction of America's position in key areas of Africa and the Middle East. Our taxpayers have been asked to support the Nasser government to the tune of approximately $1 billion on the specious grounds which the above-mentioned unnamed U.S. officials reiterate in defense of aid to Nasser. These officials allege that aid to Egypt bolsters U.S. influence over that regime; that such aid has moderated Nasser's aggressive proclivities; that such aid keeps the situation in the Middle East quiet and that it has blocked Soviet penetration in the Middle East.

If U.S. aid has allegedly accomplished all or some of these admittedly worthwhile goals, certainly the American people are entitled to a concrete accounting of these achievements. In previous correspondence with the State Department, the society, too, has been assured that aid to the Nasser government is accomplishing these objectives. For instance, 2 years ago, the State Department assured us that within 1 month Nasser would withdraw from Yemen.

Mr. Secretary, we must frankly state that there has been no response to our challenge precisely because there is no significant evidence. On the contrary, all of the available information shows that U.S. aid has been largely instrumental in strengthening Nasser's capabilities to do us harm and to further exacerbate tensions in the Middle East and Africa as well as to further cement his ties with Moscow.

Nasser's dedicated hostility toward the United States and his collaboration with the Soviet Union are two sides of the same coin. On September 20, 1962, radio Cairo announced to the people that the Egyptians "wish to be allies with the Soviet Union" in their "battle of life and death against Western imperialism * * * particularly American imperialism." These policies and sentiments have not changed one iota. Thus, in his notorious Port Said address of December 23, 1964, Nasser vilified our country as the "imperialist aggressor" and in gutter language told Americans "to go to hell" with their aid. It is no coincidence that Soviet expansion in the Middle East accelerated subsequent to Nasser's seizure of power. Indeed, it is no exaggeration to state, as the facts will bear out that Soviet inroads in this key area of the world were largely facilitated by the Nasser regime.

On November 30, 1964, President Nasser's rubberstamped National Assembly endorsed a resolution "denouncing the abominable crime committed by American and Belgian imperialism in the Congo and calling upon the United Arab Republic to provide sufficient aid to the Congo. * * *" One of Cairo's leading newspapers, Al-Ahram, helped to whip up this hate-inciting propaganda under a blazing headline "Aggression Against the Congo and the Responsibility of the European and American Peoples" (Nov. 29, 1964).

These attacks against the United States are not merely propaganda exercises, as some U.S. officials would have us believe. They are part of a coordinated drive to undermine our position and prestige in key areas of the world. Thus, the Nasser government has been among the chief instigators in inciting Africans against the United States; egging on Panamanians to riot against our country at the Canal Zone; and fomenting anti-U.S. actions in Libya. In the Middle East, the agents of the Nasser regime are constantly at work striving to undermine the independence of neighboring states while her 40,000 troops in Yemen are a pistol aimed at the vital oil interests of the United States and our Western allies.

It has been reported that State Department officials have stated that during 1964 many evidences of moderation have appeared in Egyptian policies. If this would be true, why is it that the United States is still in conflict with Egypt in such a great number of countries: in Aden, Congo, Cyprus, Ethiopia, Libya, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, and Yemen? Is it not a fact that in every one of these countries Nasser seeks to remove one of our bases or to undermine the position of one of our allies, or to hamper our communications, or to reduce or limit our influence? We hope it is not the fact of Nasser's intent to compensate us for the destruction of the American library (of course, with our taxpayers' money) which constitutes Nasser's alleged moderation. This reminds us of what Senator PAUL DOUGLAS said recently: "Arabs exert a great fascination on two types of people: British maiden ladies and members of our State Department."

The so-called Afro-Asian Peoples Solidarity Conference is another vehicle for Nasser's anti-U.S. activities. This organization, largely staffed by Egyptians with headquarters in Cairo, is forever fomenting attacks against our country among the newly created States of Africa and Asia. When President Nasser in his Port Said speech defiantly declared, "Our policy is clear and we say it openly. We say that we sent arms to the Congolese people and we shall keep on sending arms to the Congo," he revealed the true nature of his regime which is not only a threat to peace and security but a dagger poised at the very vital interests of our country.

Can it be said that those U.S. officials who defend aid to Egypt and carefully skirt over the fundamental question of the nature of the Nasser regime, are meeting their responsibilities in terms of protecting the national interests of our country? All of the significant evidence in word as well as deed, shows that the Nasser government is by its very nature anti-American and anti-Western. The good works attributed to United States aid to Egypt indicate, in our opinion, that the American people are being kept in the dark and misinformed concerning the real character of the Nasser government. It is this lack of candor and clarity which dismays the society.

According to the recent vote in Congress, the President is empowered to continue aid to Egypt if he finds it in the national interest. This raises, among others, the following questions:

1. Is Nasser's pressure on Libya to liquidate American bases there in our national interest?

2. Is Nasser's providing the Congolese rebels with weapons in our national interest?

3. Is the war waged by 40,000 Egyptian troops in Yemen in our national interest?

4. Is Nasser's anti-Western propaganda in the Aden zone in our national interest?

5. Is Nasser's interfering with our relationship with Ethiopia, Saudi Arabia, Somalia, Sudan, and elsewhere in our national interest?

6. Is Nasser's undermining of our prestige in the various African countries in our national interest?

7. Is Egypt's sending an ambassador to Communist North Vietnam in our national interest?

8. Is the continuous anti-American propaganda in the Government-controlled Egyptian press (such as the cartoon showing Uncle Sam putting a dagger in the back of an Egyptian) in our national interest?

9. Is it reasonable to expect that certain neutral and nonalined nations would make a proper choice between Soviet imperialism and the United States if we continue to pay tribute to the Soviet Union's chief satellite in Africa?

These are crucial questions which the State Department will have to answer without prejudice and without wishful thinking in advising the President if further aid to an archenemy is desirable. We fully agree with a Cairo dispatch on this subject which recently appeared in the New York Times: "It [further aid] will help free money that President Nasser can spend on arms shipments to the Congo, to Cyprus, Algeria, or South Arabia to oppose the United States and its allies."

The lessons of history show that appeasing regimes of the Nasser type only whets the appetite of its rulers and increases their potential for doing harm. This was precisely why appeasing Hitler boomeranged against those who thought that they could accommodate the aggressive and lawless character of the Nazi government. The American people have always been prepared to support aid programs which would further the national interests, but they will not support assistance to regimes which thrive on anti-Americanism and spread their hatred among other peoples.

The society believes that the moment has now come when our Government must take full inventory of those who are our genuine friends and those who turn our generosity and good will into poisoned arrows aimed at peace and security. For years, the society has stressed that all foreign aid programs should be governed by the principle that "recipient governments must demonstrate responsibility and reciprocate our friendship and good will." By this test, regimes ruled by such dictators as Presidents Nasser or Sukarno are automatically disqualified. We believe that, if the U.S. Government acts with decisiveness on the basis of this principle, it would break once and for all the vicious circle of blackmail and bribe which has so vitiated the worthwhile goals of U.S. foreign aid.

It is our considered judgment that the American people are fed up with the soothing syrup administered by some U.S. officials concerning the Nasser government. Their disillusionment is reflected in the growing resentment in Congress where their representatives are rightly challenging those who persistently apologize for the Nasser government's defamatory and hostile activities against the United States. If the U.S. foreign aid program with its many positive features is to continue to receive the support of the people, there must be a total elimination of those programs which lend aid and comfort to our enemies.

Respectfully submitted.

ALBERT SIMARD,
Secretary.
ISIDORE LIPSCHUTZ,
Treasurer.

Grain Terminal Association Supports Small Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANCHER NELSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Grain Terminal Association roundup for March 26, contains some shocking figures of just how many farmers each section of the country would lose if administration officials wanting to reduce farm population by 2½ million have their way. The roundup indicates, for example, that our Midwest States would lose 65 percent of present farmers. Those who look favorably at this administration solution to the farm problem would profit from the Grain Terminal Association's farsighted analysis, and I wish to insert it in the RECORD for their benefit:

GTA SUPPORTS SMALL FARMERS

Some of the Nation's foremost citizens are serious when they talk about getting rid of 2½ million of this country's 3½ million farmers.

But as one Member of Congress asked his colleagues, "Would the American public then be at the mercy of a few giant producers who would control the supply and prices of food?"

A national magazine took up that question and answered it this way: "If farmers in the past decade had been able to keep their prices rising at the same rate as the prices of other wholesale commodities, housewives now would have to spend an additional $4 billion a year for food. That would be $4 billion that now is going for cars and clothes and homes and furnishings and appliances."

As you remember, it was Budget Director Kermit Gordon who stirred up a big storm with his talk about eliminating 2½ million farmers. That brought thousands of letters to Washington from farmers and other rural people. Many of them were from businessmen who told Washington that grocery stores, clothing stores, furniture stores, auto agencies, and other businesses would be wiped out by the thousands. The small towns would wither.

A rural banker wrote that "every time we lose 10 or 12 farmers, we lose the people who would spend the money to sustain one average-sized business—a matter of roughly $100,000."

Just what would it mean if 2½ million more farmers were forced off the land? The Southern States would be hardest hit. They would lose more than 1 million small farmers, 79 percent of those now farming in those States. The Midwest States would lose 65 percent of present farmers, about 860,000 small producers. The Northeast States would lose 2 out of 3 farmers, about 150,000 total. The Western States would lose 210,000 farmers, or 66 percent of those they now have. It is estimated that many ranchers with as much as 2,000 to 3,000 acres would be eliminated in the West.

Of course, the land would still be there. It would just be divided up among the 1 to 1½ million remaining farms. These would all be big farms. The land might be farmed harder than ever. The big operators would, it is believed, skip right over the small towns to buy their supplies at wholesale in the larger distribution centers. They would be in a position to organize and name the price when buying or selling.

But among the million remaining farmers some would not be as big as others. And soon it would be their turn to be pushed out.

This is what GTA's M. W. Thatcher meant when he said: "Farming is going to continue. The question is, Will it be carried on by the farm families of this country, the economic and social base of our democracy, or is it going to be done by big plantation owners, barons of the soil, feudalistic overlords, who will not be concerned about the towns and villages and the people?"

Voice of Reason From Montgomery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES D. MARTIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD I would like to include an editorial from the March 30 issue of the Montgomery Advertiser. The editorial points out the double standard of reporting the news from Alabama and certain northern cities:

TIME AND TIDE WILL RUN THROUGH THIS DAY

Many are the Alabamians today who are oppressed by embittered despair that the world has come to think of them as a strain of barbarians.

He is profoundly convinced that a double standard of judgment exists in Alabama.

He recoils from the horror of a Michigan woman being slaughtered on a highway. But he is at a loss to know why that slaughter is viewed as a special category of offense against the Creator; why her murder offends the national sense more than the murder of a prominent Memphis matron in an alley or the piecemeal murder of Kitty Genovese on the streets of New York as a dozen people watched.

He is bewildered that when a Negro educator from Washington is assassinated on a Georgia highway neither Governor Sanders nor Ralph McGill is blamed. When the same thing happens in Alabama, our Governor is indicted for murder.

He has noted in the Bible that it is in order to contrast the mote and the beam; he has read "judge not lest ye be judged." He has read God's word on the Pharisees. So an Alabamian is bewildered when he is chided for pointing out that a New York nightstick is a club in Alabama.

The answer to the contradictions is not soothing. But the reality has to be faced.

In the first place, there has been a lot wrong with the South. And, alas, it is viewed in the context of the Civil War. The prewar commercial conflicts between the industrial North and the agricultural South were savage and irrepressible. The conflict amplified the differences in the two regions and the Negro slave was the South's emblematic "peculiar institution."

The Great War was fought; slavery was not the exclusive cause by any means, but that became the national illusion and continues to be outside of the history books. It seemed that the slaves were manumitted by Union deliverers over the dead bodies of Confederate oppressors.

A southerner murdered Lincoln. Booth was mentally incompetent, but the murderer was treated as a southern enterprise. In turn, the South was subjected to Reconstruction.

The mass of the Negroes were in the South and a frank system of apartness, sanctioned by the U.S. Supreme Court, developed. Southern politicians exploited the race issue, precisely as northern politicians are doing so today. This cements the deliverer versus oppressor concept.

The South had such misfortunates as Heflin, Blease, Watson, Bilbo. There followed international events such as the Scottsboro trials. All of this, taken with the past, perpetuated the association of Negro repression with the South, like sand with ocean waves. The national sense is that southern violence is entwined with the second stage emancipation of a race.

That is why the murder of a Michigan matron on U.S. 80 is placed in a more heinous category than that of a Memphis matron in an alley or Kitty Genovese on the streets of New York.

This double standard is irrational, but we in Alabama simply have to face the reality of its existence and cut our cloth to that pattern. That does not mean meek, dispirited acquiescence in the fanatical indictments of ourselves by lustful politicians. Nor need we abandon the defensive lash found in the parable of the mote and the beam: "We may say that this was God given and bring it to bear with skill."

Our troubles are many and will plague us for a long time. Restraint, a realistic regard for the aspirations of others and reliance upon the law will lighten the burden.

And in the current despair of the pillory, we may take heart from confident conviction that this State and all its people have a bright destiny. The resources of this State and the momentum of their development are great. We are afflicted at present, but these afflictions are not on the scale that can hold back the dawn.

Change and adjustment have occurred and there will be more. Expansion of our educational system and industrial development will lead irresistibly to higher levels for all. It is easier to bear the orgiastic slanders of our State if we remind ourselves of the larger fact of our certain destiny as a great one among the States of the Union.

Farm Labor Camp Filth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the significant findings of the factfinding trip to California this last week by Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz was the frequent incidence of filthy, unsanitary, and disgraceful farm labor conditions.

Dick Meister, writing in the San Francisco Chronicle, on Tuesday of this week, points out that the Secretary's findings have been confirmed by the growers own representative, the Council of California Growers.

Mr. Speaker, much has been said about American workers being unable or unwilling to do "stoop labor," but I suggest that this article points out some of the real problems. I urge that it be read by all who are really concerned with attracting and holding an adequate and stable supply of farmworkers:

FARM GROUP BITTER ABOUT CAMP FILTH

(By Dick Meister)

The Council of California Growers in a blistering attack on some of the people it represents, expressed outrage yesterday at the "filthy, disgraceful" farm labor conditions found by Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz. "Responsible California agriculture has been clobbered by the black sheep," declared the council, chief spokesman for the State's growers. It cited "the operators of filthy, disgraceful farm labor camps" and "growers who incredibly enough did not have toilet facilities in their fields." Concern over a lack of field toilets also was raised at a meeting of the State board of public health here yesterday. Dr. Herbert A. Lints, a Berkeley physician, warned that "this is a public health hazard that could spread diseases—typhoid for one." Dr. Lints urged the State health board to require all growers to provide such toilets. Dr. Malcomb Merrill, State health director, told him he would report to the board's next meeting on whether it had such power.

Disgust expressed by Wirtz for over some conditions he saw on his tour of California farm areas last week "was no exaggeration" said the council which had observers accompanying the Secretary. If Wirtz agrees to growers' requests for imported Mexican labor, the council added, it will be because he "understands the problems faced by responsible growers."

But it will not be because "all the things he saw served to convince him that all California growers are really doing everything they can to fully utilize and maintain a qualified domestic labor force.

"The overall impression gained by the Secretary and the public was not good." The council called this "tragic," commenting that a great many agricultural interests "worked their hearts out to bring together with Mr. Wirtz and his party the people and the facts which could accurately and honestly enable him to better understand the many ramifications of our growing crisis." How much of Wirtz' "overall impression" will affect his decision on imported labor, the council added, "can only be guessed at." The council blamed the bad conditions primarily on labor contractors and camp operators, but it said growers have "the ultimate responsibility and we can't pass the buck." Growers, the council warned, "are going to continue to get clobbered unless we do something about it. And fast.

"Growers must play the game fair and square. This means providing the type of decent facilities and conditions that will help attract and hold domestic workers.

"If these things are done and still a legitimate shortage exists then the case will have been honestly and fairly proven."

Growers, the council urged, must clean up their worker housing or see that housing provided workers by others is cleaned up.

"The same applies to those of us who live in areas where our local housing authorities operate facilities right out of the 'Grapes of Wrath' era" it added. Most growers, the council said, know the need "to see that decent conditions are maintained both in the camps and in the fields, but obviously some don't and it's up to us collectively and individually to see that the type of things that do exist that are wrong are made right."

The council, a frequent critic of Wirtz in the past, called his California visit a "20-hour-a-day tour by a man who appeared genuinely interested in getting all of the facts he could."

The Herd

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, we are still confronted with the so-called voting rights bill which is now pending in the Judiciary Committees of the House and Senate. It is apparent to impartial minds that the legislation is intended to subjugate people in certain sections and to federalize elections therein wiping out State sovereignty as well as obliterating State lines in those particular areas with no thought of protecting the rights to register and or vote in the Nation as a whole. The architect desires forced elections, full participation and no opposition. This has been the strength of the Communists even though they are in the minority in the countries they rule. They have taken over the election machinery, created a police state and browbeat and ruled with an iron hand.

This bill, if enacted, would be a long step in that direction for America in the sections of the country that the bill covers. I have a feeling that people all over the Nation are beginning to realize what a boobytrap this proposed legislation is, the dangers inherent in it and some at least are speaking out against the rank discrimination proposed in this legislation. It is the most vicious, punitive, insidious, iniquitous measure that has been proposed to the Congress. It is liberty destroying as well as unconstitutional. The formula set out in the bill is simply a scheme to have Federal officials take over the electoral franchise in certain States. There is so much evil in this bill that many of us hope that if enough of the people in America can be given the facts that there will be a great resentment against those who are trying to stifle the States and localities into not having free and untrammeled elections.

Recently there appeared in the Lynchburg News an editorial entitled "The Herd." This editorial points out cogently the hysteria surrounding the introduction of this bill and the evils of goose-stepping to the demands of minority pressure groups. I wish every Member of this House would read carefully and ponder the merits of the editorial which is as follows:

THE HERD

The Congress of the United States is supposed to be a deliberative body. In the past, its greatest strength has rested in its rules which protest the rights of minorities and prevent the Congress from taking precipitant action in times of crisis.

Watching the eagerness with which the Congress applauded the pious platitudes and cliches of Lyndon Johnson that "black Monday" night, we wonder. We had the impression that it was as eager to rubberstamp the President's voting bill before even hearing the details of it, as the German Bundestag was to do the bidding of Adolph Hitler 30 years ago.

Has the time come in this country when it is possible for Communist-inspired professional agitators and anarchists to create such a domestic crisis that the representatives of the people will jump to do their bidding?

What is possible for the present crop of agitators to accomplish in the name of "civil rights," is possible also for other agitators to do in the name of other causes. It would be possible for unionists to create such a crisis through strikes, demonstrations, and violence, that the Federal Government would be asked to take over the Nation's transportation system, its steel mills, its automotive plants, or what have you. And it would be possible for agitators on college campuses, with the help of the Federal courts, to so paralyze college operations that Federal laws would be demanded to insure that the institutions could function normally. Where there is Federal law, of course, there is Federal control.

No matter what any Member of the Congress says, or what Lyndon Johnson says, or any professional agitator says, there is no need for a new voting law. All that is needed is to enforce the laws alerady on the books, as the courts are now doing. But that is the hard way. The President is seeking a more insidious way—that of strengthening Federal power by means of a new law which circumvents the courts and gives the executive branch of the Central Government authority to control all elections. It is much easier to govern when one has absolute power than it is when one must share power with other branches of Government, and, in this country, with the States and the people.

We doubt that there is 1 percent of qualified voters who are being denied the right to vote—and none in Virginia. But the Congress is eager to give the President the power to interfere with elections of all the people, in all of the States.

The old Nazi and Communist trick of creating crises and anarchy in order to get special considerations is working well. It is working, because the Congress has shown repeatedly that it can be stampeded. In short, it has shown the characteristics of the bovine species of animal which is most easily driven—cattle.

Farming Without the Mexican Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, an excellent editorial appeared in the March 22 Minneapolis Tribune. It reminds us that a period of adjustment, perhaps several years, will be required to make the transition from the bracero system to a system of domestic farmworkers receiving fair wages under decent working conditions and living conditions.

Along with a number of my colleagues here in Congress, I met with Secretary Wirtz to urge him not to be stampeded into turning back to the old bracero

system. I am certain that Congress does not intend to renew Public Law 78.

The Minneapolis Tribune editorial follows:

FARMING WITHOUT THE MEXICAN IMPORTS

Braceros, long an integral part of farming in States near the Mexican border, are missing this year, and growers who long have predicted that they couldn't get along without the imported field workers are worried.

The theory of ending Public Law 78, which governed the entry of Mexican farm labor, was that the additional jobs (more than 60,000 in California last year) should be made available to Americans in need of work. The growers have maintained that domestic workers would not do the stoop labor.

This year the new system is getting its first test and the results are less than satisfactory. The California State Employment Service has successfully recruited domestic farmworkers, but only about one in three has stayed with the work.

Growers say they don't dare put a big investment into such fragile crops as tomatoes if they have no assurance that crews will be available to harvest the crops. Secretary Wirtz has been asked to use the loophole in the new law permitting importation of workers for jobs not filled by domestic labor.

But a few months are not an adequate test of an employment plan legislated with sound reasoning behind it. Available American workers, many of them inexperienced in farming, will have to get used to the jobs, and some will have to be trained for farm machinery. Wages in some areas will rise, and inevitably consumer prices on the food raised will be affected.

It may take several years to adjust to the new system, but the goals of more jobs for Americans and better income and working conditions for whoever does the fieldwork are worth a real effort during the transition period.

Employee Newspaper Gives Some Food for Thought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, how refreshing it is to hear, in these days of confusion and wild demonstrations in the name of liberty, a clear, calm voice reminding us of some forgotten truths. Such a voice comes to us in an editorial from the Wingfoot Clan, employee newspaper published at the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. plant in my hometown of Gadsden, Ala.

The editorial follows:

LIBERTY

"Liberty, too, must be limited in order to be possessed."—Burke.

Sometimes, in this present age, when we are confronted with the tensions and confusions of life, we tend to become anxious and bewildered. The world seems wobbly on its axis and the picture of events seems out of focus.

One word which seems to occupy the minds of many of our people is liberty. It's a good word but what does it mean? Liberty for what?

We have the right to own property but do we have the liberty to trespass on the property of others?

We have the liberty to drive an automobile but does that liberty give us the right to disobey traffic laws?

We have the right to park our automobile but are we at liberty to park it beside a water plug or block a driveway?

We have the right to walk on a sidewalk but do we have the liberty to force another into the street?

We have the right to enjoy the beautiful scenery of our country but are we at liberty to discard bottles, cans, wrappers, and papers on our highways and in our parks?

We have the right to build a house on our property but are we at liberty to disregard the pertinent zoning and planning laws?

We have the right to freedom of opportunity but does that give us the liberty to demand rather than merit?

As Burke pointed out, the very word liberty implies that there must be certain restraints imposed, in order that liberty might exist for all.

The right to use our fists stops where the other fellow's nose begins.

Liberty, under the law, implies that there must be a respect for law in order that the liberty of all might be preserved.

The liberty to have a job certainly implies that the individual must have certain qualifications commensurate with the skills required on the job. To disregard the qualifications would infringe on the rights of those who are qualified for the job.

We are a nation governed by laws and not by men. No man is a law unto himself because such a condition would endanger the liberties of others.

Liberty is precious but unlimited liberty for any person, group, or organization would deprive others of their liberties. Unbridled liberty is chaos and confusion and detrimental to the common good.

To possess liberty ourselves we must recognize the limitations of our liberty and the liberty of others.

Toynbee, the eminent historian, pointed out that two of the final steps leading to loss of liberty are apathy and dependency.

A "don't care" attitude and a dependency on governmental or other agencies for "cradle to grave" security can lead us to the same doom that overtook 19 great civilizations of the past.

No Surpluses in the Future?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the problems of American agriculture is that of distribution. We all know that the world scarcely has a surplus of food products and that the real problem is making it possible for us to get our food to those who need it. A recent editorial in the Lincoln Sunday Journal and Star of March 21, 1965, points this out so simply and forcefully that it deserves wider circulation and I include it in the RECORD for that purpose:

NO SURPLUSES IN THE FUTURE?

Gunnar Myrdal, famed Sweedish economist, told members of the National Farmers Union in Chicago last week that the farm surplus problem, which has plagued the United States, will come to an end in the near future.

He said the time was fast approaching when this Nation must shift gears and produce all the food its advanced agricultural technology permits. Otherwise, he said, the burgeoning populations of underdeveloped countries will face starvation of hundreds of millions of people.

The Swedish economist undoubtedly knows whereof he speaks. He is on his way home after completing studies of the food problem in south Asia. The task should not be that of the United States alone and Myrdal purposes the help of other developed nations.

This would indicate that the world must do more than increase production. It must learn cooperation in marketing, sharing of responsibilities, and how to live in peace.

Present U.S. surpluses could be absorbed in a hungry world if they could be distributed and if the nations of the world would lay down their weapons and concentrate on economic development.

If one reads Myrdal correctly, he is saying the future alternative to feeding the world may make it unacceptable. He says repercussions from starving millions could be expected and could include political totalitarianism ushered in by violence.

The American farmer, now the problem child, could very well be the first line of defense.

The farmer's dilemma is a strange one. He is the envy of the Communist world which cannot or has not learned his secret. Yet in the United States, because he is so efficient, the Government can't decide what to do with him or for him or to him.

When the statesmen of the world can do their job as well as the American farmers, there will indeed be a better world.

Voting Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, dismissal yesterday of the NAACP suit that sought to decrease congressional representation of certain States because of voted discrimination, points up sharply, I think, the need for a statute enforcing section 2 of the 14th amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

One week ago today I urged the House Judiciary Committee to make my bill, H.R. 6029, a part of the voting rights bill of 1965. I said then and I continue to believe that passage of H.R. 6400, the administration's bill, has the highest priority. I think my proposal can be made a part of it without jeopardizing its chances for prompt enactment.

The people of American want the Congress to do everything that is constitutionally possible to insure the right to vote and not merely a portion of that which is constitutionally possible.

The problem, in the words of President Johnson, is "the dignity of man and the destiny of democracy." It is the "destiny of democracy" because the right to cast a meaningful vote is the essential right which distinguishes a democracy from other forms of government. It is the "dignity of man" because any democracy which denies to one man an equal opportunity to vote with other men denies his essential human dignity.

I include as part of my remarks a news story about the dismissal of the NAACP

suit from this morning's New York Times:

NEGRO VOTER SUIT BARRED BY COURT—SOUGHT TO CUT HOUSE SEATS OF STATE CURBING FRANCHISE

WASHINGTON, March 30.—The U.S. district court here dismissed today a suit to compel a reduction in house of representatives seats of States that deny Negroes the vote.

The suit was filed by the NAACP legal defense and educational fund, which asked the court to order the Commerce Department and its Census Bureau to collect in the 1970 census the statistics needed to carry out section 2 of the 14th amendment.

That says that States shall have their house delegations reduced by the same proportion that those to whom they deny the right to vote bear to the voting-age populations of those States.

Dismissing the suit, Judge William B. Jones ruled that neither of the two groups represented by the fund had standing to sue.

One group, composed of 15 registered voters from States that do not deny Negroes the right to vote, contended that failure to enforce section 2 diluted their right to vote by giving seats in the House to States not entitled to them.

Judge Jones said their interest in the matter was "remote and speculative and shared by millions of others."

"They are not personally aggrieved or affected in a legal sense by defendants' [the Government agencies'] refusal to take future action in connection with the 1970 census."

The second group, composed of 10 persons from Southern States who contended they had been denied the right to vote, asserted that carrying out section 2 would deter this denial.

SEES NO REMEDY

Judge Jones said that even if he granted the order they sought and a reapportionment gave existing House seats to other States, that "would not vindicate their right to vote."

"They would find themselves in the same position that they are in at this time," he said.

He called the possibility that enforcement of section 2 would end the denial of their right to vote "remote and speculative."

Judge Jones also found that the census law did not authorize Federal officials to get the statistics and make the computation necessary to carry out section 2. Congress would not give them this authority in 1929 and has not since changed its mind, he said.

Jack Greenberg, director-counsel of the fund, said in a statement issued in New York that the fund intended to appeal.

"When we filed the case, we knew it would be a long, hard struggle," he said. "Section 2 of the 14th amendment is quite clear in its intention, but unfortunately has never been enforced.

"Events in Selma [Alabama] underscore the gross injustice of permitting States to bar Negroes from polls on one hand while counting them on the other for purposes of inflating the size of their congressional delegations."

In an affidavit filed with the court, Abram J. Jaffe, director of the manpower and population program of Columbia University's Bureau of Applied Social Research, described a system for distinguishing those who did not register because of apathy from those who were prevented from doing so.

He calculated that if section 2 were enforced Texas would lose six House seats, Virginia four, Alabama three, Georgia, Mississippi, and South Carolina two each, and Florida, Louisiana, and Oklahoma one each.

Program of Affiliated Young Democrats, Inc., of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to set forth the legislative program of the Affiliated Young Democrats, Inc., of New York State.

This program was adopted at a meeting held at the Hotel Piccadilly, 227 West 45th Street, New York, N.Y., at an executive meeting on Saturday afternoon, January 9, 1965, with Harold R. Moskovit, State president of the Affiliated Young Democrats, presiding:

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM OF AFFILIATED YOUNG DEMOCRATS OF NEW YORK

The Affiliated Young Democrats of New York at their statewide legislative committee meeting held yesterday noon at the Hotel Piccadilly, 227 West 45th Street, New York City, endorsed the following legislative program for 1965, which will be introduced in the State legislature by their 19 members in the State senate, of which the chairman is Senator Samuel L. Greenberg, of Brooklyn, and their 41 members in the assembly, of which the chairman is Assemblywoman Aileen B. Ryan, of the Bronx:

"Raise drinking age to 21 years; primary election for all State officers; adopt new code of New York City Air Pollution Control Board for Cleaner Air; more housing; abolition of capital punishment; permanent personal registration be made statewide, with two changes: (1) must vote at two consecutive national elections, (2) do not have to reregister if move in same county; vote at 18 years, stop turnstile justice by recodifying the statutes as it relates to juveniles, with the unison of Federal and State laws; more vocational camps, rehabilitation, and training centers; favor 2 voting days for national elections, first Monday and Tuesday in November; more State aid to education; extend ban on racial discriminations in housing and protection against slum landlords; create more judges; legalized off-track betting by referendum; raise minimum wage to $1.50 an hour; mandatory free tuition at all State and city universities and all community colleges; outlaw boxing; permanent spring primary election day in June; stronger code of ethics; presidential preference primaries; legislature to at last ratify the 15th amendment; preserve our great natural resources; program to discourage dropouts in schools; State aid to public museums, create statewide recreation department; bonus for Korean veterans; increase teachers' salaries; more and better aid to the aged and mentally ill; favor 3-day weekend plan to celebrate all holidays, except religious holidays, on Monday; help migrant workers; stronger law against dope peddlers; and finally, we strongly urge, again, that a printed record of all the proceedings verbatim of the 1965 State legislature be published, and made available to the public."

Richard H. Wels, chairman of the State legislative committee of the Affiliated Young Democrats of New York, presided at this important meeting.

Computers, Nonvoters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, now that the furor of the 1964 election has subsided the issues and results are political history. A look at some of the questions which remain to be settled is in order. One of the questions is the impact of earlier television-radio projections on Midwestern and Western States at a time when their polls were still open for ballot.

The Chicago Heights Star, a community newspaper with an interesting and astute viewpoint on politics discusses this question thoroughly in an editorial of March 21, which I place in the RECORD at this point:

COMPUTERS, NONVOTERS

On more than one occasion this newspaper has expressed concern over projecting national election results before all voters have gone to the polls. How many west coast people, we have wondered, fail to vote because computers have indicated that their votes won't make a difference anyway?

In light of this, it is interesting to read of a speech made by Pierre Salinger, former White House press secretary, before the Women's National Press Club in Washington. Mr. Salinger made an unsuccessful bid for the U.S. Senate last November, entering the race in California for the seat he held by appointment.

He told the press women that, on the basis of a recent poll, more than 350,000 Californians did not vote. Television-radio projections at 4:30 p.m., Pacific time, indicated that President Johnson had already won the big prize. The fact that thousands of residents of the State saw no good reason to ballot on the Senate post and various other offices and propositions is a sad story in itself.

The fact nevertheless is, however, that discouraging presidential voting alone can be a sticky business.

Nobody will argue that the outcome of the 1964 race was materially affected by forecasts of the results, for the margin was far too decisive. But the impact on a relatively close contest might spell the difference between victory and defeat for a candidate, and there is the additional chance that the projection itself might be grossly inaccurate, by virtue of an error at best or a bit of mischief at worst. As recently as 1960, the computers were pouring forth fantastically misleading prognostications in Illinois, chiefly because the source of the sample returns was not taken into consideration.

Even after all polls are closed, meanwhile, projections of the outcome have their drawbacks. Poll watchers for the apparently defeated faction can be expected to lose interest, whereas workers on the winning bandwagon will want to achieve the best possible precinct records as they look toward the division of spoils.

But the thing Mr. Salinger had in mind primarily was the number of persons apparently not voting at all because of time zone differentials apprising them of the probable results in advance. He has a right to be personally concerned, since the stay-

at-homes might have changed the results of other contests, including his own.

We are not sure that Mr. Salinger and this newspaper remain on the same wavelength, though, when it comes to solving the problem. He urged that polls in national elections close at the same instant, from Maine to Hawaii. His plan would embody 24-hour voting, with a common closing time.

Not among those endorsing a marathon voting period, we suspect, are persons who tallied results of Illinois' gruesome at-large House of Representatives election. Nor are we sure that a protracted balloting session would not open the way to "repeater" voting and other frauds.

It would seem that the most sensible solution is to put a lid on the national results until all polls are closed, or to revise election hours just enough to synchronize closing hours without disenfranchising anyone.

I believe we in Congress should give serious thought to this problem.

Boycott Is Un-American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES D. MARTIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, along with all the other illegal and unlawful acts, demonstrations, defiance of court orders which he engineered, Martin Luther King now demands that the State of Alabama be crippled by an economic boycott.

Don't buy anything produced in Alabama—

King cries.

Wreck their industries, throw their people out of work, create more poverty and it's too bad if the Negroes suffer, but it just has to be.

This is the callous, inhumane, un-American attitude of this so-called leader of the civil rights movement. Mr. Speaker, Martin Luther King is not interested in voting rights for the Negroes of Alabama; he is not interested in helping the Negroes of Alabama gain equal economic opportunity; he is not concerned with helping them to build a better life. He is interested only in the power he gains by using the Negroes of Alabama to his own selfish ends. If this is not his purpose, why would he demand a program that can only hurt most the very people about whom he expresses such concern?

The tragedy of this hour is that there are those who encourage and support the immoral and illegal acts of Martin Luther King. I refer to an article in this morning's edition of the Washington Post which states:

The Childs Securities Corp., a firm that underswrites municipal bonds, said today that it plans to do no business with Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, I am amazed and shocked that a reputable business firm would be so unethical and so lacking in American principles as to participate in such an action. The support of an economic boycott against a whole State and its people is a well-organized Communist technique which has been used to topple every government which the Communists have taken over.

I would hope that the executive vice president of this company, a Donald E. Barnes, would reconsider his ill-advised letter to the Governor of Alabama, threatening to boycott our State on the demand of an agitator who has set himself above the law and above the traditions of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud those writers and public officials as well as officials of private business who have condemned Martin Luther King's un-American tactic of calling for a boycott of Alabama. It will be my purpose to spread upon the RECORD, so that Members of Congress and the American people may see, the names of those companies who aline themselves with those who are doing all possible to destroy America; those who are ready and eager to wreck private companies and local communities and the States of the Union; ready and eager to deprive thousands of American citizens of all races, colors, and creeds, of the means of making a livelihood.

So that I will not be accused of quoting out of context, I include as a part of these remarks the entire news story from the Washington Post of April 1, 1965, dealing with the Childs Securities Corp.:

WILL BOYCOTT ALABAMA, SECURITIES FIRM SAYS

NEW YORK, March 31.—The Childs Securities Corp., a firm that underwrites municipal bonds, said today that it plans to do no business with Alabama.

Executive Vice President Donald E. Barnes, in a letter to Alabama Governor, George C. Wallace, said the firm would refrain from purchases and sales of all securities issued by the State, its cities, school districts, or other political subdivisions.

Barnes' letter said the firm acted because of "credit considerations, arising from the failure of the Wallace administration to protect the citizens of Alabama in their exercise of constitutional rights."

"The prospects for business and industrial growth in the State have thus been placed in doubt," it said.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965

SPEECH
OF
HON. RICHARD WHITE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 26, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2362) to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this education bill raises several important philosophic considerations which I would like to discuss. One of these is Federal aid to education, another is States rights and States responsibilities, and the equation for measuring the worth of this bill.

There is no doubt that the closer Government can be to the people, the more control the local citizen can maintain, the safer is our republican form of government. We are a federation of States, and yet the great experiment of loose States and absolute local control failed in the Articles of Confederation. This form of government was so weak that our forefathers reformed our system into our present structure, to give greater strength to the Federal Government. This was in recognition that certain responsibilities are beyond the scope and management of State government. In between these two extremes rest a gray area, that becomes the subject matter of constant controversy. We fought a Civil War over such a major controversy, and there it was decided by force of arms and much spilled blood that in the area of government preempted by Federal law the Federal Government predominates.

The principle of States rights has never been surrendered in the hearts and minds of the people of the United States, and I myself in many aspects favor the acceptance of local responsibility and control, not as a sentimental heritage from my forebearers, but as a result of fear of complete control by an impersonal, far-removed power that may not understand the needs and particular problems of the people of my State. Our culture and laws are devised to fit our own situation, and we ourselves can best understand and solve these unusual problems.

So by broad principle, I believe that States on their individual problems can best solve these themselves and should accept these responsibilities.

This is the ideal, but this cannot in reality be the final answer, for in reality there are many pressing problems on which the States have not and probably cannot adequately accept their responsibilities. It is in this area that alternatives become elusive.

This is where our avulsion to Federal aid to education collides with the need to educate. What are our fears? That through Federal aid to education a centralized government will control the minds of the young, and by so doing any future despot could then subvert our country and establish a dictatorship.

In comparing the principle of States rights to the need of educating our young for our national security and well-being the element of danger lies in the control of the curriculum. If Federal Government cannot or does not control the subject matter and accent, these young minds would not be molded to the thinking of the centralized agency.

So I believe the battleground is not whether or not the Federal Government should assist States in their educational needs, but rather whether or not the aid proposed would carry with it controls on the curriculums itself. We have long had Federal aid to education, such as the GI bill which educated so many of our citizens after World War II, who otherwise would not have had such educational opportunities. No one would deny the value of this program.

I believe the greater numbers of Americans today believe that it is proper for the United States to assist the in-

dividual States in the expenses of education; provided this help is given in such a way as to not infringe on the rights of the States to control their own educational policies.

I apply this test to the House elementary and secondary education bill, and I believe the bill insures that the controls of education will remain with State and local school agencies.

Section 604 of the bill is entitled "Federal Control of Education Prohibited." I would like to read this section to you:

> Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system, or over the selection of library resources, textbooks, or other printed or published instructional materials by an educational institution or school system.

If this bill is passed by the Senate, money would be allotted to the State and the State would, in turn, distribute this money to the local school districts. Your local school districts that run the schools have no direct contact with the U.S. Government.

This education bill does not carry with it any control on the curriculums. In the church-state battle, the original bill carries with it direct grants to parochial schools, which offended many on the church-state principle. In the committee, this bill was so modified to remove those direct grants. I consulted with religious leaders in my district who opposed these original direct grants to parochial schools, and they were unanimous in stating that almost all objections had been satisfied, and indicated that they could not conscientiously oppose passage in its amended form, especially in view of the good of the bill.

Generally, it is best that States legislate their own affairs and care for their own problems. It has become apparent, however, that the costs of educational facilities are increasing to such a point that many States cannot fully provide the necessary facilities. The question then is whether our children and Nation should be made to suffer as a result of this failure to provide educational opportunities.

Our country today faces a growing need for educational facilities. Today, one-fourth of all Americans are in our Nation's classrooms. Attendance in elementary and secondary schools will increase by 4 million in the next 5 years; 400,000 new classrooms will be needed to meet this growth. And already one-half of our Nation's existing classrooms are more than 30 years old.

Today one student out of three now in the fifth grade will drop out before finishing high school, if the present rate is allowed to continue.

If we want to cut down the number of our citizens on public welfare, the best way is education of the present generation of young people. Lack of education and poverty often go hand in hand. Unemployment of young people with an eighth-grade education is four times the national average. It does not seem reasonable to spend $2,500 a year for a family on relief and only $450 a year per child in our public schools. But these are the facts. These growing needs must be met.

The 16th District of Texas will receive over $2.7 million to help defray the rising costs of education for children of families earning less than $2,000 a year. The school districts will receive needed textbooks and library materials selected by themselves, and the present program of help to local school districts impacted with the children of Federal personnel will be continued for 2 years. This is so important to our communities having a large military population.

Educating our children to the best of their abilities is important not only to our children themselves, but vital to keeping our State and local governments effective and our Nation safe from tyranny. A local community cannot be prosperous and attract new industries with many people unskilled to do the work of the community. A State cannot be effective unless its citizens are educated enough to recognize the needs of the State and meet the responsibilities of citizenship. For our national security we must have brainpower behind our armed might. We must compete and surpass the Communists in the technology race. The more educated a people become, the more it resists Communist tyranny. We cannot hide the fact that today the United States and the entire free world is in a race of minds and technology against the major Communist countries. In an actual sense it is a matter of survival of our system.

We are the oldest constitutional government in the world, but we can no longer dream along in a world of yesteryear, safe and secure in academic arguments.

Our country shall remain strong only as long as the weakest link is made strong enough to cope with the threats and aggressions of our enemies. Armament is not the entire answer to security. Sparta of Greece found this out in ancient times. Our strength as always lies in the utilization of our free spirit, in inventiveness, in the exercise of our minds, to the benefit of us all. Our hope for the future lies in the development of the minds of our young people through education, not only in how many missiles or troops we can send abroad. Latent genius and talent may lie anywhere, in the most crowded city, in the most humble surrounding on the Rio Grande. Young minds are like cotton crops or oilfields. They grow valuable and useful only as you cultivate them and attend to them.

So applying the necessary safeguards to insure local controls of education; considering the advantages to our security with a strong educational system; weighing the great need of our children of poorer families and needs of our less populated areas of the 16th District, and the fact that at least 18 out of 19 counties of our district would qualify for this assistance, I support the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

The "Neighbors Abroad" Program in Palo Alto, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the people of Palo Alto, Calif., in my congressional district, are actively engaged in a program of international cooperation and understanding which is worthy of note and comment. Palo Alto, as we all know, is the home of one of our Nation's greatest centers of learning—Stanford University. This distinguished community has historically taken an active interest and role in international relations because of its association with the university which attracts scholars and visitors from throughout the world and which has sent its faculty, students, and graduates to every country.

With this background and rich tradition, the people of Palo Alto have undertaken a new program to help achieve better relations and understanding with their neighbors abroad. They have embarked upon a town affiliation program, which while still in its early stages, is already most successful. I wish to comment briefly upon some of the more significant accomplishments of this program in the hope that by so doing we may encourage more American communities to initiate affiliations with their counterparts in other countries.

Six years ago, in the spring of 1959, Palo Alto's civic leaders began to explore the possibility of establishing a sister city relationship with a foreign city. In the beginning, contacts were made with the American Municipal Association and the U.S. Information Agency in order to obtain advice and guidance regarding the town affiliation program. Several unsuccessful attempts were made to seek out a sister city, and it was not until July 10, 1962, that, quite unexpectedly, the Palo Alto City Council received a letter from Attorney Miguel V. Roca, the mayor of Palo, on the island of Leyte in the Philippine Republic, which contained the heartwarming invitation "to make our two cities twins." On July 23, the Palo Alto City Council voted unanimously to enter into a town affiliation with Palo, and Mayor David B. Haight called a meeting of citizen leaders to develop further plans.

Thirty-five persons, representing 19 Palo Alto organizations, responded to the mayor's call, and during the next 3 months devoted their time, their talents and their energy to planning and organizing an effective program. Representatives of this group visited other communities which had already established sister city affiliations; they discussed their plans with interested individuals and organizations; they began to study about Palo, its people, customs and institutions; they visited the Philippine consulate in San Francisco.

On October 7, 1962, the Municipal Council of the City of Palo unanimously adopted a resolution confirming the affiliation. Shortly thereafter the late General of the Army, Douglas MacArthur, in a letter expressing his pleasure in learning of the affiliation, extolled the bravery of the Palo citizenry in resisting and fighting against the enemy, and stated that "the people of Palo are, indeed, worthy of this honor."

On January 18, 1963, those who had been working to implement the affiliation program selected a name by which it might be symbolized. The name selected was "Neighbors Abroad," and it has proven to be an appropriate appellation for a distinguished and dynamic group of citizens working together to achieve friendship and amity between people.

Since formalization of the town affiliation program. Neighbors Abroad and its counterpart in Palo, the Giants Club—glory is achieved nobly through sacrifice—have accomplished much. While the two cities are separated by nearly 7,000 miles, they and their people are linked by the sister city movement, one facet of the people-to-people program endorsed by the Government of the United States.

A brief recapitulation of some of the accomplishments of the Palo and Palo Alto program may indicate the scope and beauty of the effort. It is obvious, of course, that many of the benefits of such an affiliation are subtle and intangible, but as such, they are perhaps the most meaningful.

An early accomplishment was the purchase and delivery of various pieces of sports equipment for the children of Palo. The funds for this gift were collected by junior high school children in Palo Alto who sponsored a "Philippine fiesta" at their school and by a local sports group, the Palo Club. The sports equipment was delivered personally to the people of Palo by Navy commander, Robert Bergner, a resident of Palo Alto.

One of the greatest health problems facing the citizens of Palo is the prevalence of parasitic diseases which cause great suffering, decrease average life expectancy to 42 years, and affect even those not afflicted because of their adverse effect on agricultural productivity. Schistosomiasis, or snail fever, is endemic to the Palo area. About 80 percent of the children over 10 years of age have this crippling disease. It was learned that the lack of shoes or other footwear was a contributing factor to the high incidence of the disabling, often fatal disease, and also to the prevalence of hookworm.

Palo Alto's most dramatic venture in cooperating in the fight against the parasitic disease, and one which highlights Palo Alto's desire to involve large numbers of the local community in the sister city program was the collection and shipment or more than 4 tons of shoes for the young people of Palo. These shoes were distributed in Palo by trained personnel who instructed the recipients in the prophylactic properties of the shoes—in many cases, the first to be worn by the children. Through the generosity and cooperation of Mayor Villegas, of Manila, also a participant in the sister city program, the shoes were freed from customs on the docks in Manila.

Neighbors Abroad has encouraged Palo Altans to visit Palo, and several have already done so. Three residents of Palo have visited Palo Alto and have met with the sister city committee. Continued efforts are being made to promote reciprocal visits, but the great geographic distance between the communities is a definite deterrent.

Many other commendable accomplishments have already been realized. A detailed listing is, however, impossible here, but it should be pointed out that the people of the two towns have developed and strengthened a great and lasting bond between themselves. The citizens, and particularly the students, are exchanging letters; Palo Altans assisted in the establishment of the first library for Palo; Palo Alto has participated annually in the Palo fiesta, and purchased the perpetual crown for the queen; direct communication between community leaders has been achieved through the amateur radio network; each city has given and each has received. The relationship between the two is excellent and mutually rewarding.

During the planning stages of Palo Alto's sister city program, it had seemed highly probable that a city in the Western Hemisphere would be the most logical affiliate for the community. Indeed, in the fall of 1961, the Palo Alto City Council had developed a series of criteria and characteristics for their sister city. Ideally, she was to be in Latin America—to compare with Palo Alto's Spanish and Mexican background and traditions. Preferably, she was to be a university city—again like Palo Alto—and should be relatively comparable in population.

A city which met all of these qualifications was Oaxaca, Mexico. The U.S. Department of State assisted in the preliminary explorations. Neighbors Abroad and the Palo Alto City Council sustained interest in developing an affiliation with Oaxaca, and such was accomplished during the early part of 1964. Relations between Oaxaca, and Palo Alto have proceeded rapidly and excellently. Only 2,000 miles separate the two communities, thus facilitating personal visits. Many Palo Alto residents have already visited the unique city of Oaxaca, rich in culture and tradition.

In May 1964, Oaxaca's distinguished young major, Dr. Horacio Tenorio Sandoval, and his charming and beautiful wife visited Palo Alto to participate in the community's colorful May Festival. Dr. Tenorio served as cogrand marshal of the festival. Later that same month, Palo Alto's major, Dean R. Cresap, city council member, Mrs, Frances Dias, and city manager, Jerome Keithley, visited Oaxaca.

This was only the beginning of what is already an outstanding sister city affiliation. Last December, for example, 10 young people from Oaxaca arrive to spend 1 month in Palo Alto's homes and schools. The competition to host the children was great, but 10 Palo Alto families are now richer for this unique experience.

Neighbors Abroad is now developing final plans to send Palo Alto youngsters to Oaxaca this coming summer. Again, the competition for this unique aspect of the sister city program was intense and generated even greater interest in Neighbors Abroad and the people-to-people program. The 10 high school students have now been selected and are now preparing for their trip to Oaxaca where they will live with individual Mexican families, attend public school and serve as able ambassadors of Neighbors Abroad and their country, thus completing a two-way exchange—the first of an annual program.

The people of Palo Alto, and particularly those who have worked to create and support the sister city program, are to be complimented for their outstanding work in promoting improved understanding and more cordial relations between the people of the world.

Second District of Illinois Participates in Historic March in Alabama

SPEECH

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have had the honor and experienced the pride of mentioning on several occasions the participation in freedom's fight in Alabama of the good men and women of the Second Congressional District of Illinois.

I have mentioned the experience of Ralph Fertig, one of the pioneers from our district who some 2 years or so ago, was thrown into a jail in Alabama and frightfully beaten by his jailers, all in the cause of freedom.

It has been my privilege to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the graphic and moving narrative of her experience in Selma by Emily Taft Douglas, wife of the great senior Senator from Illinois and resident of, and voter in, the Second Congressional District. Dr. Walter Johnson has furnished me with the names of distinguished American historians recruited by him for the finishing lap of the historic march, all of which I have placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent graciously granted to me, I am now including in my remarks the complete text of the article in the April 1, 1965, issue of the Hyde Park Herald, by the Honorable Leon M. Despres, alderman of the fifth ward in the city of Chicago. At a future date I hope to put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the complete list of persons from the Second District who participated in the march in Alabama, a list which is now being prepared by Mrs. Walter Johnson and Alderman Despres.

Alderman Despres' article in the Hyde Park Herald follows:

OBSERVATIONS FROM THE CONFEDERACY

(By Leon M. Despres, fifth ward alderman)

Taking part in last Thursday's voting rights demonstration in Montgomery, Ala., was one of the great experiences of a lifetime. For all who went, it was an opportunity to participate in a historic event and give encouragement to actions which will immensely improve the entire United States. Our community has a vital, direct stake in the success of the Alabama vote drive.

Our planeload of 92, sponsored by Alderman Chew, arrived at Montgomery at 11:30 Thursday morning. The keynote for the day was struck immediately at the airport under an official city sign which read: "Welcome to Montgomery."

The Reverend Aron Gilmartin, a Unitarian pastor from California, addressed us and said: "As soon as the afternoon program is concluded, you are asked to proceed immediately to the area where the special buses will pick you up for the airport. It is absolutely essential that all demonstrators leave Montgomery immediately after the program, because we expect the troopers and the National Guard to be withdrawn this evening."

The remarks from Mr. Gilmartin showed at once how different this demonstration was from the 1963 march on Washington. The march on Washington was a dramatic, national, social, and religious affirmation of equality in the midst of hospitable national shrines in the Capital of our Nation.

The march on Montgomery was a tense drive for equality at an unhospitable shrine in the capital of the Confederacy.

The bus took us quickly on U.S. 80 to the campsite at the edge of the city, and we were able to join the end of the column of marchers a short distance away. The 4-mile march itself was sensational. The first part lay in an all-Negro section of Montgomery, and the second part in an all-white section and the central business district.

During the first part, crowds lined the streets, waved at us, spoke to us, smiled, wept, nodded, and expressed encouragement and exultation. They made a wonderful show of southern hospitality. One example that stands out was a man at one corner, all smiles, who graciously held out cold, opened bottles of Pepsi-Cola for thirsty marchers. Apparently he had been doing this during the entire 2½ hours of the march. People heard the loudspeakers' appeals to join the march and fell in. A few people were reserved, but not many.

The invisible line which divides Negro housing from white housing, as it does in Chicago, came next. There we saw a segregated white firehouse just like most fire houses in Chicago. There we saw stony-faced, silent white people crowding the porches as we marched by. I saw only one porch return our waves. Our lines fell silent too. The joy of the earlier part of the march transformed into quite different feelings. Earlier, when we passed a segregated Negro school, the pupils couldn't stop smiling and waving, no matter how often we photographed them. Later, students at the windows of a segregated private white school couldn't stop looking stern, and turned their backs when we photographed them.

More hostile people lined the streets in the business section. Their passions led them to line the streets even though Governor Wallace had asked all white people to stay away. Here we met the jeers which reporters have written about. Here the parade marshals began to look anxious, asked us to close ranks, urged us not to talk to the crowd, told us not to step out of line for photographs, and kept perfect order. The watchers' hostility had to be seen and heard to be believed. Southern hospitality stopped when the inhabitants changed color.

The military protection was overwhelming. Naturally there were soldiers along the line of march, but you could see how impressive the protection was when you looked a block away and saw that there were sentries at all streets, reserve companies of foot and motorized equipment, and soldiers on roof tops. In all directions, you saw soldiers with communications equipment held to their ears for continuous attention. There were FBI men in the unmistakable Brooks Bros. suits, and probably a great many other Federal representatives sprinkled throughout the crowd.

At the capitol, the area of the demonstration was clearly marked out by sawhorses, and we were the prisoners of our protectors, with ample latitude for the demonstration but no right to move outside the area. Stretched across the capitol steps, two rows of uniformed Alabama State officers barred our way. Behind them on the steps and at the windows of the capitol, white Alabama State personnel watched the demonstration with concern.

On top of the capitol flew the flag of Alabama, and under it, the flag of the Confederacy. There was no flag of the United States.

Everywhere among the demonstrators were priests, ministers, rabbis, and nuns. Their very number was awe-inspiring. Even they, perhaps especially they, were unwelcome to white Alabamians. At the airport, a young white man with a baby in his arms looked up at some priests and asked: "Are you Catholic fathers?" "Yes," answered one. "I am Catholic, too," said the young man, "and now that you have been here, I hope you will stay home. We don't need you here." That was all. However, other Alabamians need them desperately; and perhaps the young white man does too.

The program itself was deeply moving, especially Dr. King's talk. I felt that he summarized the situation well when he said: "Segregation is on its deathbed in Alabama, and the only question is how costly Governor Wallace and the segregationists are going to make the funeral."

I talked with as many Negro Alabamians as I could. I found them tremendously encouraged, courageous, and proud over what is taking place. Last Thursday, however, it was not possible for me to find white Alabamians to talk with.

I wish that every fifth ward resident could have been in Montgomery last Thursday.

One eight-year-old white boy I read about expressed the sentiments held by our community. When his father asked him if he understood what the President was talking about on TV, he said he thought the President meant, "the colored people should be free."

The march to Montgomery helped hasten that day of freedom. I think Alabama will never again be quite the same. I hope that soon, over the dome of that State capitol of Montgomery, where Jefferson Davis changed flags in 1861, there will once again fly not the Confederate flag of racial supremacy but the American flag of freedom and equality.

Mr. Speaker, here is a partial list of the men and women who marched in Montgomery with Alderman Despres and his daughter Linda:

Charles Henderson, 1451 East 55th Street.

Mrs. Elizabeth Elwin and her daughters, Susan and Katherine Elwin, Bernadette Vial, Victoria Pyle, 5603 South Dorchester.

Norman Adamson, 7004 South Merrill.

Henry Seele, 5459 South Blackstone Avenue.

Dr. Ruth Lerner, 1525 East 53d Street.

Mrs. Helen Ketterer, 5481 Ridgewood Court.

Dr. William Shoemaker and his son Robert, 4908 South Kimbark Avenue.

Mrs. Deborah Meier, 1343 East 50th Street.

Janet Linford, 5435 South Kenwood Avenue.

Dr. Edgar H. S. Chandler, 1366 East 58th Street.

Mr. Devereaux L. Bowley, Jr., 5558 South Kimbark Avenue.

Mrs. Betty Nance, 5122 South Woodlawn Avenue.

Mr. Elliott Knauer, 4919 South Dorchester Avenue.

Curtis Hayes, 6011 South Woodlawn Avenue.

Rev. Earl Neil, 6451 South Woodlawn Avenue.

Rev. Bellarmine Wilson, 6426 South Dante.

Prof. Jacob W. Getzels, 5704 South Dorchester Avenue.

Fabian Necheles.

Mr. and Mrs. Peter Bright and two children, 1336 Hyde Park Boulevard.

Eugene and Jeanette Dibble, 1227 East Madison Park.

Mr. John C. Godbie, 5432 South Woodlawn Avenue.

Dr. Quentin Young, 1512 East 55th Street.

Fredericka McDew, 1170 East 54th Street.

Sherwin Kaplan, 1601 East 55th Street.

Manpower Act of 1965

SPEECH

OF

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4257) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. BELL. Madam Chairman, as one of those who supported the Manpower Development and Retraining Act from the very beginning, I wish to say that I support this bill now and the improvements contained herein as they relate to that program.

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker: John W. McCormack

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Adams, Brock, *Wash*
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y.*
Albert, Carl, *Okla* 4614 Reno Rd.
Anderson, John B., *Ill*
Anderson, William R., *Tenn.* 3006 P St.
Andrews, George W., *Ala* 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Andrews, Glenn, *Ala*
Andrews, Mark, *N. Dak.*
Annunzio, Frank, *Ill*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill* 4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio*
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C.*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo.* The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Ayres, William H., *Ohio*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif.*
Bandstra, Bert, *Iowa*
Baring, Walter S., *Nev.*
Barrett, William A., *Pa.*
Bates, William H., *Mass.*
Battin, James F., *Mont.*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex.*
Belcher, Page, *Okla.*
Bell, Alphonzo, *Calif.*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla.* 1314 Rusticway Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak.* 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio*
Bingham, Jonathan B., *N.Y.*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn.*
Boggs, Hale, *La.*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass.*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo.* 307 Warrenton Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N.C.* Calvert-Woodley
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio* 4301 Mass. Ave.
Brademas, John, *Ind.*
Bray, William G., *Ind.*
Brock, W. E. (Bill), *Tenn.*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex.*
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio*
Brown, George E., Jr., *Calif.*
Broyhill, James T., *N.C.*
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va.*
Buchanan, John, *Ala.*
Burke, James A., *Mass.*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex.* 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burton, Laurence J., *Utah*
Burton, Phillip, *Calif.*
Byrne, James A., *Pa.*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis.* 1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cabell, Earle, *Tex.*
Cahill, William T., *N.J.*
Callan, Clair, *Nebr.*
Callaway, Howard H., *Ga.*
Cameron, Ronald Brooks, *Calif.*
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y.*
Carter, Tim Lee, *Ky.*
Casey, Bob, *Tex.*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich.*
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y.* The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky.*
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio*
Clark, Frank M., *Pa.* 220 C St. SE.
Clausen, Don H., *Calif.*
Clawson, Del, *Calif.*
Cleveland, James C., *N.H.*
Clevenger, Raymond F., *Mich.*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif.* 1028 New House Office Building
Collier, Harold R., *Ill.*
Colmer, William M., *Miss.*
Conable, Barber B., Jr., *N.Y.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass.* 5619 Lamar Rd., Washington 16, D.C.
Conyers, John, Jr., *Mich.*
Cooley, Harold D., *N.C.* 2601 Woodley Pl.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa.*
Corman, James C., *Calif.*
Craley, N. Neiman, Jr., *Pa.*
Cramer, William C., *Fla.* 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Culver, John C., *Iowa*
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr.* 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington, Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa.*
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo.*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn.*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa.*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J.*
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis.*
Davis, John W., *Ga.*
Dawson, William L., *Ill.*
de la Garza, Eligio, *Tex.*
Delaney, James J., *N.Y.*
Dent, John H., *Pa.*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind.*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill.*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio*
Dickinson, William L., *Ala.*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich.*
Dingell, John D., *Mich.*
Dole, Robert, *Kans.* 6136 Beachway Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass.*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S.C.* 2030 Laburnum St., McLean, Va.
Dow, John G., *N.Y.*
Dowdy, John, *Tex.*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va.*
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y.* 1719 New House Office Building
Duncan, John J., *Tenn.*
Duncan, Robert B., *Oreg.* 914 Lakeview Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J.*
Dyal, Ken W., *Calif.*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla.*
Edwards, Don, *Calif.*
Edwards, Jack, *Ala.*
Ellsworth, Robert F., *Kans.*
Erlenborn, John N., *Ill.*
Evans, Frank E., *Colo.*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn.*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn.* 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md.*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y.*
Farnsley, Charles P., *Ky.*
Farnum, Billie S., *Mich.*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla.*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio*
Findley, Paul, *Ill.*
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y.*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex.* Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa.* The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga.*
Fogarty, John E., *R.I.* 1235 New House Office Building
Foley, Thomas S., *Wash.*
Ford, Gerald R., *Mich.* 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Ford, William D., *Mich.*
Fountain, L. H., *N.C.* The Westchester
Fraser, Donald M., *Minn.*
Frelinghuysen, Peter H. B., *N.J.* 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md.*
Fulton, James G., *Pa.*
Fulton, Richard, *Tenn.*
Fuqua, Don, *Fla.*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md.*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark.*
Getty., Tom S., *S.C.*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn.*
Gibbons, Sam, *Fla.*
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y.*
Gilligan, John J., *Ohio*
Gonzalez, Henry B., *Tex.* 200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y.* 3842 Macomb St.
Grabowski, Bernard F., *Conn.*
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill.*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg.*
Green, William J., *Pa.*
Greigg, Stanley L., *Iowa*
Grider, George W., *Tenn.*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich.*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa*
Grover, James R., Jr., *N.Y.*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif.*
Gurney, Edward J., *Fla.*
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga.*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif.*
Haley, James A., *Fla.*
Hall, Durward G., *Mo.*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind.* 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y.*
Hamilton, Lee H., *Ind.*
Hanley, James M., *N.Y.*
Hanna, Richard T., *Calif.*
Hansen, George, *Idaho*
Hansen, John R., *Iowa* 800 4th St. SW., Apt. S-701
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va.*
Harris, Oren, *Ark.* 1627 Myrtle St.
Harsha, William H., *Ohio*
Harvey, James, *Mich.*
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind.*
Hathaway, William D., *Maine.*
Hawkins, Augustus F., *Calif.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio* 1323 Barger Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Hébert, F. Edward, *La.* 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va.*
Helstoski, Henry, *N.J.*
Henderson, David N., *N.C.*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla.*
Hicks, Floyd V., *Wash.*
Holifield, Chet, *Calif.*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa.*
Horton, Frank J., *N.Y.*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif.*
Howard, James J., *N.J.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo.*
Hungate, William L., *Mo.*
Huot, J. Oliva, *N.H.*
Hutchinson, Edward, *Mich.*
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn.*
Jacobs, Andrew, Jr., *Ind.*
Jarman, John, *Okla.*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va.*
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J.*
Johnson, Albert W., *Pa.*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif.*
Johnson, Jed, Jr., *Okla.*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C.*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo.* 1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala.*
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo.*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn.*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kee, James, *W. Va.* 5441 16th Ave., Hyattsville, Md.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass.* 5906 Harwick Rd.,
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y.*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N.Y.* The Mayflower
King, Carleton J., *N.Y.*
King, Cecil R., *Calif.*
King, David S., *Utah*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill.*
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C.*
Krebs, Paul J., *N.J.*
Kunkel, John C., *Pa.*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*
Langen, Odin, *Minn.*
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio*
Leggett, Robert L., *Calif.*
Lennon, Alton, *N.C.*
Lindsay, John V., *N.Y.*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*

Appendix

Hebrew Academy of Washington Celebrates 21st Anniversary—Leon Cherner Honored—Israel Ambassador Harman Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, education must prepare our youth for a rapidly changing, complex, and diverse society. Institutions of learning must respect the individual in order to encourage the development of humane and enlightened men and women, and must effect the character and quality of living. To do this, education must itself represent excellence in all its teachings.

Last night the excellence that can be reached by educational institutions was indeed evident as the Hebrew Academy of Washington celebrated its 21st anniversary at the Shoreham Hotel. In celebrating its year of maturity, the Hebrew Academy honored Leon Cherner, a citizen appreciated locally, and nationally and internationally, for his leadership in community affairs and his religious and charitable participation.

Approximately 900 were in attendance at the dinner meeting which opened with an invocation by Rabbi Nathan Abramowitz of the Tifereth Israel Congregation. Jerry Wolman served as chairman of this year's testimonial. The well-known owner of the Philadelphia professional football team, and prominent builder, characterized Mr. Cherner "as a founder and devoted member of the Academy's society of patrons. His outstanding generosity and liberal support" are worthy of emulation. Participants in the program included Norman C. Kal, toastmaster; Randy Howard Cherner; and Dr. Solomon N. Skaist, principal of the Hebrew Academy, who gave the benediction.

In extending greetings Charles R. Beacham, vice president of the Ford Motor Company, spoke of the coming-of-age of the Academy and expressed tribute to Leon Cherner, "a good friend who is an outstanding citizen of his community, and a highly respected representative of the automobile industry."

Beacham went on to say:

I have known Mr. Leon Cherner for many years, and worked closely with him, and it is not at all surprising to me that he should be your guest of honor tonight.

Some men give a great deal of themselves to their chosen business or profession, and are very successful; but find they have little time or energy left over for service to their community.

Other public-spirited individuals give generously of their time and energy for many worthy causes—for awhile, that is, until their business begins to suffer for want of attention.

But now and then comes along one of those truly gifted individuals who demonstrates that it is possible—if one has the courage, the understanding, the desire and the enterprise—to do all things well.

Leon Cherner is such a man. He long has been a pace setter in the automobile business, and the honor you are paying him here tonight is ample testimony of the position he has earned as a respected member and benefactor of his community.

Louis C. Grossberg, chairman of the Society of Patrons, addressed the gathering and told of the progress of the school and the honors achieved by the students of the Hebrew Academy. He gave a warm and heartfelt tribute to the honoree, Leon Cherner.

The presentation of a coveted award to Mr. Cherner was made by the Honorable Avraham Harman, Ambassador of Israel. Excerpts of his eloquent remarks will follow later.

Responding to the presentation, the recipient replied:

"I would be less than honest if I didn't admit it's nice hearing good things about myself. (Now maybe my wife, my sisters, and my partner Henry Gertler, will appreciate what a bargain they have in me.)"

Mr. President, it was my privilege, as a friend of Leon Cherner, Norman C. Kal and others who were participants and who are constructive citizens, to be present on this significant occasion. I am a member of the Senate Subcommittee on Education and it is officially gratifying to join those citizens who help to strengthen the many forceful facets of our educational system.

I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the remarks of Louis C. Grossberg and Ambassador Avraham Harman and the response by Leon Cherner at the 21st anniversary banquet of the Hebrew Academy of Washington, be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM THE MESSAGE OF LOUIS C. GROSSBERG, CHAIRMAN, SOCIETY OF PATRONS

Joseph Andelman, the president of the academy, who is prevented for reasons beyond his control from being here tonight, asked me to bring greetings to you, ladies and gentlemen.

Let's look at the record. In 1943 a handful of dedicated men—mostly rabbis, founded the academy with an enrollment of 17 children. They had no money, no building, no general acceptance, very little prospects for the future. They did have, what Jews throughout the generations have always had—an abiding faith that "Got vet farsorgen" translated "The Lord will provide."

Our enrollment today consists on einhoro of over 450 boys and girls. They come from every background of religious life—orthodox, conservative, and reform. The faculty, in all departments of the school, are most highly qualified and dedicated educators. In the California achievement tests our children have scored grades which place them 2 years ahead of normal. Our graduates are achieving highest honors throughout this country's leading high schools and colleges. This, because of the excellent primary education they receive at the academy's secular studies. The Hebrew department provides our youngsters with the kind of basic knowledge of Hebrew which will stand them in good stead if they wish to pursue their studies further, or, in any event, gives them an insight into the rich and glorious heritage which is their birthright.

We now have a magnificent school building which every Washington Jew can—and does—point to, with pride. Many of our sincere, fine Jewish friends in days gone by, unaware of the great good their children could derive from attendance at the academy, refused to send their children there. Today all this has changed. We have youngsters whose parents are in the professions, in business, in the diplomatic corps—in fact one of our last year's graduates is the daughter of Ambassador and Mrs. Avraham Harman who are with us tonight.

In 1943 the academy had no money. We still need money. However, we do have ways and means now of getting the funds we need. We get it from tuition, the telefund campaign, the society of patrons each member of which contributes $550. or more annually to our scholarship fund: the Foundation for the Hebrew Academy of Washington, Inc., this annual donor dinner, and, last, but not least, from the activities of the ladies of the academy auxiliary. It is thus apparent that the Hebrew Academy is a flourishing institution.

On the occasion of celebrating the 21st annual dinner of the Hebrew Academy at which you, Leon Cherner are the honoree, I have the unusual distinction of wearing 3 hats and I am quite happy to tip each one of them to you, Leon.

I am chairman of the Society of Patrons of the Hebrew Academy. I tip this hat to you, Leon for the enthusiastic help you have given us since the society was formed some 7 years ago. Not only as a charter member of the society of patrons but in many other ways, notably through your help in the telefund campaign, has your ardent support been felt.

Leon, I tip my hat to you for the dedication you have displayed in our efforts toward implemeting the Israel bond program. As chairman of Fiduciary Investments you have been instrumental, in your quiet, efficient way—in inducing many of our local banks and trust funds adminstrators to purchase bonds in considerable amounts. You, personally Leon, each year buy Israel bonds in large amounts and handsomely contribute to the United Jewish Appeal.

As president of the Jewish Community Council I have the honor and pleasure to commend you Leon for all the wonderful things you have done for many of the 130 affiliated organizations that comprise the membership of the council. Be it the home for the aged, the Jewish Community Center, your synagogue, which I personally know owes to you and your family a good deal

for its very existence; to the B'nai B'rith or any worthwhile cause here or elsewhere, Jewish or non-Jewish which needs a helping hand, they find in you a ready and gracious response.

There are many meanings to many words; there is a meaning to the word, "truth"—there is a meaning to the word "charity"—there is a meaning to the word "selflessness"—there is a meaning to the word "devotion." The best of these meanings come to the fore when we, who know you mention the name Leon Cherner. The standards you set for your community responsibilities are high indeed. Yet you never shirked any of them, in fact, you surpassed them.

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE AVRAHAM HARMAN, AMBASSADOR OF ISRAEL TO THE UNITED STATES

There are three reasons why I am very grateful for your invitation to be present here when you are celebrating the 21st anniversary of the Hebrew Academy of Washington and are paying such richly deserved tribute to Leon Cherner.

The first is that my three children have had the benefit of attending the Hebrew Academy and the Midrasha which is connected with it. The academy is a fine school, well administered, and with an outstanding group of teachers. I would like to express my appreciation to the academy for having given my children a deep understanding of their Jewish roots, excellent facilities for their general education, and an understanding and appreciation of American life and civilization which I hope will remain with them throughout their lives.

The second reason is that I have the honor to represent here in Washington a country in which the Hebrew civilization came into existence, and where in our day it has been revived. Just a short time ago we received a further understanding of the depth of this ancient root and of its persistence. A group of our archeologists from the Hebrew University have just completed their season of digging at the Fortress of Massada, overlooking the southern end of the Dead Sea, where our ancestors made their last stand against the Roman conqueror over 1900 years ago. The men of the Hebrew University found 17 fragments of scrolls that have been buried in those ancient days, and they could read them with as much fluency as they read their morning newspapers published in Tel Aviv.

I believe that this is an example of the durability and supremacy of the free human spirit enshrined in our faith and civilization which have overcome all the pressure and tyranny and which persist to this day.

I believe, too, that the Hebrew academy itself is a great example of the superiority of the free spirit over tyranny. Your institution was founded in 1943 when it seemed that nazism, which had proclaimed an all-out war against Judea, was set to win. But here you are, 21 years later, proudly celebrating the steady progress and growth of a school dedicated to teaching eternal truth. The tyrant of 21 years ago is gone. We can look forward in the hope that that will be the destiny of all tyranny.

My third reason for being here is that since my arrival in Washington I have had the pleasure of knowing your guest of honor. Our paths have crossed in many places. I have the pleasure of worshipping in the same synagogue and know how greatly he has helped his Congregation Tiferet Israel to consolidate and expand its many spiritual and educational services to its growing membership. I am very grateful indeed, to him for his oustanding leadership in the economic progress and development of my country through Israel bonds. He has interested many people in this effort in which he himself has participated in such an outstanding way. I know that he has played a similar role in all public causes in Washington, and in the Jewish community of this city.

His concern and dedication to the Hebrew academy is just one example of this. He is indeed, a symbol of the men that we speak about in synagogue in our prayers every Sabbath, and on whom we call down divine blessings, "those who concern themselves with the affairs of the community in good faith." It is a great pleasure to be given the opportunity of coming here tonight to convey to him on your behalf a plaque honoring him on this occasion.

EXCERPTS FROM RESPONSE BY LEON CHERNER, THE HONOREE

I stand here as a representative of all of you; you who really deserve the recognition—you who provide the support for this 21st annual banquet of the Hebrew Academy—you, without who, there wouldn't be any good causes.

Some people say I'm a good salesman. It's true that my life is people—that I love people, but I think you must be good salesmen, too. Let's say we're sold on each other—and sold on the importance of the work we do together.

How can I thank you all? Even if I had the words, they would be poor compared to the thanks you all deserve.

As a symbol of our business, I thank John Connors, Charles Beacham, and the others from the Ford Motor Co. who have given their weekend to be with us. As a symbol of our community, I thank our many associates from the banking world who are paying us interest tonight.

And, as your symbol, I personally thank each of you for making me your guest of honor. I am grateful to you all for the previous memory you have given me. God bless you all.

Fair Employment for All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, this last week I had expected to address the closing session of a very interesting Industrial Relations Institute at the Alameda Naval Air Station, which adjoins my congressional district in California.

Unfortunately, our consideration of the education bill precluded my attendance, but the address was made in my absence by my sister, Mrs. Charlotte Danforth.

My remarks were directed at the critical problem of providing and promoting fair and equal consideration in employment, a consideration which is all-too-frequently denied today. I believe that our colleagues and all who are concerned with this important question may find these remarks of interest.

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN JEFFERY COHELAN, BEFORE THE INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS INSTITUTE, ALAMEDA NAVAL AIR STATION, MARCH 27, 1965

I would like to speak to you today not strictly about the problems of industrial relations or personal management, for this has been your program for almost a week. Rather, I would like to talk about a related but much broader problem with which we all need to be concerned—the problem of more effectively utilizing our human resources; of seeing to it that every American is allowed to work to the fullest of his abilities.

In Selma, Ala., and in the Congress of the United States, a vigorous movement is underway to insure that Negroes and all other minority group members are no longer denied the right to vote in any election; that they are no longer prevented from fully exercising this fundamental right which is so clearly guaranteed by our Constitution.

But guaranteeing the right to vote—a right which has been most frequently and flagrantly abused in the South—is only one important step that must be taken. We must also move, and move forcefully, to insure fair and equal consideration in employment—whether it be government or private—and this is not only a southern problem, it is a national problem.

When we talk of the free enterprise system, we think in terms of a free market in which goods, talent, and ideas move freely without artificial restrictions.

This system has served us well and during the last 5 years, with the help of new depreciation schedules and a significant tax cut, we have achieved a record of prosperity unparalleled in our history. Yet this system has shown some serious imperfections which contradict its goals and have caused this Nation to fall short of its potential.

We know, for example, that we enjoy a standard of living unmatched anywhere in the world. But we also know that 35 million Americans fall below the line of poverty with family incomes of less than $3,000 a year.

We know that the American factory worker earns more than $100 a week. But we also know that millions of Americans are growing up in families where the father, if there is one at all, has never been able to work, or who has worked at common labor all his life because he has never had the chance to do anything else.

We know that our colleges are graduating more students than ever before. But we also know that each year more than 100,000 young people with leadership potential do not go on because they lack the economic means.

We know that nearly 1 million teenagers are looking for work, and when the additional ingredient of skin color is added, the figure becomes a national disgrace.

Last year fully 23 percent of all nonwhite teenage boys and 31 percent of all nonwhite teenage girls were unemployed and seeking work.

In the adult labor force, the unemployment rate for nonwhites was twice as great as for whites, and the preparation of persons regularly on part time because of the inability to find full-time work was five times as high.

The great tragedy of these shameful inconsistencies and inequities is that they are caused largely by artificial barriers—by inadequate education, by a cycle of poverty which viciously perpetuates itself, by poor health, and most important, by discrimination based on race, religion, and national heritage.

The loss that has resulted from this discrimination in employment has not only been deep in human suffering, it has been deep in lost potential as well. As a matter of fact, the Department of Commerce calculated recently that in failing to utilize Negroes and other minority group members at their present levels of training and education, the Nation was wasting a substantial portion of their productivity and contribution to the national economy. The loss figure set for 1963 was a staggering $11.1 billion.

The report also stated that if Negroes and other nonwhites were permitted to achieve the same educational levels as their white neighbors, and if discrimination did not hamper their full participation in the econ-

omy, that the gross national product in 1964 could have been expanded by nearly $22 billion.

And let us not think that this underemployment and unemployment—this waste of human resources and potential—will be relieved by sheer economic expansion alone.

Last year our economy grew by $38 billion. But in his Economic Report to Congress in January of this year, President Johnson pointed out that another similar gain would do little more than enable us to hold our own.

These huge losses because of what might be called economic obtuseness or social blindness are not unique to history. For hundreds of years, the economic and social systems of countries have been hampered by class distinctions. At one time, unless you were born into the aristocracy, you had little hope of attaining a position of authority or responsibility. Yet this form of foolish snobbery and wastefulness passed and today the sons and grandsons of farmers, laborers, and poor immigrants are the managers of great enterprises.

Hopefully, we are at long last beginning a period that will see the just end to discrimination based on the irrelevancy of race.

We have the moral impetus, spurred on by the fight to secure full voting rights.

We have the economic motivation made clear in lost purchasing power and human potential.

We have the executive mandate, which all of you are familiar with, banning discrimination in Federal employment and by those doing business with the Federal Government.

And we have the congressional commands of the landmark Civil Rights Act of 1964 making unlawful discrimination based on race, or religion, or national origin by any employer, by any union, or by any employment agency.

All this is essential, but more still is required.

This country's great productive capability is based essentially on four factors: on capital investment, intelligent management, the advanced state of our technology, and the skills of our labor force.

These factors must work together, they must grow almost abreast, but the contribution of the labor force has been lagging through insufficient preparation and use of our manpower. There has been a steady shift toward demand for higher skill levels, but our educational and training systems and our social customs have not provided them.

And it is significant to note, I think, that while every estimate of future manpower needs indicates that professional and technical jobs requiring high degrees of education and skills are increasing most rapidly, that nearly two-thirds of all nonwhites are working in unskilled jobs. It is really any wonder then that our newspaper want ads are filled with thousands of open jobs while our unemployment remains consistently around 5 percent? And that is 5 percent of a labor force that has grown by 4¾ million jobs in the last 4 years.

There is no possible way that discrimination can be fully ended or the efficient matching of workers and job opportunities completely accomplished by the Federal Government alone.

We can follow the kind of fiscal and monetary policies that will help sustain growth, and we have done this through the tax cut, the revised depreciation schedules, and our protection of the dollar's stability .

We can develop programs aimed at freeing business and government from the social customs that have restricted the choice of workers, and we have done this through the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Executive orders on employment, and the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity.

We can make Federal resources available to help upgrade the labor force and we have done so through the Manpower Development and Training Act, the poverty program, and the Vocational Education Act.

All this and more we can begin, develop, and make available. But in a free nation such as ours, these efforts will all be for naught unless the programs are seized upon and used by the people.

In the long run it will be the leaders of our communiites, it will be you who are participating in this institute and who are leaders in your own fields, who will create the climate, who will make the decisions, and who will take the steps necessary to rid our land of the dread disease of discrimination and move our country forward to fulfill its rich potential.

But let me offer a few suggestions, which hopefully may encourage and stimulate further discussion, for the responsibility mut be taken and the problem must be met. The future of our free and democratic society demands it.

First, we can work in the business community to expand and further programs of equal opportunity in hiring and retention; to encourage them in the areas where they already exist and to develop them where they do not. Here in the bay area, leadership has been taken by some companies, and good records have been established by others, but certainly much more can be done.

Second, we can make an all-out effort, in government as well as in business, to let every manager, every foreman, every personnel man, and every worker know that we mean business when we say that skin color, and national origin, and religion are not to be part of our selection and our promotion system.

Third, we can be sure that we live up to the intent as well as the letter of Executive Orders No. 10925 and No. 11114 which ban discrimination because of race, creed, color or national origin in employment by the Federal Government, by those who do business with the Government, and on all federally assisted contract work. Let us be sure that our own actions and our own attitudes are as highly motivated as the law.

Fourth, we can give consideration to compensatory efforts and compensatory opportunities. Equality in hiring should mean that every worker is considered on an equal basis, but such often cannot be the case today. For many, many years some Americans, and the Negro in particular, have been systematically denied and deprived the conditions—the education, the training, and the experience—that would make this equality possible.

Is it not equally possible then that we could compensate in some fair manner for these past denials; that extra consideration could be given in placement, in on-the-job training, and in other areas, without infringing on the equally legitimate rights of other workers? Proper application may not be easy but certainly the problem warrants our efforts.

Fifth, and finally, we can let everyone around us know—relatives, friends, employees, and associates—that by denying equal opportunities to our fellow citizens because of the color of their skin, or the country of their birth, of the place where they may worship, that we make hypocrisy of our democracy. We not only betray ourselves, but we compromise our history and we weaken our resolve before the world.

We Americans of this decade are offered a rare opportunity. For a hundred years and more, the promise of our law has been equality but our precepts have not been equaled by our deeds.

Now, however, we can make the dreams and the promises a reality. We can wipe out the last roadblocks to full equality in voting and we can break down the last stubborn barriers to full participation in employment.

The task is already begun. With your help, and your neighbors, and your neighbors' neighbors, we can succeed and America can truly be the land of the free.

Senator Magnuson, of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROSS BASS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, all of us here in the Senate are familiar with the traits of the chairman of the Commerce Committee which make him one of the most respected, effective, and best liked legislators on Capitol Hill. However, the world outside is not blessed with the opportunity to be closely associated with this affable gentleman. An excellent article, published in the April 2 issue of the Wall Street Journal, points up many of the qualities of Chairman MAGNUSON which endear him to his colleagues. In order that other people can better understand this gentleman from Washington, I ask unanimous consent that the article be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SENATE "MAGGIE"—IN A CASUAL WAY, WASHINGTON'S MAGNUSON GETS MUCH DONE

(By Dan Cordtz)

WASHINGTON.—If a Senate poll were taken to pick that clubby group's half dozen most popular, most influential, and most anonymous Members, chances are that on all three lists would appear one name:

"MAGGIE."

That's the way it would be put down on most ballots, too. For to his affectionate colleagues, the full name of WARREN G. MAGNUSON is somehow too stiff to go with his casual, unbuttoned informality. Even after 20 years as Democratic Senator from the State of Washington, he exudes an air of good fellowship that prompts total strangers to call him by his nickname.

Presiding over a public hearing in the bluff, rambling fashion, chewing a big cigar and with his dark-rimmed spectacles slipping down his ruddy nose, he can appear a faintly comic figure. Grammatical slips, mispronunciations, and malapropisms are not unknown to him, and he persistently confuses such terms as "balance of trade" and "balance of payments."

If this manner occasionally traps an outsider into taking Senator MAGNUSON for less than he is, it doesn't deceive his peers. His name may mean little to the public outside his home State, but within the club it carries unmistakable weight. The point is being proved once more in the case of the proposed law to require health warnings on cigarette packages. The introduction of a Magnuson bill was the signal for 2 weeks of full-dress hearings which wind up today. If he cares to declare himself, the Senator from Washington will undoubtedly have a great deal to say about whether the final law applies to cigarette advertising as well as package labels.

Senator MAGNUSON'S official credentials alone guarantee attention to his views. He is chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, whose legislative jurisdiction affects an estimated 90 percent

of the Nation's industry and commerce; he is chairman of the Independent Offices Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, which holds the purse strings of most Federal regulatory agencies; and he is chairman of the Democratic senatorial campaign committee, which doles out contributions to colleagues at election time.

Senator MAGNUSON also enjoys the special status that goes with long service (he ranks eighth in seniority), a place on the Democratic policy committee and membership in the Senate's shadowy inner circle. He is one of the few active remnants of the fading "establishment" which helped Lyndon B. Johnson run the Senate for nearly 8 years. The President and Senator MAGNUSON, in fact, share a close personal friendship that goes back almost to the day in 1937 when both were sworn into the House of Representatives.

PRESIDENT WAS BEST MAN

"We came here together, went to war together, and came back together," the Senator declares proudly. He modestly omits the fact that the President served as best man last year when Senator MAGNUSON married Mrs. Jermaine Peralta, a Seattle widow.

More important than official rank and highly placed friends, though, is the all but universal fondness felt for Senator MAGNUSON by men of the most diverse political persuasion. Conservative Senator CARL HAYDEN, Democrat of Arizona, who has spent 38 years in the Chamber, labels him "a Senator's Senator." (One popular definition: "A man who, if he can't help you win, helps you look good losing.") Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD, of Montana, declares, "MAGGIE doesn't have an enemy on either side of the aisle." Adds liberal Democrat PHIL HART, of Michigan: "He is just one of the really nice guys in this place."

A psychiatrist might contend the 60-year-old Senator's desire for friendship reflects a childhood insecurity. Orphaned at the age of 3 weeks, he was adopted by a Swedish family in Minnesota. But at the age of 17, he worked his way west—riding freight trains and doing farm labor—until he reached Seattle. Seven years later, he had worked his way through the University of Washington and its law school and in 1933 won his first election, to the State legislature. Since then he has been in 23 more and won them all, although he received the scare of his life in 1962 when an unknown minister came within 45,000 votes of turning him out of his Senate seat.

Like many of those in the Senate, Senator MAGNUSON seems to find most of his pleasure in the company of his fellow club members. He plays poker with a congressional group almost every Thursday night, attends football and baseball games with Senator RICHARD RUSSELL, of Georgia. A good companion, he is fond of telling funny stories about his fellow Scandinavians. Before his marriage, he was one of the capital's gayer bachelors; now he spends most evenings reading and works at painting on the weekends. He is an unabashed sentimentalist, a quality that endears him to his frequently thickskinned Senate mates.

But popularity on Capitol Hill is more than a matter of being a pleasant, amusing "nice guy." To get along, goes the proverb, go along. And Senator MAGNUSON tries hard to help his colleagues wherever possible. Some outside critics suggest he is a bit too accommodating and even something of a "wheeler-dealer." But the most sternly moralistic among his fellow Senators deny there is anything sinister about his horse-trading.

"MAGGIE" wouldn't compromise with principle," one realistic Senate veterans says, "but he's not one of those fellows who looks for a moral issue in every little political proposal. He's not dogmatic or doctrinaire. He can give a little on most things. Some of these birds around here see everything in such categorical terms, they never have any room to maneuver."

Placing Senator MAGNUSON within the ideological spectrum is not easy. Both the Americans for Constitutional Action and the Americans for Democratic Action rate him, on his voting record, as a solid liberal. He wears that badge proudly, but adds that he is a conservative in fiscal matters. "I helped cut $6 billion off the Federal budget in the last 10 years," he declares. Some of his friends describe him as an instinctive conservative whose natural bent is tempered by political realism and a soft heart.

Even when he is sheepherding an administration proposal or one of his own through his committee, moreover, Senator MAGNUSON is always seeking the sort of consensus so dear to his friend in the White House. And if he finds it impossible to get, he's quite content to let the matter rest until a better day. "We seldom pass a bill in the Commerce Committee that isn't pretty well agreed on," he remarks.

NO ARM TWISTER

Nor is such agreement the grudging result of any arm twisting on his part. The chairman of a Senate committee enjoys broad power, and more than one has been known to use it tyranically at times. But not the senior Senator from Washington. His permissiveness makes the public hearings of the Commerce Committee the most relaxed in town. It encourages many members to indulge their penchant for comedy, and occasionally reduces the time schedule to a shamble. Once the doors are closed on executive sessions, committee members say, their chairman is brisker, but never domineering.

So adroitly has Senator MAGNUSON steered clear of controversy that he has really only been embroiled in a couple of bitter, knockdown battles. One was the dispute over construction of a multipurpose dam in Idaho's Hells Canyon in 1956 and the other was the 1959 wrangle over Senate confirmation of Adm. Lewis Strauss as Secretary of Commerce (Senator MAGNUSON suffered one of his infrequent defeats when the big dam was rejected in favor of two low-level dams, but he was on the winning side as Admiral Strauss was retired to private life).

When he is forced into the line of fire, Senator MAGNUSON usually emerges magically unscathed. He pushed the public accommodations section of the civil rights bill and the communications satellite bill through his committee without alienating either the southerners violently opposed to the first or the liberals adamantly against the second. Second-ranking committee Democrat JOHN O. PASTORE, of Rhode Island, on the other hand, was raked from both sides and lost the election for assistant majority leader partly as a result.

But his fellow Senators don't just like Senator MAGNUSON; they trust him. "Everybody knows MAGGIE's not out to do anybody in," explains a colleague of years' standing. "He has no further political ambitions, so he's not trying to take anything away from somebody else. All he wants is to be liked." This attitude, plus his acceptability to L.B.J. and the Senate's elders, was responsible for Senator MAGNUSON's selection (over then Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY) as head of the Senatorial Campaign Committee.

As they trust his good faith, moreover, Senator MAGNUSON's colleagues also trust his instincts and judgment. "I doubt," asserts a strong liberal, that MAGGIE ever read the civil rights bill clear through. He doesn't have a mind that focuses on detail and niceties. But he came down hard on the right side." And if he is no deep thinker, he is also far from ill informed where his own legislative specialties are concerned.

RELIANCE ON STAFFS

He relies heavily on personal and committee staffs whose abilities are acknowledged by Democratic and Republican Members alike. (So many persons work for Senator MAGNUSON directly or indirectly that one long corridor of the Senate Office Building is known as "MAGGIE's alley.") And unlike many in Congress, he does not spread himself thin. He specializes in his committee's concerns, with particular interest in fisheries, merchant marine, and the like which mean bread and butter to his home State.

It's a rare Senator, therefore, who can bring himself to turn Senator MAGNUSON down when he entreats support. "He'll go to a fellow like JOHN STENNIS, for example, and tell him how desperately the Pacific fishing industry needs help," says an admiring associate. "STENNIS won't give a damn one way or another, but MAGGIE will be so earnest and so determined that he'll figure if MAGGIE feels that strongly about it he he must be right. Anyway, the demand is never outrageous and it never involves taking something away from somebody else. If MAGGIE usually gets what he wants, it's because he usually wants what he can get."

Nonetheless, his modest goals have resulted in such legislative plums as a $10 million Federal grant for the 1962 Seattle World's Fair; a chain of dams along the Columbia and Snake Rivers; and an amendment to the food-for-peace program adding fish to the surplus foods which can be sold to foreign countries under special, easy terms. (The only fish currently in surplus in the United States just happens to be pink salmon, most of which is caught and canned in the Pacific Northwest.) And Washington, 23d State in population, collects one of every six Federal public works dollars.

Many of his contributions, his admirers say, go unnoticed because Senator MAGNUSON avoids attracting attention. In fact, his manner of operating may have been best described by President Kennedy when he spoke at a 1961 dinner honoring Senator MAGNUSON's 25th anniversary in Congress.

"Most Members of the Senate," President Kennedy said, "have developed the art of speaking with precision and clarity and force. The secret of Senator MAGNUSON's meteoric career has been the reverse. He may make clear speeches to you on great public occasions, but in Washington he speaks in the Senate so quietly that few can hear him. He looks down at his desk—he comes into the Senate late in the afternoon—he is very hesitant about interrupting other Members of the Senate—when he rises to speak, most Members of the Senate have left—he sends his messages up to the Senate and everyone says, 'What is it,' and Senator MAGNUSON says, 'It's nothing important.' And Grand Coulee Dam is built."

What Are We Doing to Our Youth?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, what are we doing to the youth of America when top Government officials, leading editorial writers, and clergymen support agitators who advocate defying the law and encourage violence to obtain objects?

A casual reading of any newspaper in any big city in America gives you the an-

swer. Crime rates in all our big cities are skyrocketing. Murder by teenagers, violence by minority groups is becoming commonplace.

What other result can we expect from the weak, from depraved minds when they are told day after day that they have been abused and injured and have the right to take any means for redress?

Mr. Speaker, America will be destroyed if we continue to tell our young people and all the minority groups that the way to adjust grievances is not through the courts, not through legislation, but by demonstrations and violence in the streets and by ruining economically those with whom you do not agree.

The shocking story in yesterday's newspapers about a young girl in New York City who fatally stabbed one youth and critically injured at least two others, should give us pause for thought. I include the news story as carried in the Washington Star for April 4:

NEGRO GIRL 15, CHARGED IN WHITE BOY'S SLAYING

NEW YORK—A husky Negro girl, 15, was accused yesterday of the switch-blade knife killing of a white youth and the critical wounding of two other persons in arguments on a sidewalk and a subway train.

The girl, Susan Doctor, was charged with homicide and was held without bail pending a criminal court hearing.

Police described her as weighing 165 pounds and looking older than her age. She wore a black leather jacket and black slacks.

They said she killed Javier Neives, 16, and wounded his pal, Wilson Lopez, 16, also white, because she objected to their attitude as she, her mother, and friends passed them on a sidewalk.

Only about 15 minutes later, police said, she stabbed and wounded Rodney Jackson, 46, a Negro, on the train, because she took offense at his manner when he asked directions.

THREE OTHER GIRLS CHARGED

In an unrelated subway incident, police accused three Negro girls of beating and kicking an unidentified white woman and booked them as juvenile offenders. The police said the girls shouted at the woman: "We are Negroes and proud of it."

In the stabbing case, police gave this account:

The 15-year-old girl, with her mother and a group of friends, left a party in East Harlem and headed for a subway station to return home to Brooklyn.

Nieves and Lopez, standing near the station, mimicked the way the mother talked.

While others in the group walked on, the girl remained behind, argued with the youths, then whipped out a knife with a 5-inch blade and stabbed both in the chest.

TWENTY-FIVE SEE STABBING

Then she caught up with the group and boarded the train.

Jackson, a passenger on the train, asked the girl's mother for directions.

The girl got into an argument with him and began stabbing him as the train pulled into the 96th Street station while 25 other passengers looked on in horror.

William La Tour, 22, of Staten Island, an off-duty housing authority policeman who was standing on the station platform, ran into the car and disarmed her.

"I saw this girl with her arm up stabbing this man who was sitting down," he said. "I got into the car as the door opened and grabbed, trying to get the knife away from her.

"She was about to attack me when I identified myself (as a policeman) and had my shield in my hand. She quieted down."

RAN THROUGH TRAIN

The police said the three girls in the other incident were among five Negro teenage couples who ran through a Queens-bound subway train shortly after midnight, shouting obscenities.

The police said the white woman did not answer their statement about being proud of being Negroes, or other remarks, and that they began assaulting her.

Patrolman Joseph Schaefer, off duty and in civilian clothes, said he saw the attack.

"I jumped up" he said, "and started to grab the girls * * * five of the Negro boys crowded around me as I moved in. But two sailors and a busdriver—also Negro—came to my aid."

Canal Facts, Please

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I am glad that the Army Engineers have seen fit to extend until July 3 the deadline for comments and criticisms on their feasibility report which recommends construction of the proposed Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal, more appropriately known as the billion-dollar ditch. An editorial in the March 31 issue of the Pittsburgh Press explains why additional time is needed to review and analyze the Engineers' report. I ask unanimous consent that this interesting editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CANAL FACTS, PLEASE

Opponents of the proposed Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal have discovered serious weaknesses in the feasibility report of the Army Engineers, who have recommended construction of the costly project. There are so many weaknesses, in fact, that the Board of Engineers should feel obligated to extend the April 3 deadline for protests.

The Upper Ohio Valley Association, which has been trying to analyze the Engineers' massive report issued March 1, has demanded complete copies of a survey conducted by Arthur D. Little & Co. This study purportedly measures the canal's probable economic impact on the region and Nation.

According to the upper Ohio group, the Engineers report that no additional data is available. Until all details of the Little report are revealed, however, the public will not be abel to judge adequately, the feasibility of the "billion dollar ditch," which is regarded by many as an enormous waste of public funds.

Opponents of the canal contend that paragraph 8, appendix IX, of the feasibility report "indicates that Arthur D. Little & Co. 'may have concluded that on certain assumptions' the canal would not produce sufficient benefits to warrant construction."

Since the taxpayers are being asked to shell out $1,128 million (with annual charges of $55,800,000) for this project, they certainly deserve to know all the pertinent facts. If there are no details to hide in the Little report, the Army Engineers should have no objection to releasing all information relating to the survey.

This factor alone is reason enough to extend the 1-month period alloted for filing protests. But the Upper Ohio Valley Association also has pointed out many other defects in the Engineers' report which require explanation.

The association contends that the $1,128 million estimated cost of the canal is at least 25 percent low. It also charges that the Engineers report fails to specify the full width of the project, underestimates the cost of farm homes to be condemned, omits a number of bridges needed, fails to include any provision for rail access to the harbor, underestimates excavation costs, and neglects to account for anticipated price increases during construction of the proposed canal.

If the Board of Engineers wishes to be fair to the taxpayers, it will approve extension of the protest deadline until all these points can be clarified. In view of the enormous cost of this project, the board cannot, in good conscience, ignore these serious objections.

The Selma-Montgomery March

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues the following two items, one an editorial which appeared in the Elba Clipper, Elba, Ala., and the other a news story. Slowly but surely the truth about the Selma-Montgomery march is coming out.

The articles follow:

THE ELBA CLIPPER

(By Lucile K. Woodham McRae)

Alabama has had a profusion of rumors of an awful lot of immorality among civil rights demonstrators prior to and during the Selma-Montgomery march last week. A two-column bordered article in Sunday's Birmingham News entitled "Lovemaking in open definitely occurred in Selma prayer vigil," gave some of the details of those awful days. Many people had known about the lovemaking and wondered why it was that newspaper and television reporters, on the scene by the hundreds, were not taking pictures and reporting these awful immoral actions when they were making such a to-do about the march. An editorial in the Dothan Eagle on March 19, was the first report I saw in any of the Alabama newspapers and then Sunday the Birmingham News gave a detailed account of what happened in Selma. The same thing has happened at other places.

Quoting from the Birmingham News article: "Charges have included illicit relations in the streets of Selma and at the march campsites; urinating in the streets of Montgomery; as many as 40 attacks by Negroes on a white female demonstrator, and a general immoral climate in the civil rights movement." Some of the rumors proved without basis, stated the News, others have been proved true according to reliable sources and eyewitness accounts. An Associated Press writer told the News, "I saw couples involved in intercourse. There was considerable other hanky-panky." Selma Public Safety Director

Wilson Baker told the Birmingham News there definitely was immorality among civil rights demonstrators and "was very definitely open in kissing and loving and drinking."

Newsmen, including two reporters for the News, witnessed demonstrators as they urinated in the middle of Montgomery's Dexter Avenue less than 50 yards from the capitol steps. A ring of people, men and women, Negro and white, stood locked arms while others in the group of demonstrators urinated and one Negro boy was hustled off to jail by police on a charge of indecent exposure.

It has been reported by an Associated Press writer, and also by a reporter of the Birmingham News, there was evidence of petting and lovemaking between white and Negro demonstrators. Some so-called ministers were present and witnessed it, the reporters said.

It has been learned that hundreds of pictures were taken of activities in Selma, en route to Montgomery, and in Montgomery. It has also been reported that a daily newspaper has had the privilege of using such pictures and refused to do so. Why? Are they also endorsing such actions It is common knowledge and a proven fact that drunkenness and sex orgies did mark the civil rights march. It is being reported that this kind of characters were recruited and paid by the day to be involved in sex with opposite members of either race. Instead of this free love being condoned it was encouraged. As reported by Congressman BILL DICKINSON, who also has the proof, "Free love among this group is not only condoned; it is encouraged. It is a fact and their way of life. Only by the ultimate sex act with one of another color can they demonstrate they have no prejudice." It's reported that there were many, not just a few instances of sexual intercourse in public between Negro and white. Negro and white freedom marchers invaded a Negro church in Montgomery and engaged in an all-night session of debauchery within the church itself and the leadership of the church had to get help to have these freedom marchers put out of their church. Yet not one word of such action was reported by the daily Montgomery newspapers. Why? Were their reporters failing to be on the job or was the control of those newspapers denying the readers this information. It is understandable why the many pictures taken of the sex activities were not printed but why did those newspapers fail to report what was going on during the demonstrations? Did they call themselves protecting Alabama from further bad publicity? Alabama folk were not those who were participating in such actions except those falling under the influence of outsiders who came to Alabama for that particular reason.

There were many Alabama Negroes participating in the civil rights demonstrations who were shocked at what happened. And many Selma Negroes are not happy that they can't trade at Selma stores where prices are good. But the Martin Luther King gang are watching them and not allowing them to trade freely where they can get the best price. Yet Martin Luther King claims to be against discrimination, and he claims to be a minister of the Gospel.

Reported in the Dothan Eagle was a letter by a State trooper, sickened by the things and the people he had seen and heard at close range in the days he was on duty in Selma, who said "It's mostly just a gathering of trash, homosexuals, beatniks, thieves, dope peddlers, addicts, and paid professional agitators. This is the bunch of people that L.B.J. is trying so hard to please." He continued with "Regardless of one's feelings about integration, voting rights, mixed marriages, whether for or against, this is not the way to change it. I have seen Negro men and white women; white men and Negro women loving each other, holding each other, hands all over each other, right here in the middle of the streets in Selma, Ala. Bearded beatniks, filthy, dirty young white girls dressed like men, so-called preachers in overalls, and some priests in their suits with the collar turned backwards, all are here, living, eating, sleeping with these Negroes, cursing Alabama and us * * *. People who live here are fed up to the point of desperation. This is what has migrated into the State of Alabama, with the protection and blessings of President Johnson, the Justice Department, and the Supreme Court."

Martin Luther King is like most politicians. Most politicians will run for office until the people get tired of their sweet talk and vote them out of office. Martin Luther King has received support in his voter registration demonstrations. But apparently he is real foolish and can't resist his attempt to be a dictator of the United States. It could be he has now made that fatal move when he will find himself without the necessary support. His true color of hate is beginning to show.

Even Lyndon B. Johnson may not be able to continue to support him in his last proposal to boycott Alabama, though the President has been a tool in the hands of King all this time. For that reason there is no telling what Lyndon B. Johnson may do if Martin Luther King puts the pressure on him. That effective pressure is similar to being blackmailed. Could there be a reason for the President having to lend an ear to Martin Luther King?

NEWSMEN SAW MISCONDUCT AT SELMA

(By Al Kuettner)

MONTGOMERY.—Did Martin Luther King's organization recruit civil rights mercenaries for the Selma-to-Montgomery march with offers of up to $14 a day, plus food and sex?

A substantial segment of our society believes the answer is "yes." A U.S. Congressman has made the charge in bare knuckle words on the floor of the House.

King admits there were some unfortunate incidents during last week's march but he and his organization deny categorically that wholesale sexual promiscuity took place, as charged.

Let us take up finances first.

Virtually all of the up to 30,000 persons who eventually participated in the march to Montgomery were volunteers, drawn to the scene by sympathies, racial ties, or politics.

Scores of interviews with marchers from all over the Nation produced almost uniform petition when it came to money. They said they were financed by students back on the campus, by their churches, or their organizations.

A number brought gifts of food, clothing, and money and shared these with the local movement.

Andrew Young, King's first assistant, acknowledged that about 25 full-time staff members of the Southern Christian Leadership Conference were on the paid administrative staff of the march.

Young said the marchers were provided with food, sleeping bags and, in a small number of cases, shoes. The food was either bought by the organization or donated.

The stories of sexual depravity on this campaign have been widespread.

A woman in Atlanta, went to her beauty shop the other day and her hairdresser remarked: "By the way, have you heard that—"

The story she told as fact originated in Selma, Ala., more than 200 miles to the west, only a few days earlier. It was an unfounded rumor, checked out by responsible newsmen and discarded, that a white woman had died after a weekend orgy involving many Negroes.

The most often repeated stories relate in details that are growing wilder by the day how wicked sex parties took place beneath the tents each night of the march.

An evaluation of how serious this became depends on your definition of an orgy. There were some individual acts of misconduct observed by newsmen who camped with the marchers and who were on the lookout for unusual activity.

What went on prior to March 21 when the trek to Montgomery began is another matter. To be fair to the hundreds who came to Alabama for the march itself, the two periods need to be separated.

Before the march was organized, there was a virtually unsupervised time in Selma when hundreds were roaming from church to church and into nearby apartments they shared with Negro tenants. There was a 4-day-and-night period when demonstrators—white and Negro—were packed beneath blankets, bedrolls, and plastic tents in a street confrontation with police.

This is the period out of which most of the sex charges have blossomed. Reporters on the street saw a considerable amount of socializing between male and female youths, white and Negro, that went beyond friendship on behalf of civil rights. After the first time and after some warnings from Negro clergymen, most of the courting appeared to stop.

Soviet Anti-Semitism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the executive branch is of the opinion that the U.S. Government should take no action specifically to condemn the virulent attack being waged against persons of the Jewish faith in the Soviet Union. I disagree emphatically with this belief that if the United States just ignores these violations of human rights, they will, somehow, fade away.

The State Department has even opposed the Ribicoff resolution, of which I am a cosponsor, which would condemn Soviet anti-Semitism.

I am pleased to report that the senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania rejects this "head in the sand" approach to human rights and religious freedom, and has adopted a resolution condemning anti-Semitism in the Soviet Union. I ask unanimous consent that this resolution, which urges action on the part of the President and the State Department, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"RESOLUTION OF THE SENATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

"The general assembly of the Commonwealth protests the wrongs and sufferings imposed by the Soviet Union upon its Jewry. Its enmity of religion is a matter of historical record and its discrimination against synagogues and Jewish worshippers is well known. Jewish congregations there are forbidden to organize a central body or contact Jewish groups outside Russia. Yiddish language institutions and other Yiddish cultural institutions have not been restored since their destruction by Stalin.

"Article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states: 'Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship, and observance.'

"A public protest against Soviet anti-Semitism is scheduled to be held Sunday, March 28, 1965, at 3 p.m. at Independence Square in Philadelphia. In protesting against the ill treatment of Soviet Jewry the general assembly should encourage participation in the rally by citizens of all religions in our Commonwealth as part of its effort to call the attention of the world to the plight of our brothers: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That people of all religions in this Commonwealth be encouraged to attend and participate in the public rally to protest Soviet anti-Semitism to be held in Philadelphia at Independence Square at 3 p.m., Sunday, March 28, 1965; and be it further,

"*Resolved*, That the Department of State be hereby respectfully memorialized to request of the Soviet Union that it grant to its Jewish citizens the right to freedom of worship; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the President of the United States restate the position of the United States in opposition to these acts of discrimination against Jewish citizens and that he instruct the U.S. delegation to the United Nations to make known the sentiments expressed in this resolution in every possible manner; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of the senate of the Commonwealth, to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, each Member of Congress from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the legislatures of the States in the United States, the Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson, the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations and the Soviet Ambassador to the United States."

I certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of senate resolution, serial no. 45, introduced by Senators Benjamin R. Donolow, Charles R. Weiner, William J. Lane, Thomas P. McCreesh, John H. Devlin, Thomas J. Kalman, Louis C. Johanson, and Martin Silvert, and adopted by the Senate of Pennsylvania the 15th day of March 1965.

MARK GRUELL, Jr.,
Secretary, Senate of Pennsylvania.

Another Depression?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, Indiana and other States are making outstanding progress on either repealing the so-called phony labeled right-to-work legislation or defeating legislation that calls for its enactment in various States.

Since section 14b of the Taft-Hartley law has divided our Nation so that about one-fourth of our States now operating under it are paying substandard wages to factory workers and other employees.

During the last 12 years, thousands of industries have relocated or moved to these low-wage areas. Millions working in these industries have been completely taken out of the purchasing market for automobiles, refrigerators, and hundreds of other products manufactured, which are priced to meet the economic needs of our workers in "living wage areas." If this condition continues, buying power will be curtailed as in the 1920's and another depression will scourge the economy and employment in our Nation:

CITY OF GARY,
Gary, Ind., March 29, 1965.

Hon. RAY J. MADDEN,
Congressman, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Following the directive of the Gary Common Council, enclosed herein is Resolution 952 (a resolution of the city of Gary urging Congress to enact legislation to restore full freedom of collective bargaining as uniform national labor policy and practice throughout the United States, by repealing existing sanctions of State right-to-work laws contained in section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended and section 705(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, and by other appropriate action, adopted by the Gary Common Council on the 16th day of March 1965.

Your truly,

BETTY MALINKA,
Clerk, City of Gary.
IRENE KOTAKES,
Chief Deputy, Civil Division.

RESOLUTION 952

Resolution of the city of Gary urging Congress to enact legislation to restore full freedom of collective bargaining as uniform national labor policy and practice throughout the United States, by repealing existing sanctions of State "right-to-work" laws contained in section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 705(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, and by other appropriate action

Whereas section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 705(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 sanction the enactment of State "right-to-work" laws prohibiting the negotiation of agreements between unions and employers assuring union security during the term of such agreement; and

Whereas by constitutional provision or statute 19 States have such right-to-work laws in effect, and by ordinance or other enactment numerous municipalities, counties, and other local bodies have adopted and put such laws into effect; and

Whereas such laws are contrary to and in derogation of provisions of Federal law contained in sections 8(a), (3) and 8(f) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, which in the absence of section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 705(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, permit under specified conditions the negotiation of agreements between unions and employers assuring union security during the term of such agreements; and

Whereas State right-to-work laws undermine union organization and interfere with full freedom of collective bargaining between unions and employers; tend to depress wages and working conditions and to promote strikes and instability and antagonism in labor-management relations; and unfairly compel unions to represent and bargain for workers who are unwilling to bear the cost and responsibility of participation in union organization and collective bargaining; and

Whereas State right-to-work laws are unfair and antilabor in their effects and are designed to weaken and harass labor unions in their organization efforts and in representing workers in bargaining with their employers; and

Whereas labor unions are generally rendered less effective in promoting the welfare of wage earners, and wages and working conditions are generally lower in States having right-to-work laws than in States where such laws exist; and

Whereas successful implementation of the national labor policy in support of union organization and collective bargaining is not possible unless unions and union security are accepted by management as desirable forms of industrial dealings: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the City Council of Gary, Ind., urgently requests that the Congress of the United States enact such legislation as may be necessary and appropriate to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 705(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, which sanction State right-to-work laws, and to restore full freedom of collective bargaining as uniform national labor policy and practice throughout the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent forthwith by the clerk of the city of Gary to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives representing their State in the Congress of the United States.

Adopted by the common council this 16th day of March 1965.

LOUIS G. KARRAS,
Presiding Officer.

Attest:

BETTY MALINKA, *City Clerk.*

Presented by me to the mayor for his approval and signature this 19th day of March 1965.

BETTY MALINKA,
City Clerk.

Approved and signed by me this 19th day of March 1965.

A. MARTIN KATZ,
Mayor, City of Gary, Ind.

The Education Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a comment, by the Richmond News Leader of March 31, 1965, on the pending education bill.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEMPORARY OR OTHERWISE

As the education bill highballed through the House last week, Representative CHARLES E. GOODELL, of New York, paused to remark on some curious diction in the text. One clause of the bill offers to supply modern educational equipment and specially qualified personnel on a temporary or other basis to public or other nonprofit schools. Logic suggests that the other basis could be permanent.

Similarly, the only other kind of nonprofit school besides a public school is a private one.

Another part of the bill offers Federal money to publish curriculum materials and texts "developed at curriculum research centers and elsewhere." The curriculum research centers are provided for in the bill, but "elsewhere" means texts developed anywhere under the sun. And yet another clause providing free school equipment says "The term 'equipment' includes machinery, utilities, and built-in equipment, and any necessary enclosures or structures to house them." Those necessary enclosures or structures thrown in so casually at the tail end sound very much like whole new school buildings and plants, housing whole new schools, paid for 100 percent by the Federal Government.

And of course, that's exactly what they are. When the Senate approves the measure ("if" seems out of the question), a Federal school system will have been erected behind a screen of doubletalk, with the curriculum, texts, administrators, and teachers selected, developed, and supplied by the Federal Government—without Federal control, of course. The $1.06 billion authorized, naturally, is just the starter.

The ballyhoo behind the legislation says it will bring children in underprivileged areas up to the educational standards of the Nation. But of the six titles, only the first sets up criteria based on poverty; the other five allow the Commissioner of Education to dispense money as he pleases. A close study gives some indication of the empire herein established:

Title I: The poverty formula, tied to present expenditures per pupil, results in the largest grants going to 10 of the wealthiest counties in the country. However, grants must be "consistent with such basic criteria as the Commissioner may establish," and the Commissioner can hold up funds until the local people knuckle under.

Title II: The Commissioner makes gifts of library books and equipment to local agencies on whatever "equitable" terms he chooses. He deals directly with the local school boards or institutions, bypassing State departments of education.

Title III: The Commissioner sets up so-called supplemental educational centers, with the Federal Government paying all costs for "establishment, maintenance, and operation of programs, including acquisition of necessary equipment." Local officials (not the State) must ask for these centers, but their plans must meet the Commissioner's arbitrary criteria. Within the language of the law, these "centers" can be complete model school systems, from elementary through high school. The State's function is limited to offering "recommendations."

Title IV: The Commissioner makes grants to colleges and universities for research, surveys, and demonstrations. The present U.S. Commissioner says, "Our goal is a national network of federally supported but State- and university-operated research centers."

Title V: Having emasculated the State education departments, the Commissioner now proceeds to "strengthen" them. The bill provides direct grants to compliant States for educational planning, curriculum research, publication of texts, and the training of administrators. To complete the hideous marriage, the Commissioner is given authority to lend U.S. personnel to the States and to bring State personnel into the U.S. Office, for 2-year periods.

Seldom has a law been proposed in such a flurry of deceit. It is only in the last title, title VI, that the definitions are given which hint that "equipment" includes whole school systems, with the necessary plans, teachers, and texts supplied by the Federal Government. But it is also title VI that seals the law with the mark of duplicity. In title VI, we are assured that, after the Federal Commissioner of Education has set the criteria, planned the educational approach and goals, approved the texts, and rewarded compliant State departments of education, he won't control education. "Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system." If a wee bit of control does seep in, no doubt it will be no more than temporary or otherwise.

Residual Oil: April Fool Joke

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Last Friday I issued a press release on the residual oil problem, and I am happy to note that on Saturday the Secretary of the Interior agreed with me. We both feel that there is no national security basis for this program.

The Secretary has referred the question to the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning to make "a searching new study." I hope this does not result in the interment of the question in this quiet burial ground.

The matter has been studied to death. We need no new studies. We request a prompt finding by the Director that there is at this time no national security basis for the controls.

Then, I trust the President will have the courage to issue a proclamation bringing this injustice to an end.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., ISSUED ON FRIDAY, APRIL 2, 1965

New England is once again to be victimized by the imposition of quotas for residual oil imports.

We had hoped and expected that we had convinced the Secretary of the Interior that his controls were on a very shaky legal foundation, there being no national security basis for his program.

We had thought that he was aware of the harm being done to New England, already suffering acutely from economic benefits given to other sections of the country to its disadvantage.

We had believed that his April 1 pronouncement would be: "No more controls for New England."

Imagine our consternation when we are told on March 31 that everything would be all right for New England, only to find out on April 1 that some last minute influence caused the Secretary to do a complete about-face. What happened? If there was no national security reason to impose controls on us on March 31, what intervened to create a national security basis for this hardship on April 1?

At his press conference on March 31, the Secretary of the Interior said: "We had contemplated what would have amounted to an open end program in Florida and the five New England States, with a continuation of the existing program in the other east coast States. This represented my best judgment as a solution."

But this was not the April 1 decision of the Secretary. His best judgment was not allowed to prevail. Who intervened? Whose judgment is being substituted for that of the Federal official duly charged with this great responsibility by the laws of the land? Who played this April Fool's joke on New England?

The Secretary says that he does not have the power, "acting alone, to make a decision" on the national security question. Why not? The President of the United States delegated to him all the vast powers of the Presidency in respect to oil matters. What more powers does the Secretary need?

Who says that New England must continue to suffer this burden, when the Secretary of the Interior has concluded publicly that in his best judgment these unfair controls are not needed?

The Secretary admits honestly that consumers are paying a penalty of about $40 million a year as the result of this program, and a large percentage of that penalty is inflicted upon New England.

The Secretary admits honestly that he doesn't like and cannot justify the present plan, and he begs for an "alternative, workable plan." There isn't any such plan.

The only alternative to the present outrage is no controls. The alternative is for the Federal Government to admit the truth; there is no national security reason to justify this program. Once that admission is made, this jerry-rigged scheme to sabotage New England can be ended, and free enterprise can begin to make sense out of this expensive boondoggle promoted and maintained by the Department of the Interior.

Chemical and Biological Weapons May Be a Greater Threat to Our National Survival Than the Atomic Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON H. CLAUSEN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, much has been said lately about the use of chemical and biological warfare in our conflict in southeast Asia. So that it will be readily available to every Member of Congress, I am placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this afternoon a synopsis on this subject written by the Honorable Charles J. Conrad, of California.

Mr. Conrad, in addition to being a 10-term veteran of the California State Legislature, is a widely recognized expert in the field of chemical and biological warfare. I feel that his remarks on this subject are well worth studying:

CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS MAY BE A GREATER THREAT TO OUR NATIONAL SURVIVAL THAN THE ATOMIC BOMB

1. The Communists could obtain their objectives more readily.

Even assuming the Communists believe they could win a nuclear war, they would inherit a nation in ruin and deaths running into millions. On the other hand, if they temporarily immobilize our population and defenses by use of chemical and biological weapons, they could seize a civilization complete with slave labor.

2. It is possible to build, undetected, a striking capability of chemical and biological agents.

Unlike nuclear weapons, which require an enormous industrial capacity capable of detection, chemical and biological agents can

be produced in factories disguised as breweries, fertilizer plants, etc.

3. Even under total disarmament the Communists could wage a chemical or biological war.

All other weapons require military hardware, i.e., warplanes, submarines, guided missiles, etc., to deliver them upon an enemy target. On the other hand, it would be possible for the Soviet Union to offer a complete disarmament with inspection, then at a later date, utilize fishing vessels, commercial aircraft or saboteurs to attack us with chemical or biological agents.

CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS OFFER GREAT POSSIBILITIES TO THE FREE WORLD FOR EFFECTIVELY AND HUMANELY STOPPING COMMUNIST AGGRESSION

1. All other weapons from the spear to the atomic bomb can cause death.

By contrast there are chemical and biological agents that do not kill but merely cause temporary incapacitation.

2. In guerilla warfare it is difficult to differentiate between friend and foe.

Any bombing of an area such as Vietnam will cause casualties among friendly civilians. The use of incapacitators will enable us to segregate Vietcong infiltrators from government supporters.

3. Bombing supply trails is difficult and would have to be continually repeated.

On the other hand, it would be possible to seal off the trails used to bring arms and supplies to the Vietcong by drenching the area with persistent chemicals; i.e., chemicals whose effect will remain for a period of time.

4. All other weapons can destroy a civilization.

The use of incapacitating agents, however, leaves the industrial and agricultural capacity of the area untouched. This relieves the United States of the necessity to support the population after the end of hostilities.

5. In the event of all-out war, chemical and biological agents can destroy the Communists' food supply.

This is Red China's greatest fear and one reason for the continued propaganda against chemical and biological warfare. Red China could survive a nuclear attack better than the destruction of her rice and wheat crop. In print this may sound inhumane, but the United States has surplus food and considerable experience in feeding populations. If forced to resort to such methods, we could relieve the suffering of the civilian population more quickly and easily than would be the case following an attack by conventional high explosives or nuclear weapons.

WHY THE SECRECY REGARDING CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS?

1. It is a holdover from ancient superstitions which associated such weapons with the devil and black magic.

2. It was part of the Allied propaganda following World War I. The victors were unwilling to outlaw submarines, aircraft, etc., but felt they could safely denounce "poison gas" because, at that time, Germany had the most advanced chemical industry.

3. The decision in World War II (which may have cost American lives) that we would use chemical weapons only in retaliation.

4. Continuous propaganda from the Soviet Union and Red China which is often repeated by certain groups here in the United States. Obviously, our enemies wish to prevent the use of these weapons while at the same time they prepare to use chemical and biological agents against us when the time is ripe.

WE SHOULD REMEMBER THE DECISION TO USE THE ATOMIC BOMB

Recent disclosures indicate one of the reasons for the decision to drop the A-bomb on Hiroshima was the knowledge that sooner or later the Soviet Union would be able to develop such a weapon. Had we not been the first to use atomic warfare, the Communists might rule the world today. For we would not have developed the bomb and during a later crisis (the Berlin airlift or the Cuban missiles) we would have faced a Soviet Union armed with nuclear weapons while we were defenseless.

If we continue our present policy, this can happen with chemical or biological weapons.

IF WE BEGIN UTILIZING CHEMICAL OR BIOLOGICAL WEAPONS, WON'T THAT LEAD TO THEIR USE BY THE COMMUNISTS?

The Communists will use such weapons anytime they believe they can get away with it. The quicker we start using the humane type of chemical agent in areas such as Vietnam, the quicker the public, press, and government leaders will become aware of the capabilities of such weapons, as was the case with the atomic bomb. The people of the United States then will understand the necessity for building up our chemical and biological arsenal as well as developing a defense against an attack by such weapons.

DON'T WE HAVE A TREATY AGAINST THE USE OF CHEMICAL AND BIOLOGICAL WARFARE?

No. The U.S. Senate wisely refused to ratify the Geneva Convention outlawing such weapons for two reasons, which are as valid today as they were 40 years ago.

1. The statement by General Fries "An outlaw nation would always use this weapon against us if it felt it could gain victory by so doing."

2. The history of World War I showed the chemical weapon to be relatively efficient and relatively humane.

In World War I, 24 million pounds of mustard gas caused 400,000 casualties; that is, one casualty for every 60 pounds of mustard, 8 times as effective as high explosives. But death occurred in only 2 percent of the chemical casualties and only 7 percent were so severely injured that they had to be discharged from the service. With high explosives, death occurred in 26 percent of the casualties and this does not take into consideration men who lost legs, arms, were blinded, etc.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE ARE NOT EVEN BEING TOLD WHAT WE ARE ACTUALLY DOING

1. A new chemical to replace tear gas in control of mobs has already been adopted by the U.S. Army.

This agent is known as CS. It has been used successfully in many parts of the world and here in the United States was used by the Maryland National Guard to put down the riot in Cambridge last May. Despite this fact, the press and public have been kept in almost complete ignorance and CS has not been utilized on other occasions where its use could have saved lives and property.

2. The so-called defoliation project in Vietnam has been hamstrung through political interference.

The public was subjected to enormous amounts of propaganda against this project not only from the Communists but from various groups here in the United States. The truth is the defoliation project was reasonably successful and could be much more so if the military were allowed a free hand in the choice of chemicals and when and where to use them.

THE PUBLIC IS OFTEN SUBJECT TO SCARE STORIES

While U.S. officials regard honest discussion of chemical and biological warfare "rather delicate," fantastic yarns make headlines several times a year.

A prime example was the report of an anti-espionage expert in the West German Embassy in Moscow being drenched with mustard gas in a monastary. The U.S. medical official mentioned in the story is not known and no Soviet agent would think of using mustard because of its strong odor and comparatively slow action.

Reports from Cuba have been equally inaccurate. Yet the same news media that reports such fantasies do not supply the public with factual reporting of the threat and possibilities of chemical and biological warfare.

EVERY DAY'S DELAY INCREASES THE DANGER

It takes time, money, manpower, and especially public awareness to put our chemical and biological capabilities on a par with our nuclear forces. In addition, every day's delay sees American lives lost in places such as Vietnam, lives that might be saved through the use of chemical agents.

WHAT MUST BE DONE?

1. Our elected officials must familiarize themselves with the subject.

2. They then must have the courage to help end the ignorance and superstition that surrounds these weapons and tell the public, within the limits of national security, of the dangers and opportunities existing in these weapons.

3. We should announce to the world through the United Nations that chemical and biological agents cannot be controlled through treaties or inspections; that they pose both a threat to the free world; and an opportunity to halt mob violence and stop Communist aggression in the most humane manner; that the United States has no treaty prohibiting the use of such weapons and that we feel free to do so whenever our national security or the interest of the free world indicates that such weapons should be utilized.

4. The press, radio, and television should give widest possible coverage to the actions mentioned above. In particular, opportunity should be extended to the military and responsible Government officials to answer the propaganda that would most certainly reach record heights if the above suggestions were put into effect.

The Congressional Secretaries Club Observes Its 30th Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago a small group of congressional staff members got together and formed an organization that has rendered and continues to render invaluable service to our offices. I refer to the Congressional Secretaries Club.

Formed to work toward the solution of problems common to all congressional offices, to promote greater cooperation between our offices and Government agencies involving the perplexities of our constituents, and to further the general welfare of congressional staff members, as well as provide a program of enlightenment, special activities, and sports, the club has reached a new landmark.

On its 30th anniversary the club membership reached an all-time high of 2,802 members, in addition to Members of Congress who are honorary members.

Last Saturday night the club held its anniversary banquet at the Hotel Shoreham and honored the President of the United States, who began his Washington career as a congressional secretary,

making him the recipient of the annual "Man of the Year" award. The placque was accepted for the President by a member of his staff. The Secretary of the Year award, made annually by the newspaper Roll Call, went to Clary Cochowski, secretary to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI]. Miss Virginia Butler, of the Ways and Means Committee staff, club vice president, was banquet chairman. A special anniversary award was given to Sidney Yudain, Roll Call editor and publisher, for his contribution to and support of the club during the past decade.

Hyde Murray, a member of the professional staff of the House Committee on Agriculture, and president of the club, made a challenging speech, outlining club accomplishments as well as pointing the members to greater goals in the future.

Mr. Murray's anniversary address follows:

REMARKS OF HYDE MURRAY, PRESIDENT OF THE CONGRESSIONAL SECRETARIES CLUB

Distinguished guests, officers, directors, and members of the Congressional Secretaries Club, we're going to try to make the length of all speeches tonight conform with the rules of the House, not the Senate.

I cannot pass up this chance, though—it comes only once every 30 years—to talk to you a little bit about what the Congressional Secretaries Club means—what it's all about, and where it's going.

For 30 years the growth of this organization has paralleled the public life of our Man of the Year and the events of three of the most turbulent and rapidly changing decades of man's existence on this earth.

In 1935, some 30 years ago, there was a great depression in our country. Lyndon Johnson was attending Georgetown Law School and working as a congressional secretary then.

In 1940 war clouds were forming over America and the world after 8 years of far-reaching domestic change had been wrought by the New Deal. Congressman Lyndon Johnson played an important part in those changes as a Member of the House of Representatives from the State of Texas.

By 1945 World War II was over, and the atomic era was at hand. Lt. Comdr. Lyndon Johnson had served his Nation in the Armed Forces and was once again a Member of the House, taking his part in America's task of rebuilding the world, while avoiding a nuclear grave.

During the next 5 years the threat of world communism became a menace to freemen everywhere. In 1950, a new crisis broke out in the Republic of Korea. Lyndon Johnson by this time was a U.S. Senator, and again he participated in deliberations and decisions that wrote history.

In 1955, President Eisenhower looked down Pennsylvania Avenue at a Congress dominated by a political party now his own. The world and the Nation wondered if a deadlock in democracy would occure; but the majority leader of the Senate, Lyndon Johnson, and the late and kindly gentleman who served so long as Speaker of the House, Sam Rayburn, put their country first.

By 1960 a new dimension had been added: the space age was upon us: sputniks, orbits, capsules, astronauts, all became used, if not new, words in our vocabularies. Lyndon Johnson again played an important role in that effort, and in 1960 he was elected as the Vice President of the United States.

Tonight, some 30 years after the founding of the Congressional Secretaries Club, he is the single most powerful man in the world. But is that why we honor him tonight? I think not.

Rather, I think we honor him simply because he is a local boy who made good, a graduate of the congressional school of hard knocks. Yes, his biography may list Texas as his home, but I suspect his heart belongs to the Hill.

And that, I suspect, describes every one of you here tonight. Whether your hometown is Waterloo, Westchester, or Walla Walla, something has happened to you in Washington.

The challenges, the opportunities for service, the excitement, the prestige, and the camaraderie of the busiest place in the world have got you—like our man of the year—hooked, but good, more than enough to compensate for the hazards, the disappointments, the cynicism, the frustrations, the fatigue, and the heartbreak that also lurk here.

Through the years the Congressional Secretaries Club has been an important vehicle for providing the camaraderie that puts politics on a personal level. If you haven't made friends with a member of the opposite party or a member of your own party since you've been in the club, you just haven't been a member very long.

GOALS OF THE ORGANIZATION

As you know, the Congressional Secretaries Club through the years has pursued three main goals: First, to make your office function better; second, to provide for your general welfare; and third, to provide you with a good social and recreational program.

I think you'll agree that this club has, through the years, done an outstanding job of meeting these goals. But the future demands even more.

Thirty years ago there were 127 million Americans. Today there are 192 million. Thirty years from now there will be at least 322 million. World population is exploding, and our tomorrows promise us many opportunities and many problems.

As the largest and oldest employee organization on Capitol Hill, the Congressional Secretaries Club has an obligation to share in these challenges.

Now don't get me wrong—we aren't going to carry the world around on our shoulders (that's what we have our man of the year for). We should definitely continue to have parties, sports, trips, recreational activities, and so on—but we should, I think, continue our efforts to develop and grow as an effective and constructive staff institution.

How, you may ask, can the Congressional Secretaries Club, whose membership is made up of just about every shade of political opinion on display, undertake such a project? Here's how:

ASSISTS NEEDY CHILDREN

First, we should be concerned about the Capitol Hill community and what kind of place it is. For reasons too obvious to enumerate, we should be concerned about what kind of citizens today's Capitol Hill's children will become tomorrow. Only a few of you live here, but all of us work here. There are boys and girls right here on Capitol Hill who don't have decent shoes, who don't own warm coats, and who receive very little personal concern from anyone. The club has and is conducting its annual clothing drive for this purpose. Last year some 51 high school girls in this area stayed in school wearing clothes that you ladies donated.

This week the board voted to adopt Catharine Watkins School just 12 blocks from the Capitol, so tonight you're the godmothers and godfathers of 1,150 kids here on Capitol Hill. We hope to raise enough money to see that every child in Watkins School has decent shoes and clothing this year. I know these kids can count on you.

UPGRADING STAFF COMPETENCE

Secondly, in the years ahead the club must also do more to upgrade the general professional competence of the congressional staff structure. More people mean more constituents, and more constituents mean more problems, and more problems mean more letters, and more letters mean you'll have to answer them better and quicker than you do now. The growing complexity of legislation also demands greater technical skill and educational requirements of the congressional staff.

I'm talking about you, because you're going to have to do a better job if the Congress is to perform its constitutional role.

Wasn't Thomas Jefferson right—and I'm one of those who believes he was a pretty solid citizen—when he said: "If men were angels, no government would be needed; and if all men in government were angels, the separation of the power of government would likewise be unnecessary"?

Congress, as an equal partner in the Federal trinity, simply must have the best possible internal support.

Yes, partisanship has its place, but I don't care whether we're in the mainstream or a part of the consensus—Republicans or Democrats, liberals or conservatives, moderate liberals or moderate conservatives, or whatever else—our first duty is to our country, and we should all become as good at the particular skills we employ as we can.

If you don't think this is important, just look at page 47 of your program. Based on the historical fact recorded therein, the chances are that 26 of you will become Members of the House of Representatives, 4 of you will become U.S. Senators, and 1 of you—maybe one of you—sitting out there tonight will someday hold the office that our 1965 Man of the Year now holds.

Yes, my friends, the community and the Congress are important to the Congressional Secretaries Club, but so in the years ahead will be the world.

The beginning of an international parliamentary secretaries group has already been started by your board. Our meeting with the staff members of the Japanese Diet last year was the first step. More work will be done this year, and perhaps some day it will be expanded into a forum for the exchange of ideas and communication between the parliamentary staff structures of all those nations which lodge the trust and hope of their people in representative government.

This 30th anniversary salute, I fear, has violated the 5-minute rule, and I hope you will forgive me for talking too long. I hope, though, sincerely that as this wonderful organization goes forward, you will think about what a Congressional Secretaries Club president will be saying about you at the 60th anniversary banquet some 30 years from now.

Urban Renewal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVID S. KING
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report that Utah has now become one of the 46 States whose laws make possible the community sponsorship of federally assisted urban renewal projects. This fact results from the recent action taken by the Utah Legislature and concurred in by Utah's new and energetic Governor, Calvin L. Rampton. Prior to that, Utah was one of only five States in the Union having no enabling legislation to allow local participation in this program. I am proud to have been able to do my part to promote urban renewal legislation.

Let me point out some of the program's meritorious features. It can result in the elimination or arresting of municipal blight; it can rebuild rundown areas and develop new uses for them. Urban renewal can help reduce expenditures in police, fire, welfare, and other relatively fixed municipal costs. It can draw new investment into the community for the construction of housing and business and industrial buildings. It can create new jobs. The partnership which it creates between local government, private enterprise, and the Federal Government accomplishes many otherwise impossible things.

The Federal contribution to the cost of the program is an important consideration: it makes possible loans and grants for carrying out many of its features. Special FHA financial aids and public housing assistance help to provide low-rent or moderate-rent housing for families displaced by urban renewal. Relocation grants are made to reimburse displaced families and businesses for their moving expenses and for direct losses of property. Urban renewal, then, is designed to help compensate local citizens, businesses, and communities for out-of-pocket losses incurred when renewal programs are introduced. More important, however, the program is designed to stimulate local communities to initiate needed projects. It is a program to help people help themselves.

In his recent message to Congress on cities, President Johnson stated:

Our cities are making a valiant effort to combat the mounting dangers to the good life. Between 1954 and 1963 per capita municipal tax revenues increased by 43 percent, and local government indebtedness increased by 119 percent. City officials with inadequate resources, limited authority, too few trained people, and often with too little public support, have, in many cases, waged a heroic battle to improve the life of the people they serve. But we must do far more as a nation if we are to deal effectively with one of the most critical problems of the United States.

In my opinion, the federally assisted urban renewal program seems to be one answer to the problems of our cities. I have supported this program; I plan to continue to do so.

I feel this way even though most of the cities in my State are small; and only one city in Utah has over 100,000 in population. However, the urban renewal program can be helpful to smaller cities. As a matter of fact, nationwide, more than 70 percent of all the cities in the program are under 50,000 in size. Also, Congress has made special provision for these smaller cities by fixing the Federal share of the costs to communities under 50,000 population at 75 percent, instead of the 66⅔ percent allowable to the larger cities.

There is still widespread misunderstanding about urban renewal, however. I recently received a publication that helps to clear up some of its misconceptions. It is the annual report issue of Business Review, published by the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia. The Review carried a most interesting and enlightening article entitled "The Toil and Turmoil of Urban Renewal." Because I think this article makes significant reading for all American communities, I would like to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE TOIL AND TURMOIL OF URBAN RENEWAL

(In ancient days, said China's Lao-tze in the sixth century B.C., men lived in peaceful rural simplicity. Then men attained knowledge, wrote books, complicated life with inventions, and moved from the fields into cities. Hence all the misery of men.)

Like the elephant which six blind men of Indostan went to "see," urban renewal casts many different images. One person sees it as metropolitan rejuvenation to make cities more livable. Another is impressed by its displacement of people. Still others are struck by its slow progress, its diverse objectives, its high cost. Differences of opinion are inevitable in an undertaking with the dimensions and complexities of urban renewal.

A city is a mass of humanity cooped up in a mass of masonry. The city is where the tumult is—a clatter and a chatter of multitudes on the sidewalks, a screech of rubber on asphalt, the shriek of a fire engine, the rumble of a subway, a Fourth of July parade, a 5-o'clock stampede to the suburbs, a shooting in a side-street saloon, and the honking of impatient motorists. The city is also where one goes to enjoy Van Cliburn at the piano, Ormandy on the podium, Fonteyn in the ballet, or Willie Mays in center field. In addition to the performing arts a city offers a cultural smorgasbord of art galleries, libraries, museums, and a variety of educational, scientific, and philosophic organizations affording fruitful opportunities to enrich hours of leisure.

For millions of citizens, the city is home in the fullest sense of the term—a place to live, to work, to play, to go to school. Many city dwellers are transfers from farms or villages; more and more, however, are city born and city bred. They love the city where there is always something going on; they loathe the countryside, dull and dead. Nocturnal orchestration of crickets and peepers would annoy urban sleepers, but not motor trucks thundering through the streets.

Urbanization is a product of our business civilization, our commercial and industrial economy. Seventy percent of the country's population occupy 1 percent of the land area. The heaviest concentration is in 219 metropolitan areas, each of which has as its nucleus a city of 50,000 population or more.

Urban concentration has its disadvantages but it also has its vexations. Familiar to everyone are: the traffic congestion in city center brought on by the widespread preference for personalized transportation, the shortage of downtown parking space, the decline of mass transit, the smog, the strain on water supply, the pollution of streams and the expense of sewage disposal, the exodus of urban population into ticky-tacky towns, the influx of minority groups and their socio-economic segregation in residential ghettos, the detrioration of certain commercial, industrial, and residential areas of the city, the decay of downtown business districts, shrinkage of the tax base, skimpage of municipal services, unwillingness of suburbs to merge with the city—in short, metropolitan muddles, 219 of them.

HOW URBAN RENEWAL GOT STARTED

Urban renewal had its legal origin in the enactment of State enabling laws, some of which date back to 1944. Almost every city has its areas of rundown residential properties that have degenerated into unsightly and unsanitary shanty towns unfit for human habitation. Once a neighborhood reaches that stage of degeneration and decay, the contagion may spread further. Blight often begets more blight, and private enterprise may be powerless to rebuild.

Obstacles to restoration by private enterprise are basically twofold. First is the difficulty of assembling the parcels of multiple ownership into a sufficiently large tract to justify a restoration project. Almost always such plans are thwarted by a "holdout" or two. A second obstacle is the discouragingly high cost. Efforts to assemble land for a renewal project are likely to touch off speculative inflation of land values; and old buildings, howsoever dilapidated, have some value which becomes a significant item in the cost of new construction.

Remedies for these two basic obstacles to private restoration of slums were sought, therefore, in State enabling legislation and the Federal Housing Act of 1949 under which a community acquires and assembles properties in slums, using the power of eminent domain where necessary. Local and Federal Governments pay the net cost of renewal, which is the difference between the cost of acquiring and clearing slum properties and the income received when the land is sold or leased for public or private redevelopment. The so-called writedown is not intended to be a subsidy to the private redeveloper, who must pay a fair value for the cleared land, but is a cost of slum clearance. In some States such as Pennsylvania, there is a modest contribution to the net cost of renewal.

Subsequent amendments to the act raised the sights and broadened the horizon. In addition to slum clearance, provision was made for conservation and rehabilitation of areas that do not require demolition. Furthermore, provision was made for assistance to hospitals and urban colleges and universities to achieve needed expansion and to cope with blight encroaching on their doorsteps. Above all was the realization of the need for Federal aid to revitalize the economic base and taxable resources of cities. Slums are not confined to residential areas of cities. There are also commercial, industrial, educational, and recreational slums. Thus the concept of slum clearance was broadened to make Federal aid available to cities in need of comprehensive urban renewal.

HOW URBAN RENEWAL WORKS

Urban renewal works best when there is competent leadership at the local level, and the wider the degree of local participation the greater the success. The Federal role is largely one of financial and technical assistance.

To qualify for Federal aid, a locality must establish a so-called workable program for community improvement. Such a program must have the following basic elements:

1. Codes and ordinances establishing adequate building standards of health and safety.

2. Detailed neighborhood analysis to identify the nature and extent of the area in need of restoration.

3. Formulation of a comprehensive plan for the community's future development.

4. Administrative organization with authority and responsibility for coordinating and carrying out a community program.

5. Evidence of adequate financial resources to support the local share of an urban renewal program.

6. Provision of housing to meet the needs of families displaced by the renewal project.

7. Assurance that the entire community is fully informed and is given an opportunity to participate in the development and execution of the program.

Depending upon State-enabling statutes, the local public agency may be a department of the city government or a special agency appointed by the mayor with, or, as in Philadelphia, without the approval of city council. After the local public agency's plans are completed and approved by the Urban Renewal Administration, Federal assistance is made available in a loan and grant contract in

which the local agency bears one-third of the net project cost and the Urban Renewal Administration, two-thirds. For cities of 50,000 population or less, the cost sharing is one-fourth local and three-fourths Federal. Larger cities may also qualify for three-fourths Federal matching funds if they absorb certain planning costs.

The Housing Act of 1961 permits the Federal Housing Administration and the Federal National Mortgage Association (Fannie Mae) to join in a program of mortgage insurance and purchase to make more moderate rentals possible. Long-term loans below market interest rates can be made to nonprofit organizations and cooperatives, limited dividend corporations, and certain public agencies to build housing for people of moderate incomes. To facilitate the most reasonable rents or carrying charges, FHA waives its usual one-half of 1 percent insurance premiums and insures loans for as long as 40 years.

Actual operations usually begin with acquisition of properties. In most instances, titles to the parcels are obtained by negotiation with the owners, and court condemnation proceedings are used only as a last resort. In all cases, local agencies are expected to assist displaced people and businesses to find suitable relocations. The relocation, of course, is seldom satisfactory in all respects to the family or business relocated.

Removal of structures and clearing the land is generally done under contract with a private contractor who, in some instances, may lay out the streets and other improvements. Meanwhile the city installs the necessary public facilities. When the land is ready for development it is publicly advertised and new construction takes place in accordance with the established plan.

WHERE URBAN RENEWAL WORKS

The Federal urban renewal program is nationwide. An indication of its scope is the growing number of communities participating. From 31 communities with renewal projects at the end of the Urban Renewal Administration's first fiscal year in 1950, the number has grown to 743 as of 1964 at midyear. The 743 localities participating are distributed among 42 of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Moreover, five of the eight States without localities participating in urban renewal have enabling legislation, as shown in the map.

Pennsylvania, with renewal projects in 85 localities, and New York in 66, are in the forefront of urban renewal. Other States with relatively large numbers of communities engaged in renewal are New Jersey, Michigan, Georgia, and California. In some communities the need for renewal may arise from the nature of its industries; in others it may be overcrowding or obsolescence and overage of private and public facilities.

Urban renewal is taking place not only in most parts of the country but also in all kinds of communities. Large cities were among the first to take advantage of Federal assistance to replace their blight-stricken residential and industrial areas with modernized construction. Subsequently, communities of medium and small size followed, as shown in the chart. By 1964, over half of the localities participating in urban renewal were in communities of less than 25,000 population. Of course, well over half of the country's communities under 25,000 population are still untouched by urban renewal, though many of them have blighted areas.

HOW URBAN RENEWAL HAS GROWN

Over 1,300 urban renewal projects had been started as of mid-1963.

In 1958, for the first time, the number of projects under sledge hammer and trowel exceeded those in the paperwork and blueprint stage. Now project completions are mounting. By the end of fiscal 1963, over 100 projects had been completed, and numerous others were nearing that stage.

With many renewal projects in many communities still in various stages of advancement, it is difficult to comprehend the overall accomplishments of the urban renewal program, but it may be helpful to cite some benchmarks of progress. Through June 1963, most of the congressional authorization of $4 billion for urban renewal grants had been utilized, almost 30,00 acres of land had been slated for acquisition and redevelopment, approximately 129,000 structures had been demolished, and 157,000 families had been relocated from blighted areas undergoing renovation. Of the families relocated, 46 percent, according to reports of participating agencies, went into standard private rental housing, about 21 percent into standard sales housing, and about 25 percent into public housing. The remainder—approximately 8 percent—relocated themselves into quarters that did not conform with minimum standards of safety and sanitation. The latter did not avail themselves of the relocation services offered by the local agencies established for that purpose.

Substantial progress has also been made in the expanding conservation program focusing on rehabilitation of urban properties capable of restoration without demolition. Most cities have some forlorn-looking properties, unhinged, unpointed, unpainted, and covered with the silt of time. Such buildings, too desolate for habitation but too good for condemnation, can be prime material for urban renewal's salvage program. Over 45,000 structures and 107,000 dwelling units have been selected for restoration and by June 1963, work had been completed on more than 17,000 structures, including more than 25,000 dwellings.

URBAN RENEWAL'S SIDEWALK SUPERINTENDENTS

Urban renewal has recently encountered a spate of criticism from sidewalk superintendents—professional and amateur. Urban renewal is criticized for its architecture, its overemphasis upon bricks and mortar, its failure to eliminate slums, its bulldozer tactics and displacement of people, its snail-paced progress and alleged lack of clearly defined objectives.

It is asserted that urban renewal legislation is ill conceived, that the central administration is too paper bound, that local agencies formulate their petitions to Washington more in terms of money than ideas, that city planners are "blue sky," that slum dwellers get pushed around, and that blight grows faster than its eradication. The severest critics maintain that urban renewal is a failure and should close shop.

Probably the most serious of these indictments is the removal of people and businesses preparatory to slum clearance by exercise of the power of eminent domain. Though upheld by the courts, the process is criticized as an arbitrary infringement upon the rights of the dispossessed families. In answer to the charge, the Urban Renewal Administration points out that as a prerequisite for Federal assistance a local agency must provide decent, safe, and sanitary housing for dispossessed families, and provision is made for followup of all those required to move. Of families being moved currently in Philadelphia, for example, 96 percent are successfully relocated to safe and sanitary housing. Some inevitably relocate without seeking assistance of the relocation office. A prominent builder operating in a number of urban areas points out that virtually the only direction that slum evacuees can move is up.

Slum clearance is the most vulnerable spot of urban renewal and there is where the sharpest shafts are hurled. The reason for the disappointing progress in slum clearance is the inability of the private housing industry to build houses that low-income families can afford. The Housing Act offers financial aid in making up part of the difference between the cost and reuse value of sites, commonly called the land writedown. But the value of land is only a small fraction of the monthly rent or purchase price. Newly built housing, therefore, is seldom within the means of the lowest income groups.

Some progress toward a solution of this basic difficulty has been made under the Mitchell-Lama program in New York City. The essence of that program is a 50-year municipal loan up to 90 percent of development costs at low rate of interest plus a 50-percent tax abatement for a fixed number of years. Under such a plan it is possible to replace slums with satisfactory housing for low-income families.

An entirely different program inaugurated by the Ford Foundation concentrates on renewal of urban people—the families who live in the "gray areas" of cities. Grants have been made to 41 slum schools as focal points for projects designed to improve the educational and employment opportunities of disadvantaged groups. The underlying basis of the experiment is the conviction that social planning must accompany physical planning.

The problems of substandard housing, health, and sanitation, school dropouts, unemployment and crime are all so closely related to each other and of such tremendous magnitude that now, for the first time, a Federal antipoverty program has been devised to deal with them in a comprehensive manner.

URBAN RENEWAL'S ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Urban renewal has instilled new life in American cities from coast to coast. In the heart of Boston, which was as bad as if not worse off than Philadelphia, a multimillion-dollar Government center of Federal, State, and private office buildings is replacing a 60-acre slumdom.

An insurance building resembling a tall boat in drydock is the eyecatcher of Hartford's Constitution Plaza built on reclaimed land alongside the Connecticut River.

One of the most amazing transformations is Pittsburgh's Golden Triangle—a family of sleek skyscrapers occupying what formerly looked like the junkyard of a steel mill at the source of the Ohio River.

Cleveland's Erieview Plaza Building is the showpiece of a quarter-billion-dollar renewal complex capitalizing on the city's vast lakescape.

In like manner, St. Louis is making the best of its Mississippi River waterfront formerly dominated by weatherbeaten warehouses. A 630-foot Gateway Arch, symbolic of westward expansion also symbolizes the city's urban modernization.

San Francisco's Golden Gateway apartment-townhouse project and the half-billion-dollar Century City in Los Angeles are among the outstanding renewal developments on the west coast.

In all of these cities as well as in Baltimore, Norfolk, Nashville, Minneapolis, and many others the stamp of urban renewal is the vastly improved appearance of their downtown business districts. Gone are the solid rows of ancient buildings with dirty faces. The new center-city look sports more open space, more glass, more class.

One of the best ways to strengthen the economic base of a city is to spruce it up with modern architecture, utilizing new building materials and new ideas as reflected in the handiwork of numerous urban renewal re-creations. This stimulates new private investment, attracts new industries, keeps some of the older ones that are flirting with the idea of moving elsewhere. An old-line Philadelphia firm of considerable size and prestige that had been "looking around" joined the renaissance with a magnificent structure of its own. Urban renewal has far-reaching generative effects.

In reply to a critic bemoaning urban renewal's burden on the city treasury, William Rafsky, a leader in the Philadelphia program, points out that "civic improvement programs have resulted in an increase in assessments, reversing a trend of declining real estate values" and that "they have made possible civic services with no recent tax increase."

Urban renewal adds immeasurably to the amenities of urban living in such developments as Lincoln Center, the Golden Triangle, and the Golden Gate. With the continuing concentration of population in metropolitan areas there is a growing need for more cultural facilities. Moreover, the variety and quality of such facilities play an important role in attracting industries with large complements of scientific and research personnel.

In former generations, cities took great pride in citing their rates of population growth from one census enumeration to another. They seemed to be oblivious to the accumulation of problems generated by the very process of growth until conditions became intolerably acute. Some of the worst aspects of urban living are now being remedied with federally aided renewal efforts planned and executed by local agencies. Much of the criticism of urban renewal is based upon mistakes made in the early years of the program, and urban renewal frequently gets blamed for things outside its jurisdiction—such as property condemnation for construction of highways and other improvements. This is not to say that urban renewal has achieved perfection, but the program is making a commendable contribution toward better urban living. "In our urban areas," said President Johnson, "the central problem today is to protect and restore man's satisfaction in belonging to a community where he can find security and significance."

The Tobacco Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, several years ago, when the successful operation of the tobacco program was questioned, I gave a talk describing the operation of the program, why it is needed, and the distinctions which not only require but also make workable a separate farm program for tobacco. While I said at that time that "increasing yields per acre may make production adjustment through acreage control more difficult as new varieties and cultural methods are adopted," that is not my chief reason for recalling the speech. I do think many parts of that review remain pertinent, and because it may be of interest at this time I ask unanimous consent that my remarks of August 30, 1957, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TOBACCO PROGRAM: WHY IT IS NEEDED—HOW IT IS WORKING

(By Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, of Kentucky)

The welfare of my State, which is an agricultural State, rests very largely on the productivity and economic well-being of her farmers. Most of these farmers raise tobacco—for Kentucky is one of the great tobacco States, and supplies high quality burley, as well as Dark-Fired and Dark Air-cured tobaccos, to the entire world. The price of tobacco is a matter of vital concern to some 200,000 rural Kentucky families, because it directly affects their income, their standard of living, and their future opportunities.

That price is determined, not alone by the well-established demand for quality cigarette tobaccos, but also by the effective operation of the production control, or marketing quota, program for tobacco—through which growers cooperate with their Department of Agriculture to maintain a balanced supply in line with that demand. The necessity of keeping supply and demand in balance, in order to avoid ruinous price fluctuations, is generally recognized—as is the function of Government in providing for farmers the legislative and administrative means to do this job.

In maintaining stable supplies through production control—when this course is chosen by two-thirds of the farmers—our tobacco program also appropriately provides for price supports in order to safeguard individual farmers against unnecessary loss. This is not a subsidy. I want to make that clear from the outset. It is not a special benefit or a giveaway. Price support is simply a tool—in the case of tobacco, it is a loan which is repaid—in our production-control kit. In this tobacco production-adjustment program, price support does two things: First, it makes possible the adjustments in the total supply, which are achieved over several crop years, by stabilizing prices during the period in which these adjustments are being made. Second, it extends equal price protection to all farmers contributing to the production-control effort.

While the tobacco price-support and production-control program is in several respects similar to our programs for the other basic commodities, it is in many respects unique—in its design, operation, and results. And although the tobacco program has been an outstanding success among all our farm programs, I believe it is neither well understood nor as widely appreciated, at least in areas of the United States which do not produce tobacco, as it deserves to be.

For example, it has been said on the floor of the Senate that under this program the growing of tobacco is subsidized by the Government, and by taxpayers. A number of people may be under that mistaken impression, for I have also seen it expressed in newspapers and magazines. On the other hand, I understand that officials of the Department of Agriculture have sometimes been criticized because their other price-support or production-control efforts are not as successful as the tobacco program. That may not be entirely fair either, because each commodity is different and has its own special problems; what works for one may not work at all for another. Even in the Department of Agriculture, however, the merits of the tobacco program occasionally seem to be overlooked, or may not always be fully appreciated.

I hope we can bring about a better understanding of this program, and obtain for it the broader appreciation it deserves—not only among tobaccomen, but among all who are interested in farm problems, programs, and policies. I hope that I can contribute something to that understanding by describing today some of the basic reasons why a separate and distinct program is required for tobacco, and by showing how our present program makes good use of those characteristics which set tobacco apart in a class by itself.

Although I will discuss the program in the light of the most recent proposal to eliminate fixed 90-percent support for tobacco, the facts I expect to point out may apply with equal force to questions which may arise in the future, as they have in the past.

DISCRETIONARY PRICE SUPPORT HAS BEEN PROPOSED FOR TOBACCO

The Secretary of Agriculture recently recommended to the Congress a new approach to the farm problem. He said that production control is impractical, and that present laws governing acreage allotments and price supports are obsolete. He asked for major changes in the different price-support programs for the six basic farm commodities—corn, wheat, cotton, tobacco, peanuts, and rice.

These programs, of course, play a central role in our efforts to protect, stabilize, and increase farm income so that farmers may share more fully in, and contribute more effectively to, the general prosperity and economic welfare of our country. They deal, however, with a wide variety of complex problems, many of which have proved difficult to solve, and which, therefore, are the subject of continuing attention and effort by the Congress, the executive branch, and by those most concerned—the farmers themselves.

After appearing before both the Senate and the House Committees on Agriculture, Secretary Benson laid his specific legislative recommendation on this subject before the chairman of the House committee on May 28. I am expressing my views at this time on this matter, as it affects tobacco growers, because I am convinced that that proposal would, if adopted, seriously threaten or destroy our tobacco program.

The official departmental proposal is primarily a request for much greater, and discretionary, flexibility—from 0 to 90 percent, or as a second choice from 60 to 90 percent of parity—in the price-support levels of the basic crops already under flexible support formulas. Now, I have the highest respect for the Secretary of Agriculture, and for his integrity in seeking overall solutions which will be fair and helpful to farmers, and which will benefit the country as a whole. I realize that he is faced with serious problems of continuing surplus production in some of the commodities for which strict production controls may not be desirable or practical—a responsibility which Congress, and agriculture itself, shares.

Included also in the Department's request, however, was tobacco—which has a distinct program of its own, for reasons I believe I can show are sound, and which is not a flexible support crop. As far as tobacco farmers are concerned, the idea of abandoning 90 percent support is a drastic proposal which is not justified by today's needs or by the record of performance made by that program.

I see no reason to compound our farm problems by opening the door to controversy over abandoning a program which has proved workable, effective, popular, economical, and fair to all segments of the industry and to the Nation as a whole.

TOBACCO PROGRAM—AND TOBACCO ITSELF—IS IN A CLASS BY ITSELF

In supporting this view, I will not take time to review the history and development of the tobacco program, although that history is most enlightening and offers us many lessons which we can study with profit today. It is enough to say that our present program rests squarely on that long history—which goes back 50 years to the days of the night riders in Kentucky, and over 300 years to the first crop control measures in the New World, taken at a time when severe depression in the tobacco areas already walked hand in hand with overproduction. (In 1639 the Province of Virginia enacted a tobacco production adjustment law.)

The tobacco program is distinctive not only in its historical origins, which proved in violence the need for production and mar-

keting controls long before such measures were adopted generally. It is also distinctive in the justifiable confidence which growers have placed in their program, and in the diligence they have exercised to keep that program sound. It is distinctive today as the one program with fixed supports, at 90 percent of parity, and established by law, and which, through effective production controls has made that support level work—to the advantage of growers, the Federal Government, and the taxpayer.

This is not to imply that tobacco has won a favored position to which it is not fully entitled, or at the expense of other commodities. That is not true. On the contrary, while billions have been spent in honest efforts to solve the problems of other commodities, and those of a lagging farm economy in general, the tobacco farmer has held the line and stuck to his program of balancing supply with demand.

Neither is it to imply that this program is necessary suited to other commodities. They have their own characteristics and particular problems. The only question involved here is whether or not a large group of over three-quarters of a million farmers, working together, is entitled to the help and assistance of their Government in carrying out and administering the program of their choice so long as they keep that program on a reasonably sound and equitable basis. My answer to this question is that their performance in good faith entitles tobacco growers to the continuation of their present program.

We have this distinct tobacco program today simply because the production, marketing and consumption of tobacco itself is in many ways unique. It therefore requires a different price support and production control program.

I would like to discuss now those characteristics which make tobacco different—which both require a separate program for it, and make that program workable. This fact has received too little attention: that the unique nature of tobacco not only creates special problems, but has also given us the solution to those problems. This coin has two sides. When we turn over the challenge we find opportunity—an opportunity which tobacco growers seized years ago, and which must not arbitrarily be taken from them.

I. PRODUCTION DIFFERENCES

First, as to its production, tobacco is a high-labor crop. It requires some 410 man-hours of labor to raise an acre of burley. That compares to approximately 81 man-hours for an acre of cotton, 11 man-hours for corn, and 4 for wheat—where, of course, a man may produce on 100 times as many acres.

Most of these long hours of labor represent hard, backbreaking toil. It takes a full year to produce an acre of burley tobacco. In fact, because seedbeds are often burned, steamed or chemically treated in the fall, before the crop is sold, the tobacco farmer's year may be 13 months long.

The seedbed is ordinarily sown in January or February. The young plants are carefully nurtured under canvas, and are transplanted when the ground warms up and the weather is right. In the summer months, the tobacco is cultivated a number of times, wormed by hand or sprayed, topped, suckered, and perhaps primed. Then it is cut, hung in the barn, cured, stripped, sorted into grades and tied in hands—and finally sold just in time to prepare the seedbed for the next crop. Each of these operations, and the many others involved, are done by hand. Each requires careful management and attention. Successful tobacco culture is an acquired art—as well as a skill based on years of experience.

At every step of the way, the tobacco grower is beset by disease, pests, and capricious weather. Having finally learned to control to some extent the additional vagaries of his markets, the tobacco farmer feels that a reasonably stable price structure is indispensable to his efforts, and is his just due.

In terms of his special need for effective price supports, this high-labor requirement means that when the four or five baskets of burley produced on an acre of our tobacco land are set out for sale on the warehouse floor, a year of the farmer's toil, hope and fears is sold at auction. Typically, tobacco is this farmer's major cash crop—his primary source of income. Our growers must depend, then, to an unusual degree on their price-support program.

This mutual dependence of growers on their program has, however, served to encourage and develop that spirit of cooperation and sense of responsibility which contribute so much to the success of the tobacco program. In the practical operation of that program, tobaccogrowers, and representatives of the trade as well, join together to resolve their problems in a way that is fair to all, and that is in the best interests of their industry and its individual members.

Second, tobacco production is not mechanized. For example, no machine has been developed to harvest the delicate tobacco leaves—which are as perishable as green garden vegetables until they are cured.

Because tobacco culture is unsuited to mechanization, and production has not been mechanized, we know that the second acre of tobacco costs the farmer as much to raise as the first. For many crops, it may be true that production per farmworker has doubled in the last 15 years—thus creating a "new dimension in farm policy" in these areas. Contrary to the general trend, however, and because of increased quality requirements, raising an acre of tobacco requires more labor today than it did 15 years ago. (Table I.)

The belief that the "technological revolution" in agriculture as a whole makes possible, through increased mechanization, sufficiently lower costs on added units of production to more than offset the lower average price received does not apply in the case of tobacco. Nearly every grower would like to increase his tobacco acreage, of course—but not when he knows that the price he receives would drop, while his hours of labor and cost per unit of production would remain about the same.

This basic difference in production methods, which sets tobacco apart from the trend in much of agriculture, does, however, simplify the issue as to what is a proper level of price support for this crop. There is little question about the level of prices required to assure tobacco farmers a fair return for their labor. Tobacco farmers, large and small, are generally agreed that 90 percent of parity provides them a decent minimum wage floor (although less than hourly rates for common labor), and that a lower price would not be accompanied by a compensating increase in sales and decrease in labor requirements.

Third, tobacco is an intensive crop. For this reason, it is well suited to our small family farms, in hilly country, and on soils where other crops may not do so well, as well as on superlative soil such as we have in the Kentucky bluegrass.

The average size burley allotment in my State last year was 1.37 acres. However, that acre and a third produced over a ton of high-quality cigarette tobacco—worth $1,400 to the Kentucky farmer who sold it on last December's market. That typical Kentucky patch of tobacco, in fact, produced burley for 2 million cigarettes, or 10,000 cartons.

Only 2 percent of all burley allotments are larger than 5 acres; 90 percent are smaller than 2 acres; and one-fourth are half an acre or less (table II).

Because high value of production is associated with these small plots, however, and because our present program works, hundreds of thousands of modest family-type farms are able to depend on their tobacco allotment as a major source of income. For example, 300,939 farmers have burley allotments this year, of which 146,611 are in Kentucky. Including Dark-fired and Dark Aircured as well as burley, there are 174,579 tobacco allotments in Kentucky.

The continued progress and growth of Kentucky agriculture rests, then, to a large degree, on our tobacco price support program. Most of the rural families in my State live on small farms, and have few alternative sources of income. These farms, cultivated intensively rather than extensively, do not have the broad fields of level, tillable acreage suited to large-scale crop production with heavy equipment and self-propelled machinery. Tobacco is and must be their main cash crop. In fact, at least 3 out of 4 farms in my State raise tobacco, and some 200,000 rural Kentucky families depend on tobacco for a substantial or major portion of their income.

These are the men who know tobacco best—and who produce the world's finest tobacco. I do not believe they will agree that it is worth less than parity, or that their years of experience and months of toil should be sold cheaper.

In terms of workable production controls, however, this intensive land use means that tobacco can well afford the strict measurement and compliance checking we now have, the cost of which is less than one-fourth of 1 percent of the crops' value. Small allotments having a high dollar value of production make accurate measurement practical and economical. So again we find reasons in the nature of tobacco culture itself which justify a distinctive production control and price support program.

Fourth, tobacco is a highly specialized regional crop. Burley and Flue-cured tobacco—the major cigarette types—accounted for 90 percent of last year's billion-dollar tobacco crop. Kentucky produced two-thirds (66.2 percent) of the burley, North Carolina two-thirds (67.6 percent) of the Flue-cured tobacco.

In my own State, tobacco is a quarter-billion-dollar crop, and produces 43 percent of Kentucky's cash income from farm products sold. In the great Bright leaf State of North Carolina, over half the farm income comes from tobacco. Nine States raise most of our tobacco, and within those States there are highly concentrated areas specializing in the various qualities of tobacco, of which there are 26 distinct domestic types and 1,466 grades (table III.)

This concentration is a natural historical consequence of tobacco's peculiar dependence on soils and climate. Identical seed planted in adjoining counties may produce two different types of tobacco. Each year's weather may turn out a markedly different tobacco crop in the same area. Under identical weather conditions, variations in soil from farm to neighbor's farm result in noticeably different qualities. Moreover, each stalk of burley tobacco produces several grades from tips (until recently worth least) to trash (customarily worth much more)—and I have not mentioned differences resulting from cultural and curing practices.

This complex array of qualities, which depends on such a variety of closely related factors, is highly important to our tobacco trade and to our modern tobacco industry. It marks a difference in product which makes clear, I believe, tobacco's need for a special program of its own. It is local specializatrum of products—from heavy, smoke "black" tobaccos to the mild, bright, golden leaf.

This local specialization, moreover, contributes greatly to the effectiveness of our tobacco program. Perhaps in no other crop would rigid allotments based on historical production be more justifiable, nor could historical production patterns be continued more equitably.

I do not say that our tobacco program allows complete freedom of enterprise, but the equity of historically based production patterns is well established and widely accepted. Tobacco producers do feel that this program, in which they join together in a cooperative effort to comply with the law of supply and demand, provides them essential freedom in the marketplace to sell their product for what it is worth.

II. MARKETING DIFFERENCES

Marketing differences which require a separate and distinct price-support and production control program for tobacco, and which also make the present program workable, are perhaps even more significant than the production differences.

My fifth point, therefore, is that all our farmers' tobacco is channeled exclusively through central markets. None is kept on farms. Each selling season farmers must take the entire crop of cigarette tobacco to the auction warehouses—scene of the familiar "tobacco chant."

Our system of cooperative marketings for tobacco was developed after years of trial and error and travail. It works well. It seeks to provide uniform sales conditions, to insure that buyers are available for all the tobacco offered, and that farmers are protected from sharp seasonal fluctuations in price through the option which each may exercise of selling at the price bid or else having his baskets of tobacco delivered to the "pool" under the price-support program.

This auction warehouse system, operating in conjunction with the pools, is the central mechanism around which our successful tobacco program is organized. It offers distinct advantages in the price support operations of that program. For example, it makes possible a definite floor, not only for the tobacco crop as a whole, but for each farmer's individual lots of tobacco.

Under this plan, it has not been necessary for the Government to purchase large surpluses, as with some other crops. The plan is also fair to the farmer, in that he is the direct beneficiary of the price-support effort—receiving immediately 90 percent of parity in cash, and a dividend on any amount over that for which the tobacco is later sold. This whole operation is so sensible, in fact, that it is handled without loss by the farmers' marketing cooperatives under contract with the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Our central marketing system also makes practical and workable the realistic production controls required for no-loss operation of 90-percent supports, because it permits accurate identification of the source of all tobacco sold. In addition, it makes conveniently available the data for accurate market reports on the amounts and prices of the various graders sold.

The sixth difference which sets tobacco apart, and requires a separate program for it, is the limited field of buyers for this crop. As I pointed out when I sponsored the amendment first establishing in law 90 percent of parity as a separate provision for tobacco, the major buyers competing for the tobacco offered by three-quarters of a million farmers can be counted on the fingers of both hands. Six companies produce 99 percent of the cigarettes, and three of these account for 73 percent (table IV).

This is a situation unique in agricultural marketing as far as I know. Usually less than half a dozen major buyers are represented on any auction floor. These buyers can scarcely fail to be familiar with each other's needs and practices. A farmer who trucked his crop of tobacco 50 miles to the warehouse was at the mercy of buyers before the protection offered by this fixed support floor was inaugurated.

I consider my speech on this subject, made in the Senate on June 17, 1948, still to be a correct statement. That was during the debate on the long-range agricultural program, which required a change from fixed 90-percent supports to flexible supports down to 60 percent of parity on all basic commodities, including tobacco. At that time the Senate adopted my amendment preserving 90-percent support for tobacco, it was written into the law, and this separate provision for tobacco has been retained through every change made in our farm programs since that time. I quote from that speech:

"It is my contention, and one which I believe is supported by the facts, that the unusual conditions under which tobacco is produced and marketed, when coupled with the usually limited field of buyers, operate to give a dominant bargaining position to the buyers and to deprive the producer of tobacco of a free market, in the sense that a market is enjoyed by the producers of other agricultural commodities. In this limited market, the buyer pays a price which is not necessarily or always related to the law of supply and demand, but is fixed by the maximum amount the buyers must pay to get the tobacco, which in reality is the support price. For this reason the support price should remain fixed at 90 percent of parity."

As I pointed out 9 years ago, and I quote: "The tobacco farmer must take his crop to the place where the representative of the great tobacco manufacturers will come to buy his crop. Unless the representatives are there, the tobacco farmer cannot sell his tobacco. The farmer who has spent a year in backbreaking toil to produce a crop of tobacco, which is his cash crop and his principal source of income, knows that he must sell his tobacco to one of the few buyers, or else lose his years' labor. Can it be doubted that the buyers know that the farmer must sell or lose the work of a year?"

At that time, I offered the opinion, "which is one shared by my constituents, who know every phase of tobacco growing, buying, and selling, that the Federal Government offers through its parity and support-price program the only substantial assurance the tobacco growers have that they will receive a reasonable price for their product."

A seventh distinction, which operates to make our tobacco loan program among the most effective of farm price-support efforts, relates to the excellent storage qualities of tobacco. Cured tobacco, redried and compressed into 1,000-pound hogsheads, is virtually nonperishable, thus reducing the risk of holding loan stocks several years for improved markets. In fact, tobacco increases in value as it is aged. This enhanced value in itself often covers storage and interest charges on loan stocks held for up to 2 to 4 years.

Without a fixed level of support, on the other hand, this very storability would operate to the farmers' disadvantage—as it did for the hundred years when 1 year of good prices was followed by 2 or 3 years of starvation prices. In the absence of a strong support program, tobacco farmers are placed in double jeopardy; first, from lower prices caused by a year of unexpected abundance, and second, from reduced production or lower prices in later years as these hogsheads are moved from storage into trade. Producers of perishable crops, at least, are exposed to economic loss only once, and need make but a single adjustment.

It may be argued that flexible supports are desirable for semiperishable commodities, where old stocks must be moved or spoil, or where adjustments must reflect current consumption at all times. But, in tobacco, the very possibility of lowering supports could tend to depress prices. Progressively lowered support prices would, of course, soon destroy the tobacco program, and would result in huge losses in the process.

III. CONSUMPTION DIFFERENCES

An eighth and very important consideration is that there are no alternative uses for our tobacco. Most farm products have a number of uses, and can compete in a wide variety of markets at different price levels; many in fact must take into account these changing relationships. Again it may be argued in the case of some other crops that flexible supports will enable these commodities to seek out alternative uses and markets, or will encourage industrial utilization of farm products. Tobacco has no such opportunity.

This lack of alternative uses for tobacco clearly shows the need for controlling production and supplies in line with the demand for cigarette tobaccos. Burley and Fluecured growers know that they are completely dependent on this single-use market, that at best they can profitably sell only as much tobacco as we smoke.

On the other hand, the limited use for tobacco provides a much clearer picture of the demand-supply situation than most commodities enjoy. The question of how much tobacco is needed is argued within relatively close limits, and is understood by farmers. They can then support, and do support, a program which meets these realities, and which gives each of them a fair share of the market at a fair price. So once more a special problem in tobacco contributes to the practical workability of our present program.

My ninth point concerns the relatively inelastic consumer demand for tobacco. Agricultural economists have shown, and it is historically true, that the price farmers receive for their leaf bears little or no relation to that consumer demand. The supply of tobacco, of course, almost wholly determines prices farmers receive, and realistic recognition of this fact has led growers to acceptance of progressively more effective production controls.

Burley consumption, in turn, may depend on a number of factors, but the price paid to the farmer is not a major one—because his percentage of the retail sales price is so small. These two facts taken together—that consumer demand plays a minor role in determining the farmer's price, and that his price scarcely affects consumption of tobacco—make an effective, stable price-support program essential if tobacco growers are to share equitably in the fruit of their labor. In addition, they remove from economic controversy the desirability of 90-percent support for this commodity.

I would like to point out here why the price farmers get for their tobacco has little or no effect on domestic sales of cigarettes. In a pound of manufactured tobacco, worth $3.45 at retail last year, Federal and State excise taxes account for $1.37, or 40 percent; manufacturing and distribution margins are $1.53 or 44 percent, and the farmers' end is 55 cents or 16 percent. For the tobacco in a 25-cent pack of cigarettes, the farmer receives about 3½ cents. Therefore, a 10-percent drop in farmers' prices would save only 3 mills on the cost of a pack of cigarettes.

I believe American consumers are willing and able to pay the farmer this very reasonable price for his tobacco. I might add that whereas farmers generally receive 40 percent of the consumer dollar—and we are concerned about such a low share—tobacco farmers receive less than half that.

As I understand the reasoning behind the Secretary's present proposals for all the basic crops, a lower support price is supposed to stimulate increased consumption and sales so that the price drop will be offset, or more than offset, by an increase in farmers' sales,

and therefore an increase in their gross income or net income. This may be true in the case of other farm commodities, and I know that in manufacturing, for example, the greatly increased sales volume which may result from small reductions in price has played a very important part in our economic development.

However, because the consumer demand for tobacco is relatively inelastic in the first place, and because prices paid farmers are scarcely reflected in the retail price of cigarettes in the second place, I do not believe that the Secretary's argument would apply in the case of tobacco.

It is true that "production times price equals income," but the experience of tobacco growers is that small increases in production can cause sharp decreases in price, and in their income—and that prices continue to fall far faster than any increase in poundage sold can possibly make up.

IV. HOW THE TOBACCO PROGRAM HAS WORKED FOR THE GOVERNMENT

A 10th difference is that, alone among our different price-support operations for nonperishable commodities, the tobacco program does not result in burdensome Government-owned stocks. As a matter of fact, the Commodity Credit Corporation does not now own a pound of tobacco—and has not had a pound of cigarette tobacco in its inventory since World War II, when it help supply our Allies. CCC neither has to buy tobacco in the open market, nor under purchase agreements—nor has it been necessary for CCC to take title to any loan tobacco in recent years. In other words, tobacco is not subsidized. The tobacco price support program has, in fact, made several million dollars in interest profits on CCC loans.

This remarkable record must be credited to the farmers who have made the sacrifices necessary to keep their part of the bargain in this program. The Government can do no less than to keep its part of the bargain and maintain 90 percent support prices so long as growers continue to demonstrate their willingness to keep this program sound.

The distinctive machinery for this efficient and economical program is to be found in the operations and responsibilities of the tobacco pools, or grower cooperatives, which undertake to sell loan stocks of tobacco at a profit to the farmer over the 90-percent rate, and which over the long run have succeeded in doing so. These pools may not be wholly perfect, but they are a very important part of a system which has dealt with difficult problems with outstanding success. Several of them predate our Government programs by a number of years, and their experience and influence are generally recognized.

Our tobacco loan program actually operates just as the name implies it should. It is expected that the tobacco held as the security for those loans will be advantageously merchandised at private sale, and that the money advanced will then be repaid to the Government in full. It has worked this way with conspicuous success. In the 11 years since the war, for example, CCC has loaned $1½ billion to the tobacco pools to cover the amounts advanced to farmers. Nearly a billion dollars of that has been repaid by these pools, with interest, and the remainder is secured by current stocks of tobacco. I submit that this is an outstanding record for any Government loan program particularly on a farm commodity. (Table V.)

I will not take time to mention here a number of less striking differences in the operation of our tobacco program and the legislation which governs it, except to say that tobacco farmers, their leaders and their representatives in Congress, have generally resisted a number of special or fringe benefits enjoyed by other commodities. They have done so for the sole reason that they did not want in any way to jeopardize their right and claim to fixed 90-percent supports.

A final difference between tobacco and other farm commodities is that it is the only one on which excise taxes are imposed.

While the operation of our price support program for tobacco has not cost the Government anything, tobacco has brought immense revenues to local, State, and Federal Governments. This fact alone merits the continuation of a tobacco program which insures stable prices and balance supplies.

Each year Federal and State excise tax receipts from tobacco far exceed farmers' cash receipts for tobacco, as the chart from the cover of the March Tobacco Situation shows. The Federal excise tax on tobacco returned $1,639 million to the Government last year. States received $513 million from their own excise taxes. Municipalities benefited by substantial sums. In addition, import duties on tobacco amounted to $19 million last year. While not levied with a view toward aiding farmers, these considerations ought to at least obtain for tobacco farmers a sympathetic attitude toward their problems and needs.

These annual receipts of over $2 billion in Federal and State revenues from the growers' efforts are about double the return to the growers themselves. That relationship is well illustrated by the blue stamp of a rather glum DeWitt Clinton which seals every pack of cigarettes. The stamp is worth 8 cents to Uncle Sam. The grower gets 3½ cents for the tobacco within.

This high-revenue-producing capacity and special contribution sets tobacco apart, in a separate class by itself. As my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Florida, stated on this floor 2 years ago: "It is a highly important matter to the Federal Government, therefore, that tobacco growers shall prosper, and that there shall be a sustained abundant level of tobacco production as free as possible from either overproduction or underproduction."

It may be pertinent to point out here that the Federal tax alone produced by tobacco since 1932 ($25 billion) would pay twice over for the entire cost to the United States of the farm price-support and farm-income stabilization programs, broadly interpreted, for all commodities, basic and nonbasic, in the last 25 years. This includes CCC nonrecourse loan, purchase, and payment programs; the National Wool Act; the International Wheat Agreement; donations of commodities to other nations; Public Law 480 sales for foreign currencies; school lunch and other welfare distribution; the Sugar Act; Federal crop insurance; acreage allotment payments under the ACP program from 1937 to 1944; parity payments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; and the programs under the triple A of 1933.

V. HOW THE TOBACCO PROGRAM HAS WORKED FOR TAXPAYERS

In commenting for a moment on how the present tobacco program has worked for taxpayers and consumers, I would like to refer to the figures accompanying the Secretary's well-known letter of May 2 to Senator ELLENDER, chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture. It was the substance of this letter which Secretary Benson shortly thereafter embodied in his legislative proposals for tobacco as well as the other basic crops, and which he sent to the House Committee on Agriculture on May 28.

These figures indicate that in the last 25 years, through June 30, 1956, the "net realized cost of programs primarily for the stabilization of farm prices and farm income" was $11.8 billion. Tobacco's share of that amount was $105.3 million, according to the table on page 7—or less than 1 percent of the total, charged to the Nation's fourth largest field crop produced by 11 percent of her farms. It is a modest figure when compared to the others on that page, and in saying this I do not imply that the other commodities and other farmers do not fully deserve the help we have tried to give them.

I would like to point out, moreover, that the great bulk of this money was spent for soil conserving activities in the 1930's. Only the figure "3" to the right of the decimal in this $105.3 million amount reflects CCC losses on tobacco price-support operations. That was the cumulative figure, over all the years of the tobacco programs, through June 1956. Since that time the loss has been reduced as of May 31 of this year to only $10,924—or eliminated for all practical purposes. Furthermore, interest income on CCC loans is not shown in this table—possibly because tobacco is the only commodity which produces an interest profit. Since 1948 and before, therefore, the entire tobacco price-support program has operated without loss—winning for it an especially unique place in our farm price support operations.

I believe this analysis shows how well the tobacco program has served taxpayers as well as farmers, and will continue to serve them in the future. All our people, in cities and towns as well as on farms, may well consider it the most successful of all our farm programs—in their own and their neighbor's interest.

One other point in the Department's May 2 statement calls for comment. That is, that "about two-thirds of all producers are at the minimum (allotment for burley) and thus sealed off from any visible relationship between the level of their price support and the size of their allotment." That is not true. As I have shown, in table II, only one-fourth of the burley allotments are at the minimum of five-tenths of 1 acre or under.

Finally, I would like to review what our tobacco program has meant to farmers.

VI. HOW THE TOBACCO PROGRAM HAS WORKED FOR FARMERS

Perhaps the most eloquent testimony on what farmers think of their tobacco program is found in the referendum votes. In the elections held since 1948, burley and Fluecured growers have consistently cast ballots approving marketing quotas by between 95 and 98 percent. Their interest in these elections is real, because the tobacco program is vital to their welfare.

In April 1955, for example, 74 percent of the eligible burley voters came out to vote. That was the year our growers were faced with the hard decision to cut their allotments by 25 percent, reduce minimum allotments from seven-tenths to five-tenths acre, increase the penalty on excess or "red card" tobacco from 50 to 75 percent, and close the door to establishing allotment history by growing penalty tobacco. The vote was in favor of the program—by 96 percent. That is quite a plurality and quite a turnout at the polls for any election. In all the history of our farm programs, I can think of no more dramatic demonstration than this of the willingness of a group of farmers to make the sacrifices which are sometimes necessary to keep their program sound.

A brief glance at the dollar-and-cent figures on farm prices and income over the years will show what this program has meant to tobacco farmers in pocketbook terms. At the turn of the century Kentucky farmers could sell their tobacco for only 4 cents a pound. Farmers were desperate—literally up in arms—but began then to organize for the long search for a solution to their problems. In 1910–14, a stable period for agriculture generally, burley was worth 9 cents, and the crop brought farmers barely $20 million.

Conditions had not improved a great deal by 1930–34, when representatives of growers began working with the Department of Agriculture on what was to evolve into our present tobacco program. Fifteen years later, 1945–49, burley prices were 3½ times higher—

and the crop was worth six times as much to farmers—a quarter of a billion dollars instead of $40 million. Even in terms of "real" dollars, burley prices had nearly doubled, and larger but controlled crops tripled farmers' purchasing power from their burley.

These gains have been maintained and improved under peacetime operation of our postwar program. Last year the burley crop sold for the highest prices on record—averaging 63.5 cents a pound for a crop which returned $322 million to farmers.

Farmers are selling their 1957 Flue-cured crops in the Carolinas today, and marketing has been finished in the Georgia-Florida belt. This crop, too, is bringing record prices—a dramatic change from the situation last year when Flue-cured supplies threatened to get out of hand, and which must be credited to a realistic cut in allotments, prompt measures to eliminate less desirable varieties, and participation in the soil bank. Burley growers, who cure their crop more slowly by natural air drying and market it later in the year, are looking forward to another favorable selling season on their 1957 crop, now being housed in their tobacco barns.

I think this record of increased crop values and better tobacco prices clearly shows what our tobacco program, using the tools of 90 percent support and production control to match, has meant, and can continue to mean, to farmers (table VI).

CONCLUSION

I do not say tobacco farmers have no problems today. We do have some problems in tobacco—as in all other phases of agriculture with which I am familiar. We need to maintain and increase our export sales—which account for 6 percent of the burley market and a larger portion of the market for other tobaccos. Increasing yields per acre may make production adjustment through acreage control more difficult as new varieties and cultural methods are adopted. The shift to filter cigarettes is changing consumption patterns, and new manufacturing methods are beginning to be used.

But these are all problems which can be handled, and should be handled, within the framework of our present program—using the successful techniques already developed where these are applicable, and taking full advantage of the hard lessons of the past. In the past we have been able to meet problems at least as serious as these—within this framework. There is no need now to tear down the house built so painstakingly over many years.

I do not say that the tobacco program is perfect. Minor modifications in it have been made from time to time—without disturbing the foundation of 90 percent support on which it is erected—and may need to be made in the future. I do not say that it operates without a certain pulling and hauling at times. This is inevitable where a variety of interests are involved, and wherever earnest efforts are made to realistically limit production so that farmers may obtain fair prices without sibsidies. My colleagues and my friends know that I have helped work out these problems on many occasions.

I do say that tobacco farmers have learned how to work with and through the elemental forces of supply and demand, instead of being crushed by these forces. They have shown that by controlling production to match the demand they can achieve stabilized prices at an acceptable level without Government subsidy. They have made 90 percent-of-parity supports work—without loss to either growers or taxpayers.

In view of the latest proposal to Congress to abondon 90-percent support for tobacco, it seemed to me appropriate and timely to lay the facts in this matter before the Senate. It may well be that the Department of Agriculture, in drawing up a general, or blanket recommendation for all the basic commodities, simply failed to take into account the special nature and particular needs of tobacco—or the specific advantages offered by the present tobacco program. If that is the case, as I believe it to be, I trust the Department will not press its recommendation as applied to tobacco. In any event, I have no fear that the Congress would adopt such a proposal—which would threaten the livelihood of three-quarters of a million farm families.

I oppose lowering supports for tobacco. I am confident that my colleagues from the tobacco States take the same position, and will join me in opposing any move to destroy the present tobacco program. Furthermore, I believe it is plain to anyone who understands the problem that our tobacco program needs to be continued.

My purpose here today was to analyze this problem, to set out the basic reasons which require a distinct and separate price support and production control program for tobacco, and to show how the unique character of tobacco production, marketing, and consumption also contributes to making our present program effective and workable. It seemed to me worthwhile to enumerate those characteristics which make tobacco different, and the consequences which must follow from them, and I hope this appraisal will prove helpful.

Thanks to the joint efforts over many years of a great many conscientious and devoted people, and to the active cooperation of tobacco farmers everywhere, the tobacco program has been conspicuously successful. I believe it is a basically sound, helpful and essential part of our total farm program today. I believe it can continue to serve faithfully and well the Burley growers of my State, the rural economy of the South, and hence the general welfare of our country—and do so without placing an undue burden on the Federal Government or the taxpayer.

In closing, I feel I can do no better than to quote the President's agricultural message to the Congress of January 11, 1954. President Eisenhower said at that time that "each farm crop has its own problems, and these problems require specific treatment." And in regard to tobacco, the President stated: "Tobacco farmers have demonstrated their ability to hold production in line with demand at the supported price without loss to the Government. The relatively small acreage of tobacco and the limited areas to which it is adopted have made production control easier than for other crops. The level of support to cooperators is 90 percent of the parity price in any year in which marketing quotas are in effect. It is recommended that the tobacco program be continued in its present form."

I believe those conclusions are still valid, and that that recommendation is as sound today as it was 3½ years ago.

TABLE I.—*Labor used in production of field crops*

	1940–44 (hours)	1955 (hours)	Percentage more (+) or less (−)
Tobacco:			
Man-hours per acre	436	494	13
Man-hours per 100 pounds	42	34	19
Cotton:			
Man-hours per acre	99	81	18
Man-hours per bale	182	93	49
Wheat:			
Man-hours per acre	7.4	4.3	42
Man-hours per 100 bushels	43	22	49
Corn:			
Man-hours per acre	25.6	11.4	55
Man-hours per 100 bushels	80	28	65

Source: Agricultural Research Service, USDA, June 1957.

TABLE II.—*1957 burley tobacco allotments—Distribution by size; cumulative percentages*

	Kentucky	United States
0.3 acre and under ..... percent	9.3	12.8
0.5 acre and under ..... do	19.6	26.8
0.7 acre and under ..... do	49.6	63.6
1 acre and under ..... do	60.7	73.6
2 acres and under ..... do	82.6	90.0
5 acres and under ..... do	96.7	98.2
Average allotment ..... acres	1.37	1.03

Source: Tobacco Division CSS, USDA, April 1957.

TABLE III.—*Farmers' cash receipts from tobacco—Latest 5-year average; percentage of total for 9 leading States; percentage tobacco contributes to State's cash receipts from sales of farm products*

	Tobacco receipts (million)	Percentage of United States	Percentage of all farm products sold
North Carolina	$491	42.8	52.7
Kentucky	230	20.1	42.4
South Carolina	92	8.0	26.1
Virginia	83	7.2	18.0
Tennessee	73	6.4	15.4
Georgia	66	5.8	10.3
Connecticut	23	2.0	13.4
Maryland	19	1.7	7.6
Florida	22	1.9	3.8
Other tobacco States	48	4.1	1.2
United States	1,147	100.0	3.7

Source: Agricultural Marketing Service, USDA, June 1957.

TABLE IV.—*Cigarette output by companies, 1956*

	Billions of cigarettes	Percent of total
American Tobacco	128.9	30.1
R. J. Reynolds	113.5	26.5
Liggett & Myers	68.4	16.0
Brown & Williamson	50.0	11.7
Phillip Morris	39.7	9.3
P. Lorillard	22.8	5.3
All others	5.1	1.1
Estimated output	428.4	100.0

Source: Harry M. Wooten report, Printers' Ink, Dec. 28, 1956.

TABLE V.—*CCC postwar commodity loans—Net cash outlay to farmers under price support program fiscal years 1947 through 1957*

[Dollar amounts in millions]

	Amount loaned	Amount repaid	Percentage repaid to date	Purchases
All commodities	$19,718.1	$6,065.8	30.8	$6,179.3
Wheat	5,940.4	1,387.8	23.4	442.4
Cotton	5,410.3	1,802.3	33.3	67.7
Corn	3,644.5	653.1	17.9	534.1
Tobacco	1,526.9	945.3	61.9	1.6

Source: Commodity Credit Corporation, USDA.

TABLE VI.—*Burley tobacco prices and crop values, U.S. season average price and value of production, 5-year averages from 1910*

	Price per pound (cents)		Crop value (millions)	
	Actual	Purchasing power	Actual	Purchasing power
1910–14	9.7	24.4	$20.2	$60.5
1915–19	23.5	38.1	65.7	113.4
1920–24	20.4	31.7	55.7	85.8
1925–29	21.9	33.9	57.8	89.4
1930–34	12.8	25.9	41.5	83.4
1935–39	22.2	44.3	67.0	133.3
1940–44	35.4	56.7	148.3	232.4
1945–49	43.8	47.9	247.3	271.5
1950–54	50.6	45.7	303.4	273.2
1955	58.6	52.3	275.2	245.7
1956	63.5	55.7	321.8	282.3

Source: Agricultural Marketing Service, USDA, June 1957. Cols. 3 and 5 adjusted to "real" prices and values by using 1947–49 index of prices paid by farmers for commodities, services, interest, taxes, and wage rates equals 100.

Exclusiveness Hurting GOP, Volpe Asserts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most thoughtful calls to the 13th Annual Republican Women's Conference this year came from Gov. John A. Volpe, of Massachusetts.

Governor Volpe made the vital point that a political party must be inclusive, not exclusive. And he noted that this formula has brought results in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. As a member of three minority groups, the Governor said, he has seen from his own experience the value of appealing to all people.

I think that the Governor's remarks deserve the attention of all thinking Republicans and under unanimous consent I insert the April 4 Washington Post account of his talk in the RECORD:

EXCLUSIVENESS HURTING GOP, VOLPE ASSERTS
(By Kay Roberts)

Gov. John A. Volpe of Massachusetts gave his party, the Republican Party, and his audience, Republican women, a good scolding yesterday for "deadly exclusiveness," and said, in essence, that it is time to shape some things up.

Speaking before the final brunch of the 13th Annual Republican Women's Conference, Volpe charged the GOP with deserting the minority groups that originally made up the party: "farmers, Negroes, Americans of all ethnic groups—French, Poles, Italians, and so forth."

"We sought and took their votes, but we gave them very little recognition," he said. "The Republican Party became the exclusive party—exclusive at the top. We excluded instead of included the minority groups who were in fact the very life blood of our party."

FOR SOMETHING

Himself the son of Italian immigrants and a onetime card-carrying member of the plasterers union, Volpe said that the Republicans must concentrate on bringing ethnic groups and labor back into the party.

They must be shown, he said, "that we care for them and for their problems—that we, the Republican Party today, are for something rather than against everything—that we are for education, for mental health, for highways, for industry, for jobs, for people in all walks of life."

And he added, "first of all we must show that our party is not living in the 19th century and trying to face 20th century problems."

DISUNITY OFFSET

He said that President Johnson carried Massachusetts by 1,236,000 votes last November but that he [Volpe], his running mate and the Republican candidate for attorney general, Edward W. Brooke, a Negro, won by several thousand on the State level.

Disunity of the Republican Party at the national level, he said, was offset at the State level by hard work coupled with a ticket that "was not wrapped up in an exclusive Anglo-Saxon Protestant package."

Volpe described other 1964 races that put Republican representatives of minority groups into office. These he said disrupted the deadly exclusiveness of the Republican Party.

The Late Emmet J. McCormack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on February 24, 1965, the American maritime industry lost one of its greatest men in the passing of my longtime friend, Emmet J. McCormack, cofounder of Moore-McCormack Lines. I should like to call to the attention of the House what his associates at Moore-McCormack Lines had to say about him in their 1964 annual report:

The death on February 24, 1965, of Emmet J. McCormack, cofounder, former chairman of the board and director of Moore-McCormack Lines, Inc., marked the end of a lifetime in shipping.

Mr. McCormack was born in Brooklyn, N.Y., in 1880 of Irish immigrant parents. His boyhood days were spent in the area presently occupied by the company's piers at the foot of 23d Street. After leaving school at the early age of 14, he found gainful employment in various enterprises. He shipped out for a while as a seaman, later retiring to become a deckhand on a towboat. This latter job provided the means for this 25-year-old natural-born salesman to organize his own coal bunkering operation, the Commercial Coal Co. Later he acquired a part interest in a 150-ton salvage boat, which was the beginning of an eventful life in shipping. At the age of 31 he was head of the company that started the Richmond-Brooklyn ferry service.

In 1913, Emmet J. McCormack joined forces with Albert V. Moore and formed the Moore & McCormack Co., Inc., later to become Moore-McCormack Lines, Inc. The blend of their talents, knowledge and experience, coupled with a faith in the future, contributed immeasurably to the success of the company.

Mr. McCormack was cited by King Gustaf VI, of Sweden, with the Royal Order of Vasa, and also was honored by the Government of Brazil which awarded him the Order of the Southern Cross. In addition, he was named honorary mayor of St. Louis, and an honorary citizen of the State of Maryland. He was a former deputy commissioner of the city of New York.

During World War I, Mr. McCormack served as an Overseas Adviser on Transportation to the Chairman of the U.S. Shipping Board, the Navy, and the War Department. He was instrumental in organizing the United States Lines prior to its being acquired by private interests.

He was associated with the Maritime Association of the Port of New York, a director of the New York Dock Co., a member of the American Bureau of Shipping, a member of the Naval Architects and Marine Engineers. He was ex officio chairman of the American Steamship Owners Association, now known as the American Merchant Marine Institute.

In addition to his maritime interests, Mr. McCormack organized the Kingsboro National Bank and was chairman of the board until its merger with the Colonial Trust Co. which is now part of the Meadow Brook National Bank. He was active also in the Democratic Party and served as a delegate to several national conventions.

To those of us who were not fortunate enough to know Mr. McCormack in the days of the *Barnstable*, the *Montara* and the *Saga*, one had only to see the friendly greetings extended to him from all hands on his way to and from his table at India House or the Whitehall Club to understand what his unfailing optimism and warm Irish wit meant to the company in those early days. As one of our directors recently put it "Mac has nothing but friends." As we confront the myriad problems facing the domestic shipping industry, we shall sorely miss his wise counsel.

Goodby to Braceros

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURT L. TALCOTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, a big city newspaper editor can be more provincial than a barefoot country boy when he writes about something he does not understand. An editorial in the Sunday Star of April 4, 1965, entitled "Goodby to Braceros" demonstrates this. A short editorial can include so many inconsistent and misleading statements that it is impossible to answer.

A very few of the misleading statements are mentioned in the following letter which I wrote to the editor of the Evening Star.

This is a most serious and difficult problem that cannot be twitted and passed over with a flippant "goodby."

I ask Congress and the Secretary why Public Law 414 is available to hotel operators, but not to farmers? Unemployed are more willing to learn the service trades than "stoop" labor.

The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 5, 1965.

Mr. NEWBOLD NOYES,
Editor, the Evening Star,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. NOYES: Your editorial "Goodby to Braceros" displays a provincial ignorance of vegetable agriculture and an utter disdain for the real problem of the migrant family.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is replete with testimony that termination of the temporary Public Law 78 was not intended as a termination of the permanent Public Law 414. Growers are not asking Secretary Wirtz to enforce Public Law 78; they, and numerous workers in industries allied with or dependent upon agriculture, are urging the Secretary to legally utilize Public Law 414 to prevent wholesale crop spoilage and unemployment of local domestic workers. You must try to understand the difference.

The problem is appreciated by everyone who lives and works in a vegetable producing area—and not understood by eastern big city dwellers who have never been on a farm and have no idea how artichokes or asparagus grow.

Like you, our Department of Labor is not oriented to the farms or agriculture. City-dwellers enjoy the "chow lines" and banquets, but ignore or neglect the problems of planting, cultivation, harvesting, processing, and distribution of vegetables.

If you had to live only a week with a nomadic farm family (especially observing the sensations and feelings of the innocent children), you might know somewhat of the cruelties you want to perpetuate with the "migrant system." Next to communism and war, the migrant life is the cruelest existence to which we can subject children—truly un-American. The braceros did not "roam"; only the American domestic workers roam. This is a pathetic tragedy which should be discouraged—not encouraged.

For your information and consideration, unskilled farm workers earn more than they can earn at any other job anywhere. Is not the farmer just as entitled to competent, reliable labor as the manufacturer? Should the farmer alone be required to accept the rejects and unemployables from other industries?

Is the California farmer the one to carry the burden of solving the social and environmental problems of Harlem and the big city slums, the economic and planning problems of the West Virginia and Kentucky coal fields, and the educational and social problems of the South?

Admittedly, farm wages, working and living conditions should be improved; but it should also be remembered that the men living in California "farm labor camps" enjoy a better, cleaner bed; more ample and nutritious food; and better washing and laundry facilities than they have at home.

Automation and mechanization of agriculture is speeding ahead—eliminating first the jobs of those who need them most—the low-skilled, local domestic worker.

In yor noble humanitarian mission against the farmer why do you ignore the principal "mass exception to the law"—the wholesale importation of foreign workers to Washington, D.C., for work in restaurants and hotels? Is none of the 4 million unemployed Americans able to do this work? Why do you not advocate that Secretary Wirtz deny Public Law 414 to the hotels? Should not the big city hotel and restaurant operators be required to hire those drawing unemployment checks here in Washington every week—before importing foreign workers? Should not the wages of the hotel worker be increased to entice the unemployed in the Washington, Baltimore, and New York areas to come to work? Why such a different attitude toward farmers than hotel operators? Because the hotels are here and the farms are faraway in California?

Sincerely,

BURT L. TALCOTT,
U. S. Congressman.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965

SPEECH
OF
HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 26, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2362) to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Chairman, this is a crucial time for education in the United States. Some people may ask, why, in view of the economic progress we have been making and our predominant position of world leadership, it is necessary for the Federal Government to now begin to provide substantial aid to our Nation's elementary and secondary schools?

Our schools need Federal aid today because they are continually being asked to do more than was required of them in the past. Our schools are being asked today, not just to provide a basic education for all children, but to provide an education which will equip youngsters for a successful college career or to provide an education which will equip other youngsters for a highly competitive, skilled labor market.

Our schools need Federal aid today because we have reached the point in national maturity where we can no longer be satisfied with a goal of education for all, but we must strive for the goal of quality education for all.

Our schools need Federal aid today because in the decades to come the investment we make will determine whether we continue to be the most prosperous nation in the world, and the leader of the free world's democracies.

Historically, this country has realized that to have a strong, flourishing democracy there must be a strong, well-educated citizenry to support it. As far back as 1787, when the Continental Congress declared in the Northwest Ordinance that "Schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged" the Federal Government has realized its responsibility toward supporting our educational system.

The Federal Government contributed to the educational resources of this Nation by establishing the land-grant college system when it saw that State and local governments could not provide the higher education desperately needed by the youngsters of our growing and spreading Nation. In 1917 there was a growing need for vocational education to train and equip our youngsters with job skills, a need which could not be filled by State and local governments alone, thus the Federal Government responded with the vocational educational acts. When our troops returned from Europe and Asia after World War II, no State or local government could fill their thirst and need for education, so the Federal Government once again stepped forward, this time with the GI bills. And again, when it was a need for training youngsters in the engineering and scientific and technical fields, a need that could not be filled in any other way, the Congress passed the National Defense Education Act to fill this gap.

The role of the Federal Government in giving aid to education has been an accepted and honored part of our history for almost 175 years, accepted because each program was enacted to meet definite needs only when other remedies were inadequate, honored because each program has been administered without evidence of Federal restrictions on academic freedom.

H.R. 2632 shall take its place in history as another instance where the Federal Government has seen the need to join with the State and local governments in proving adequate education for our citizens.

H.R. 2632 will be accepted by the American people because this program will be enacted to meet definite need where other remedies are inadequate. H.R. 2632 will be an honorable part of our history because it will be administered without evidence of Federal restrictions on academic freedom.

To properly carry out their primary responsibility for public schools, the State and local governments must have the utilization of the greater financial means which the Federal Government can provide through the various titles of this bill.

Title I of the bill provides approximately $1.06 billion for aid to school districts where at least 3 percent of the elementary and secondary school youngsters come from families with annual incomes of $2,000 or less. Approximately 5 million of our 48 million schoolchildren come from such families, families whose income prevents them from supporting the decent schools their children desperately need in order to break out of the grasp of poverty. Title I is designed to support and encourage the establishment and expansion of special programs, including the construction of minimum school facilities where needed, to meet the special needs of educationally deprived children of low-income families. These programs will be conducted, where needed, under a shared time arrangement so that no child who needs these services are denied them.

Title II of the bill provides $10 million to States for the purchase of books for elementary and high school libraries, and to purchase textbooks for children in public and private nonprofit schools. This title in the bill recognizes that every child must have access to the basic materials of instruction, if he is to receive a decent education.

Title III of the bill proposes a 5-year program to establish supplementary educational centers and services which would provide educational services not available in sufficient quantity or quality in elementary and secondary schools. During 1966, $100 million would be distributed among the States for these programs which will enrich the educational diet of our children.

In title IV, there is authorized the training of research personnel and improved dissemination of information derived from educational research and development. This would give more assistance to the research facilities which are directed toward improving the quality of our schools.

Finally, title V of the bill authorizes grants for the strengthening of State departments of education. The $25 million provided in this title would stimulate State departments of education to continue their leadership role in the development of quality education for all American children.

The enactment of H.R. 2632 will mean a brighter future for our schools, for millions of our youngsters, and inevitably, for our country.

Air Flight Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. Y. BERRY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, in connection with H.R. 2175, which would prohibit the coin-operated sale of air flight insurance, I have asked unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article appearing in the March 21, 1965, issue of the New York Times entitled "Flight Insurance Fought by Pilots" and a subhead "Union Says Airport Vending Encourages Sabotage."

The article follows:

FLIGHT INSURANCE FOUGHT BY PILOTS—UNION SAYS AIRPORT VENDING ENCOURAGES SABOTAGE

WASHINGTON, March 20.—The Nation's airline pilots have opened an all-out campaign to ban the sale of flight insurance at airports.

The drive, a major project of the Air Line Pilots Association, is based on the pilots' belief that easy-to-buy trip insurance is too much of a temptation for sick minds.

The pilots' union asserts that insurance has been a possible or definite factor in at least five fatal crashes attributed to sabotage. And, it says, the insurance involved in most of the cases was airport vended.

The association has injected its considerable influence into one of the most bitter of aviation controversies. The union has no support from the Federal Aviation Agency and thus far only scattered backing in Congress.

The heat of the controversy can be best judged by a recent lawsuit, filed by the son of a man killed in a recent sabotage case. He sued the three insurance companies who sold the saboteur $105,000 in airport policies, accusing them of negligence in not screening the killer when he bought the insurance.

EXPERT WAS CONSULTED

The FAA last July asked an insurance expert to determine the relationship of flight insurance to sabotage cases and to recommend whether airport sales should be banned. The expert was Clarence Pell, Jr., who heads the aviation division of a large insurance firm.

His verdict: Neither limiting nor eliminating flight insurance would solve the sabotage problem.

The association challenged Mr. Pell's finding as somewhat suspect. It questioned the wisdom of having an insurance executive judge the merits of a question that would wipe out a lucrative business. The union says that flight insurance sales total $40 million annually. Some insurance officials say the actual figure is under $20 million.

While the pilots' group was naturally suspicious of Mr. Pell's objectivity, he was not alone in his findings. In 1963, a Government-Industry Committee on Airline Sabotage reached the same conclusion.

Here are the arguments and counterarguments on the issue:

For insurance: Why penalize the public by removing an inexpensive form of protection for families and loved ones? Sabotage is a terrible but admittedly rare crime.

Against insurance: Passengers can get protection elsewhere, through long-range travel or regular life insurance. For that matter, the families of those killed in air crashes aren't exactly being left destitute, even without flight insurance. The handmaiden of every air tragedy is an avalanche of lawsuits. One major accident involved damage claims of $77 million. Only about 20 percent of the passengers buy airport insurance.

For: Not all travelers can afford to buy large long-range policies or large amounts of regular life insurance.

Against: Why single out air travelers as having an apparently exclusive need for protection? At least 80,000 Americans die every year in automobile accidents, falls, drownings, fire, and other mishaps compared to the 200 who died in airline crashes last year. Air transportation can no longer be considered in the "special risk" category. Insurance companies admit this. They sell regular life insurance to pilots and stewardesses for the same rate paid by those who don't fly for a living.

For: There is no evidence to show that elimination of airport insurance would solve the sabotage problem. Motives other than insurance frequently are involved.

Against: Nobody says the elimination would end sabotage. But it would minimize the chances by removing the temptation for an easy payoff.

For: The record shows that not a single saboteur has ever collected from an insurance policy. This knowledge is the best deterrent against the crime.

Against: The fact that nobody has ever collected in the past is not likely to keep some deranged person from trying it anyway, nor has it prevented the most recent sabotage-for-insurance cases. Because an aircraft bombing usually involves total destruction, the saboteur believes he has at least some chance of getting away with his deed. Few laymen are aware of the clues that a bombing leaves behind. Sabotage is by no means a perfect crime, but there is considerable evidence that saboteurs regard it as such.

For: Anyone insane enough to commit mass murder isn't going to be deterred because he can't buy insurance at an airport. He would buy insurance elsewhere.

Against: Regular insurance involves some screening, by no means perfect, but at least more thorough than sales through an impersonal vending machine or by a girl at an airport counter. The availability of airport insurance probably tips the scales toward murder in a saboteur's mind.

Comdr. John M. Donlon, U.S. Navy, of Amsterdam, N.Y., an Outstanding Example of a Successful Naval Officer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL S. STRATTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. STRATTON. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of real pride to me that a native of my congressional district and a resident of my home city of Amsterdam, N.Y., has recently been honored on two separate occasions by the U.S. Navy of which he is an outstanding officer and a model of the kind of success that can come to a top career officer in this outstanding field.

The officer in question is Comdr. John M. Donlon, U.S. Navy, commanding officer of the nuclear-powered submarine U.S.S. *Shark*—SSN 591.

Commander Donlon has been honored by the Navy in two ways. First, he and his ship were awarded the 1964 Marjorie Sterrett Battleship Fund Award for battle efficiency and excellence. In addition, Commander Donlon also was himself awarded the Legion of Merit, one of the Navy's top decorations, for outstanding service as commanding officer of this great submarine.

Mr. Speaker, I have a particular pleasure in bringing to the attention of my colleagues here in the House the exploits of Commander Donlon, because he was first appointed to the Naval Academy by my distinguished predecessor from the original 32d District of New York, the Honorable Bernard W. "Pat" Kearney, who will be remembered by many Members as having been for many years an outstanding and distinguished Member of this House, and one whom I am proud to call my friend.

I know all of us in Amsterdam share "Pat" Kearney's pride in the achievements of this young man whose excellence Congressman Kearney recognized so clearly so many years ago when he appointed him to the Naval Academy. In fact Commander Donlon's achievements bring not only cerdit to himself and his family, but they also testify to the diligence with which former Congressman Kearney discharged his duties as a Member of this body in nominating young men to our service academies.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot help adding one further observation, and that is that the submarine *Shark*, which Commander Donlon commands, is a sister ship of U.S.S. *Tinosa*—SSN 606, for which my wife was the original sponsor in Portsmouth, N.H., more than 3 years ago.

As a Member of this House and also a member of the Naval Reserve, I salute Commander Donlon, the officers and men of the U.S.S. *Shark*, Commander Donlon's family and friends in Amsterdam, and Gen. Pat Kearney, who appointed him to Annapolis.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include two articles from the Amsterdam Evening Recorder, which describe these achievements in greater detail:

[From the Amsterdam (N.Y.) Evening Recorder, Oct. 20, 1964]

COMMANDER DONLON'S SUB WINS STERRETT AWARD

A submarine, commanded by an Amsterdamian, has been named winner of the 1964 Marjorie Sterrett battleship fund award. The nuclear-powered U.S.S. *Shark* (SSN591) under Cmdr. John M. Donlon, was selected by the Navy as first in battle efficiency competition during the year, and announcement was made by Adm. David L. McDonald, chief of naval operations, in a letter received last week:

"DEAR CAPTAIN DONLON: Congratulations to you, your officers and men on the occasion of the award of the Marjorie Sterrett battleship fund prize to the U.S.S. *Shark*.

"The history of the Marjorie Sterrett battleship fund is a manifestation of the faith that the American people have in our country and in our way of life, and of the trust placed in the Navy to safeguard these ideals. "The achievement of the U.S.S. *Shark* in winning this honor during the battle efficiency competition conducted by Commander Submarine Force Atlantic Fleet during fiscal year 1964 reflects the high standards of performance and leadership on the part of all hands during your tenure. This attainment by your command is an outstanding example of readiness.

"Well done."

STARTED IN 1916

In addition to the ward, enlisted men on the *Shark* will benefit from a cash prize of $638 for the ship's recreation fund. The Sterrett award dates from 1916 when the fund was started by the Tribune Association (now the New York Herald-Tribune) after receiving a dime from Majorie Sterrett, 13-year-old Brooklyn girl who had been reading about preparedness and who wanted to help build a battleship.

Various types of warships have been honored by the Navy which this year selected submarine competition, and the *Shark* was given No. 1 rating among the 90 submarines of the Atlantic Fleet. The Pacific Fleet award among 55 subs went to the U.S.S. *Scamp*, sister ship of the *Shark* and commanded by Cmdr. A. J. M. Atkins, classmate of Commander Donlon at Annapolis, 1949.

The Amsterdamian was given command of the *Shark* 1 year ago after transfer from the *Tinosa*, latest nuclear sub commissioned last week at Portsmouth, N.H. Sponsor of the *Tinosa*, launched 2 years ago, was Mrs. Samuel S. Stratton who witnessed Saturday's ceremonies at Portsmouth.

[From the Amsterdam (N.Y.) Evening Recorder, December, 1964]

CMDR. JOHN DONLON GETS LEGION OF MERIT MEDAL

An Amsterdam naval officer, Cmdr. John M. Donlon, U.S. Navy, has been presented with the Legion of Merit, the Nation's fifth highest award, for "exceptionally meritorious conconduct in the performance of outstanding service during a period of 1964."

Presentation was made last week by Rear Adm. Elliott Loughlin, commander of Submarine Flotilla 6 at the Charleston, S.C., naval base. The citation states:

"The President of the United States takes pleasure in presenting the Legion of Merit to Comdr. John M. Donlon for exceptionally meritorious conduct in the performance of outstanding service during a period of 1964 as commanding officer of the U.S.S. *Shark* (SSN-591).

"Planning for and successfully executing a complex, difficult and important independent submarine operation, Commander Donlon, through his sound judgment, leadership and professional skill, was instrumental in achieving results of great value to the Government of the United States.

"His diligent and meticulous preparation, and his careful analysis and documentation of information were highly important contributions to the success achieved. His inspiring performance to duty was in keeping with the highest traditions of the U.S. Naval Service," according to the citation given by Paul H. Nitze, Secretary of the Navy, for the President.

Since the operation of the submarine *Shark* is classified, the Navy Department release offered no further information concerning the Legion of Merit award.

The crew of the *Shark* was recognized in October when the sub was honored with the Marjorie Sterrett Award as "first in battle efficiency" among 90 submarines of the Atlantic Fleet.

The Amsterdamian, son of Newspaperman Hugh P. Donlon and member of the Annapolis class of 1949, took over as commander of the sub in November of 1963. He and his family are currently residing at 1401 Pooshee Drive, Charleston, S.C.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDWARD J. GURNEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, March 26, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2362) to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is anyone in Congress or in my home State of Florida, who is more enthusiastic about education on all levels, or who believes more strongly than I, that more money needs to be spent on education, not only for classrooms, but for instructional materials and teachers' salaries.

I believe strongly, too, that our educational system is the real strength of our Nation. I always will support sound measures that improve education.

For example, I would gladly support a bill which earmarked a portion of our Federal tax moneys to be turned back to the States, earmarked solely for use in our State educational system, and which would leave control in State hands. Such a proposition would preserve the integrity of our State and local educational systems, which is a great overriding issue in this whole matter.

But after studying this bill and studying the report by Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL'S Committee on Education and Labor, I am convinced that this is not a sound piece of legislation.

There are many reasons why this bill is unsound. The biggest danger is that for the first time in the history of the Republic, the Federal Government is entering the field of general aid to education at the elementary and secondary level, signaling a dramatic shift of power from the local level to Washington.

This bold injection of the Federal Government into this field is camouflaged by proponents who argue the main purpose for the bill is that the Federal Government should and will help, in this legislation, poor school districts and underprivileged children.

As a matter of fact, however, this argument does not hold up on close examination of the bill. Instead, the most money will be funneled into the richest school districts in America and the least into the poorest.

Under this formula, the 10 richest counties, with approximately 32,000 children from poor homes, will receive $9 million.

The 10 poorest counties, with the same number of children from poor homes, will receive just half that amount, about $4.5 million. Nothing could be more unsound than this.

Here is another example of this inequality. Texas, Maine, and Florida have approximately equal per capita income per person and per family. Under the bill, Texas receives twice as much per school age child as Maine does, and half again as much as Florida does. This is certainly unfair.

Further, the bill ignores State distribution of school moneys, and under the present formula is another example of the inequality for distribution.

My 11th Congressional District of Florida is a case in point. Under title I of this bill, where the bulk of the money, over $1 billion, is to be spent, the 11th District, with desperate classroom shortage, thousands of students in double session, with more than twice the number of pupils than the 9th District, and raising 38.9 percent of its school money from local taxes, gets only $1,824,958.

The Ninth District, in turn, has no classroom shortage, raises only 19.6 percent of its school money from local taxes, but gets $2,009,840, or $200,000 more than we do under the bill.

As a matter of fact, taxes collected from my district by the State actually are funneled into the ninth district, as well as others, under the minimum foundation plan.

Yet, under this bill, we get a far less proportionate share of Federal money than this other district, although we not only deserve but actually need a greater proportional share. My district's tax money will be used in part to subsidize this other district and make a further imbalance.

There are more reasons why this bill is unsound.

There is the business of helping private schools which is to be done under this bill. I certainly do not think the Federal Government has any business using public Federal tax money to support private schools.

This provision tries to avoid the church-state issue by not giving money directly to private schools, but by making public facilities available to private school students. Thus, the church-state issue is carefully skirted, but for the first time this bill will put the Federal Government into this field, using public tax money.

Answers to questions dealing with whether or not pupils will be transported from private to public schools or whether the public school teacher will conduct

classes in private schools were completely contradictory and were left unsettled.

Title II of the bill provides $100 million for both public and private school textbooks and library materials. The U.S. Commissioner of Education is given the power to set standards for texts and textbooks, the most dangerous thing I can imagine, what goes into a textbook, what kind of a textbook we are going to use in our schools. And yet, under this bill the Commissioner will make far-reaching decisions in this matter.

Under title III, the Commissioner will get $100 million to establish model schools at the local level, possibly the first step toward a complete takeover of our school system by the Federal Government. The Commissioner has authority to establish Federal-local schools without the approval of the State education agency. In other words, in this instance, the Federal Government will be fully in the local school business.

Title IV provides another $100 million for Federal education centers, permitting the Commissioner to further buttress his own Federal school power under title III. This new power provides more muscle to the Federal Government to get further in the education field.

In summary, I would go back to the main argument for this bill, that it is designed to aid economically deprived or neglected schoolchildren.

But a thorough analysis proves otherwise. Title I of the bill will distribute over $1 billion of the $1.3 billion total to 90 percent of the school districts in the country, without regard to actual need.

Under the remaining titles, distribution is not tailored to need, either; in fact, there is not even an attempt here to utilize the banner of poverty, although administration backers claim the bill is geared to the economically deprived child.

The textbooks and instructional materials under title II, for example, are not limited to needy children or poor schools, but are admittedly provided as part of a general program.

The Federal-local schools in title III are not limited to deprived children, or problem students, but specify "persons of varying talents and needs," in other words, everyone, again stretching the education dollar to the breaking point.

We see here, then, for the first time, the Federal Government moving swiftly and surely into the field of general aid to elementary and secondary schools, casting the die for Federal control and doing away with the policy of local and State support and control of our public schools, a policy substantially followed for nearly 200 years in our Republic.

Various Republican proposals offering alternative solutions have placed principal emphasis on local control. This would be achieved through granting tax credits to the extent of local school taxes up to $100.

In addition, authorization would be given for a Federal income tax credit for individuals who assume the cost of tuition and other expenses of a college education.

Further demonstrating Republican concern for underprivileged children, Republicans have proposed to include a federally supported program for youngsters from 3 to 7 years of age, together with a $300 million grant to the States for this purpose.

Many educators believe and the hearings adduced testimony that training in the preschool years is the most important period in the lives of underprivileged children.

However, these and other constructive proposals were rejected outright as the huge administration majority has voted time and again to cut off debate.

The Democratic leadership in the House has made a travesty out of the legislative process in the consideration of this bill.

I think Congresswoman EDITH GREEN, always a strong supporter of education and a member of the Education and Labor Committee, has summed up the problem well in the following remarks she made about this muzzling:

Mr. Chairman, I have been a Democrat all of my life, and one reason I have been proud to be a Democrat is because we have believed in protecting the rights of the minority. I have never interpreted the Democratic platform or the statements we have made that this applies only to ethnic groups; that we are only interested in protecting the rights of Negroes or any other minority. There was a man long ago who said, "I may disagree with what you say, but I will defend to death your right to say it."

Today it seems to me we have in the House a determined effort to silence those who are in disagreement.

A statement was made a moment ago by one of my colleagues, with whom I have been on the same side in many legislative battles. He said that all the members of the committee on this side agree that there is no possibility of a church-state issue. As a Democratic I do not understand why we, as the majority party, are afraid to have this discussed. I wish that for once we could have a Supreme Court decision on whether such aid is constitutional or is not.

Mrs. GREEN's plea today to open debate was a brave attempt to buck the administration as was her effort yesterday to improve the distribution system which is so unsound.

Now I have always been enthusiastic about supporting our education system. And if States cannot raise enough local tax dollars, then I would favor giving them back tax dollars earmarked for education, from the income tax. But let us leave the control of education in local hands. Why is it necessary to surrender to the Federal bureaucrats?

I have seen nothing that convinces me that a few Federal administrators in Washington, highly insulated in their bureaucratic offices from the many varied problems of local school systems, are better prepared to solve school matters than local authorities.

In fact, I am convinced that they will not solve them nearly as well as local officials.

Education we are all for. But, let us reach good education through sound measures, not through poor legislation, as is this bill.

Conservation Fate Could Prove Costly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HANSEN
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD an editorial from the Salt Lake Tribune, published in Salt Lake City, Utah, dated March 28, 1965.

The editorial deals with an acute problem which the Congress will be forced to face in the near future—the problem of the continued success of the technical services program of the Soil Conservation Service.

I have previously pointed out, Mr. Speaker—and it has been pointed out by many of my colleagues—that the proposal to reduce by $20 million the funds available to the SCS for these services is a false economy. The program is a proven one. Since its inception it has benefitted not only the farmer, but every segment of our economy.

The editorial is an excellent one. I urge all of my colleagues to read it and take to heart the message it contains.

The editorial follows:

CONSERVATION FATE COULD PROVE COSTLY

Congress should carefully scrutinize the Budget Bureau's recommended reduction of $20 million in the appropriation for the U.S. Soil Conservation Service for the next fiscal year.

The proposed trim is linked with a plan to charge farmers and ranchers cooperating in soil conservation districts up to 50 percent of the cost of technical assistance received in soil and water rehabilitation programs. Payments would be credited to a special revolving fund to finance future technical aid for landowners and operators.

On the face of it, charging for a service seems reasonable, even though the plan departs abruptly from the policy of the Soil Conservation Service for the last 30 years. Recreation users of public lands are being charged for the privilege beginning this year. Legislation is proposed for user charges for inspection of poultry, grading of wheat and other crops, certain border inspections of private vessels and aircraft and to create a revolving fund for the Rural Electrification Administration. Such charges presumably are to be gaged somewhat on ability to pay. Many low-income farm families could not afford the added expense.

HITS LEAST ABLE TO PAY

The suggested cutback in the conservation program is reported to be part of a plan to pare older Government programs to offset expenses incident to President Johnson's Great Society plan, mainly in health and education.

Before taking action, Congress should endeavor to determine whether the damage done to the productivity and stability of the soil would be offset by the new, touted programs. The "war on poverty" envisions rural family loans, 30-year loans to cooperative associations and some retraining. We seriously doubt that the loss of about one-third of the present SCS technical staff available to farmers and ranchers in building soil and water resources, would be compensated for in the newer proposals.

Landowners and tenant farmers affected by the economy move in many cases would be

the least able to pay for the services, and a number are least convinced of the need for long-term conservation practices. Most affluent farmers have already improved their land under the SCS program. Those expected to pay for a service heretofore free would include marginal operators and newcomers to the land with little or no understanding of the necessity of nature in balance. An indirect result of the proposed change in policy would be a drop in State and conservation district support.

SOIL EROSION NATIONAL PROBLEM

Accelerated soil erosion and its effects remain among the most crucial problems bearing directly upon the total economic strength of the country. Soil erosion remains serious on more than 700 million acres of privately owned rural lands in the United States, and the equivalent of 500,000 acres is lost each year as a result of erosion and other forms of land damage.

Erosion increases flood damage, chokes streams and lakes with sediment, damages fisheries, and reduces the ability of the land to meet the demands of expanding world populations.

Studies show that the Soil Conservation Service was already operating on an "economy" budget. In Utah, for example, where the number of farmers cooperating in 43 soil conservation districts totals about 12,500, the number of SCS technicians available has been gradually falling off because of budget deficiencies. Last year the Soil Conservation Service was able to handle only 7 of 10 requests received for technical assistance. Even so, the agency helped achieve some remarkable improvements on land treated.

It is difficult, often inconsistent, to argue against a proposed economy. But this plan entails diverting funds from a proved, beneficial long-term program to untried experiments in the Great Society. And it could create more poverty of natural resources and beauty as well as farm production and income.

Outstanding Entertainer of 1964—Vikki Carr

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, Miss Vikki Carr, one of the finest young vocalists of our time, was honored recently by the Mexican-American Community of Los Angeles represented by the East Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, the Council of Mexican-American Affairs, the American GI Forum, the East Central Area Welfare Planning Council, and the Mexican American Political Association.

That these five major civic organizations were unanimous in their tribute to Miss Carr is indicative of the high esteem in which the Mexican-American community holds this outstanding songstress.

Mr. Speaker, having been extended the courtesy of making the official award presentation to Miss Carr, I did so flanked by the presidents of the sponsoring organizations and Miss Carr's parents.

I congratulated these leading Mexican-American organizations, individually and collectively, for having selected Miss Vicenta Florencia de Casillas Cardona, better known as Vikki Carr, as "Outstanding Entertainer of 1964."

I also commended them for their effort in highlighting Mexican-Americans, such as Miss Carr, for their achievements in all fields of endeavor in the form of an award to be given jointly by these prominent organizations on an annual basis.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of the printed program announcing this reception and award presentation ceremony honoring Miss Vikki Carr, Los Angeles' own "Outstanding Entertainer of 1964."

In addition, I would like to include an excellent Los Angeles Times article on Miss Carr's Los Angeles singing debut in the Cocoanut Grove of the Ambassador Hotel.

These two items provide a brief summary of Miss Carr's rising musical career, and will help convey some idea of the deep pride the entire Los Angeles community takes in her successful debut.

Finally, I want to take this opportunity of joining with Miss Carr's family and friends in extending to this most talented artist and lovely young lady my very best wishes for her future success and happiness.

VICKY CARR—OUTSTANDING ENTERTAINER-1964

"I Have Dreamed Golden Dreams"—Poor Butterfly.

The year 1964 was a year of progress for a multitude of presons in a wide variety of fields. In the case of Miss Vikki Carr, 1964 was a year when the entertainment industry and the general public alike proclaimed her as an outstanding talent. As in the case of most dedicated artists, success was no accident to Vikki Carr. It was the fruit of 7 years of hard work and much preparation.

A great deal of credit must be given to Miss Carr's parents, Mr. and Mrs. Carlos Cardona of Rosemead, Calif., whose encouragement and advice helped smooth out the problems which inevitably mark the path to success.

The East Los Angles Junior Chamber of Commerce, in cooperation with the Council of Mexican-American affairs, American GI Forum, the Mexican-American Political Association and the East Central Area Welfare Planning Council, takes great pride in honoring Vikki Carr as the "Outstanding Entertainer-1964."

Her efforts to help her community by raising funds for scholarships, and her pride in her Mexican-American hertitage, have not gone unnoticed by persons both in and out of the community.

Congratulations are in order for Vicenta Florencia de Casillas Cardona—Vickki Carr.

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Times, Mar. 6, 1965]

SUCCESSFUL DEBUT: VIKKI CARR TRIUMPHS AT GROVE

(By John L. Scott)

Florencia Visenta de Casillas Martinez Cardona, who chose the professional and easier to remember name of Vikki Carr, made her major Los Angeles debut Thursday night at the Cocoanut Grove before an enthusiastic, capacity audience.

Among celebrities applauding Miss Carr's vocal efforts were Bill Dana, Lloyd Bridges, Inger Stevens, Carolyn Jones, Jim Nabors, Annette Funicello, Steve Forrest, Robert Lansing, Peter Brown, Harry Guardino, George Jessel, and various others.

Eighteen months ago Vikki Carr was a comparative unknown, singing more or less for her supper in a small night spot now extinct. Today she's a Liberty recording star, has appeared on TV in Las Vegas and Australia, and is considering at least two offers for Broadway musical shows.

LOCAL GIRL

But her Grove appearance has proved her greatest thrill, she said after the performance Thursday. The girl from San Gabriel (Rosemead High School) told her cheering audience: "I've come home."

Few local products have won such a reception in their own community, but Miss Carr wears her plaudits gratefully and graciously.

The songstress of Mexican extraction, and in her early twenties, produces the big sound when she sings. She reminds one of a hoydenish Judy Garland—a little girl with a large voice that can tax a nightclub's sound system.

VARIETY OF SONGS

She also achieves in certain tunes that plaintive note so necessary for good balance in a program.

Miss Carr reveals that so important natural flair for songmaking, which, with careful nurturing, should take her far.

Her program at the Grove practically ran the gamut of the nightclub song catalog, ranging from "Bye-Bye Black Bird" to a novelty caled 'Supercalifragilistic Expialidocius." Honoring her proud parents, who were in the audience Thursday, she included a Mexican number, "Cuando Caliente El Sol," and bowed off with a thank you piece to a standing ovation.

The songstress was introduced by Carolyn Jones and held modest court at an after-show champagne reception.

Miss Carr enjoyed the efficient backing of Freddy Martin's orchestra conducted by Andy Thomas. Martin and his band played a stirring "Holiday in Mexico" overture to open the show.

Manpower Act of 1965

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4257) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, we Republicans recognize unemployment as both a personal and a national tragedy. It is a personal tragedy for the jobless individual and his family. It is a national tragedy because of the loss of productivity and revenue and the waste of our greatest national resource, the skills of our people.

A few years ago the Republican policy committee sponsored a searching study, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] into the causes of unemployment in this country and the possible remedies. I served as chairman of one of the subcommittees for that study.

We learned that one out of every five unskilled workers was without a job, that the unemployment rate among untrained persons was three times higher than among the trained. We learned, at

the same time, that jobs were going begging for lack of qualified applicants. To a great extent, therefore, the unemployment problem did not result from the inability of our economy to create jobs, but because of our failure to train people to fill them.

Our Republican study group in 1961 endorsed the need for such legislation as the Manpower Development and Training Act, which was passed the following year. My colleagues will recall that on the House floor we substituted for the bill reported by the Committee on Education and Labor a bill embracing the Republican study group's recommendation and largely written by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

The role of the opposition party in our form of government is an important one. It has been correctly said that we should support the administration when it is right, criticize it when it is wrong, and be ready to offer constructive alternatives to bills we agree with in principle but disagree with in detail.

The constructive alternative offered by Republicans in 1962 resulted in the successful manpower development and training program. The bill before us would strengthen and extend this program and, therefore, has my wholehearted support.

Sister Mary Jeanine Gave Witness to Her Faith at Selma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I have great admiration for the many clergymen and members of religious orders who participated in the demonstrations for human freedom in Selma, Ala. As events have tragically shown, it took an act of courage to be part of this demand for justice for all Americans. By their presence, the ministers, priests, rabbis, and nuns gave witness to their love for their fellow men and to their belief in the brotherhood of the sons of God.

I am proud that among those who took part in the demonstrations in Selma was Sister Mary Jeanine, a native of my home city of Milwaukee and chairman of the Department of Sociology at Cardinal Stritch College.

Frank A Aukofer, of the Milwaukee Journal, wrote a sensitive and vivid story of Sister Jeanine's day in the front line of civil rights demonstrators.

That story follows:

[From the Milwaukee (Wis.) Journal, Mar. 16, 1965]

CITY NUN KEYSTONE IN SELMA LINE

(By Frank A. Aukofer)

SELMA, ALA.—A frail looking Milwaukee nun was the keystone of "the Selma line" here all day Monday. With the bright Alabama sunshine slowly burning her face, Sister Mary Jeanine, 47, chairman of the sociology department at Cardinal Stritch College stood facing police in the same spot all day without anything to eat and only a small cup of water to drink. She did not have the water until after 3 p.m.

Temperatures were in the mid-70's in the afternoon. Not a cloud marked the sky and there was no shade.

LINE OF HUMANITY

The "Selma line" was how demonstrators here referred to the line of humanity that confronted police and sheriff's deputies from Wednesday night until the march on the Dallas County courthouse Monday.

Sister Jeanine is the former Bernice Gruesser, daughter of John A. Gruesser, now of St. Petersburg, Fla. She is a Milwaukee native and a 1934 graduate of St. Mary's Academy in Milwaukee.

Sister Jeanine's civil rights day started with a march shortly after 9 a.m. She was in the eighth row.

When the sheriff's posse stopped the marchers, the line spread wider and Sister Jeanine moved up to the second row. She stood there until about 10:30 a.m., when clergymen were asked to fall back to consider their next move.

However, a line of demonstrators was left facing the police and sheriff's posse.

STANDS IN THE MIDDLE

Up front, in the middle, stood Sister Jeanine. "We can't leave the young people here alone," she said.

The Franciscan nun was wearing a black wool sweater and a rain cape over her habit, and black rubber boots.

The cape went about noon.

Msgr. Franklyn Kennedy, editorial manager of the Catholic Herald-Citizen in Milwaukee, took the cape from her. But the boots and sweater remained.

She sang. She clapped. She prayed with the other demonstrators.

And all the while her face burned.

It did not go unnoticed. Around 1:30 p.m., a television technician stepped out of a crowd of newsmen and walked up to the nun.

He handed her a small tube of first aid cream and said "Compliments of CBS, Sister."

Because she was in the front row, Sister Jeanine became part of the reception line which shook hands with the day's distinguished visitors, Representatives EDWARD BOLAND, Democrat, of Massachusetts and SILVIO CONTE, Republican of Massachusetts and William Evans, administrative assistant to Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, Democrat of Massachusetts.

Another nun, Sister Rose Maureen, a freckle-faced ("I'm a Kelly") Maryknoll nun from San Francisco, spent the afternoon at Sister Jeanine's side.

SANDWICHES GIVEN OUT

About 2:30 p.m., civil rights workers passed out peanut butter sandwiches. Sister Jeanine passed them along to those around her, including two Negro girls, 10 and 11, from Selma. The nun's hands had been resting on the girls' shoulders for an hour.

Sister Jeanine did not take any sandwich because, she said, there were others in the line who had not had anything to eat all day.

When aids of Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr., started organizing the courthouse march, late in the afternoon, Sister Jeanine was placed at the head of the group of marchers formed from those who had been standing at the barrier. On each side of her was a Unitarian minister. They had been with her most of the afternoon.

Sister Jeanine and her two Unitarian escorts wound up in the 39th rank as they were assimilated into the main line of march.

About half way on the six block march to the courthouse, Sister Jeanine started to limp—sore feet.

"How do you feel now?" asked Rabbi Allan Levine, 32, of Rochester, N.Y., who was in the rank behind her.

"I feel just wonderful," she said.

After the service for Rev. James J. Reeb, at the courthouse, Sister Jeanine stood on the sidewalk in the path of the lead marchers. It paid off.

"I got to shake hands with Martin Luther King," she said excitedly.

PROTESTERS LINK ARMS

For the return march, she linked arms with Father Francis Doyle, of St. Louis, Mo., executive secretary of Joseph Cardinal Ritter's human rights council there, and Otis Flournoy, a Negro field staff member of the National Methodist Student Movement.

About 7:30 p.m., on her way back to Good Samaritan Hospital for supper and a night's sleep, Sister Jeanine paused in front of Brown's Chapel Church to put her arm around a Negro girl.

"Well," said the nun, "it was a great day."

"Sho 'nuff," the girl replied.

A Record of Great Accomplishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, recently, the San Francisco Bay area paid long overdue tribute to a World War II hero and a courageous spokesman for veterans' causes. The public honor extended to Frank Curley was sponsored by the San Francisco County Council of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

This ceremony on March 8, 1965, also paid special recognition to the American Gold Star Mothers.

I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD information contained in the program which gives Frank Curley's record of accomplishment, salutes the American Gold Star Mothers and lists those who paid a personal tribute:

A RECORD OF GREAT ACCOMLISPHMENT

Frank enlisted in the Armed Forces April 6, 1917, the very day this Nation took up arms in defense of its principles. He was only 17½ years old then, and was overseas several months later. Subsequently, while he, himself, was a patient in a service hospital, he went out of his way to help the more severely disabled servicemen around him.

Personally modest, Frank has no concern for himself. On the other hand when he is pursuing a claim for a disabled veteran or his dependents, he has no equal. He is the expert in such matters. He is a fighter for veterans, their dependents, for good government and other things that are right. And a winner. The record books are overflowing with the difficult cases he shepherded to successful conclusions—even where others before him had failed.

In 1945 Frank authored a workable on-the-job training program cooperated with labor and industry to iron out any differences for the protection of the disabled veteran trainee. Finally after months of meetings with labor and industry the training program was acceptable to the Division of Apprenticeship Standards of the California Department of Industrial Relations. Then Frank introduced it to the Veterans' Administration

which was accepted as a workable program, thus returning thousands of World War II disabled veterans to dignity, employability, and as taxpaying citizens.

Frank spearheaded drives for many recreational and rehabilitation facilities, established first San Francisco Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, fought a long uphill battle for the erection of the Wheel Chair Haven at Kezar Stadium just to mention a few.

An expert on affairs of veterans and legislation, Frank never does anything casually. He thinks things through, applies his analytical legally trained mined, resolves the difficult.

Frank Curley enjoys support of members from all veteran organizations, labor and industry, because of his complete dedication to the principle of putting the interest of veterans, their dependents and his Nation above private or personal consideration.

MELVIN SOSNICK COMPANY SALUTE TO AMERICAN GOLD STAR MOTHERS

We feel how weak and fruitless must be any word of ours which would attempt to beguile you from the grief of a loss so overwhelming. But we cannot refrain from tendering you the consolation that may be found in the thanks of the people they died to save. We pray that our Heavenly Father may assuage the anguish of your bereavement and leave you only the cherished memory of the loved and lost, and the solemn pride that must be yours to have laid so costly a sacrifice upon the altar of freedom.

Those sentences reach the heart of the matter. The essence of a nation embattled in the simple trust that death is easier to face if the flag is still flying when we fall, and bereavement partakes less of outright tragedy in the knowledge that those who died saw the flag aloft in their last moments.

We are debtors both to you and to your departed sons. We have gained immeasurably from the payment in blood and tears that you and they have jointly made. It is our comfort to know that you, who share the loss, have remained among us to share the gain.

The knowledge of the fact also sustained your sons, we are sure.

MELVIN SOSNICK,
Chairman of the Board.

A personal tribute extended to Frank Curley and American Gold Star Mothers.

President Lyndon B. and Lady Bird Johnson; Hon. John F. Shelley, mayor, San Francisco, Calif.; Hon. William J. Driver, Administrator, Veterans' Administration; Hon. GEORGE P. MILLER, Congressman, 8th District, California; Hon. "J" Eugene McAteer, senator, 14th California District; Hon. Peter Tamaras, supervisor, San Francisco; Maj. Gen. Roy Lassetter, Jr., U.S. Army; Rear Adm. Harold J. Cokley, Marine Corps, U.S. Navy; Charles L. Gould, captain, USNR, Publisher San Francisco Examiner & News Call Bulletin; Allen Martin, VFW Department Commander, California; Claire, Dianne, and Gary Caulfield; Marjorie Hoe, president, 8th district American Legion auxiliary; Marvin Sosnick, president, Melvin Sosnick Co.

Hon. Noah Mason

SPEECH
OF
HON. O. C. FISHER
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened to learn of the recent death of our former colleague, the Honorable Noah Mason, of Illinois. It was my privilege to serve with him for many years. He was a tower of strength, a dedicated American who fought for those principles which he considered good for the country. He was a disciple of good government. This Nation is better off because he served here.

Mr. Mason was a friend. He was humble, modest, and affable. Universally respected, Noah had a way of commanding the good will and understanding of his contemporaries. Since his decision to retire he has been missed. The Nation sorely needs more men of his caliber, who are willing to stand up and be counted on the side of right and honor.

To his surviving widow and children I extend my deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK MacGREGOR
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention today to the efforts of private business in this country toward providing a proper kind of encouragement and assistance for the quality education we all want for America's young people.

Too often we hear the statement that local government and private sources are not capable of providing for our educational needs. Too often, in our eagerness to improve educational standards, we tend to overlook what progress is being made by non-Government sources, and too quickly come to believe that the Federal Government must step in as the only source of competence.

It has recently come to my attention that the Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co. of St. Paul, Minn., has announced its second $1.5 million grant to assist in the training of future teachers. This unique plan involves the distribution of individual grants of $2,000 in teaching tools and reference materials to each of the approximately 700 accredited teacher training colleges in the United States.

Mr. R. H. Herzog, Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co. vice president, in announcing the program, said that the assistance grant program will enable teacher's colleges to expose future teachers to modern teaching techniques that will help them cover more material more effectively in the classroom.

The 1965 grant matches a similar program in 1963 that awarded $1.5 million in equipment to 500 public, private, and parochial schools across the country.

"The first AGE program clearly demonstrated the interest of teachers in improving their methods of presentation," Herzog said. "More than 1 out of every 10 eligible schools in the United States submitted proposals," he said.

Each $2,000 grant will consist of a complete teacher training unit in visual classroom communications. Included will be a unit of instruction in the use of visual aids, reference books, sets of transparency originals of illustrative material in 70 different subjects, transparency making equipment, and classroom and portable overhead projectors and supplies.

The new Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co. grant will be made available to any college offering accredited teacher training courses leading to certification and graduating more than 12 students a year. Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co. said it will use Circular 719, "Earned Degrees Conferred 1961–62," published by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, as the source for eligibility and only schools listed therein will be awarded grants upon application. The circular is the most recent report issued by the Government.

Any such college will receive the $2,000 grant simply by applying before May 31, 1965. Distribution of the awards will be made at that time.

I can most heartily agree with Mr. Herzog's feeling that private industry has a responsibility to support our education system. This grant program is a prime example of industry meeting that responsibility. Mr. Herzog also said:

By improving our education system at its roots—where teachers themselves are trained—we would hope to ultimately help improve the students. Thus, all American free enterprise profits from these same people, who though their education and motivation will move our great corporate enterprises forward in the future. We must recognize our stake in education.

The knowledge explosion is one of the salient characteristics of our age.

With more and more knowledge available, it becomes imperative for the teacher not only to cover an abundance of material but that she cover it interestingly and effectively. She must make learning important to her students and must motivate them to continue to learn so that they will make a meaningful contribution to our national life rather than become a drain upon it.

Today's complex society puts a great premium on brainpower. The challenge of today's and tomorrow's teachers is greater than at any time during the Nation's history. It is generally recognized that the country's growth and prosperity—indeed its very survival—is largely dependent upon the ability of our schools to turn out thinkers, doers, innovators, and leaders.

We hope that our new program will encourage our teachers in that essential mission.

Immorality and Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include an address by Hon. Spruille Braden, dean of American ambassadors. I rec-

ommend its reading and careful study, as it is a subject of great importance:

IMMORTALITY AND COMMUNISM

(By Hon. Spruille Braden)

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, from the depth of feeling with which I say we thank you, I trust everyone here will sense how grateful Mrs. Braden and I are for the hospitality of the Americanism Educational League, and for the special award given me yesterday by its trustees. Also, I am indebted to the Knightly Order of St. Brigette for the presentation to me of its Grand Cross.

Thus to be honored and to find ourselves in this distinguished company ordinarily would suffice to make us optimists, seeing the bright side as opposed to pessimists looking for gloom. (Parenthetically, I reject the definition of an optimist as one who doesn't care what happens so long as it doesn't happen to him—and a pessimist as one who lived all of his life alongside an optimist.) Instead of pretending that all events are ordered for good in the best of all worlds, I prefer to be a realist, a bit cynical perchance, and even an extremist, who believes in Thomas Jefferson's dictum made in 1791: "We prefer war in all cases to tribute under any form and to any people whatever." In short, I am not a romanticist who believes that good always automatically conquers evil any more than I believe that evil, because of its dirty and foul blows, has an invincible edge. If we will protect ourselves in the clinches and slug it out with the Devil, we can win.

Speaking of the Devil, an old Spanish aphorism is pertinent: "The Devil knows more by reason of his age than because he is a demon." While the passing years have not given me, I hope, any Satanic tendencies, I have acquired quite an experience in fighting a variety of demons. Among them have been a motley crew of shady characters, Latin American dictators, and Communists. Also, as chairman of the New York City Anticrime Committee, crooks in general along with some elite gangsters striving for anonimity. But, even these latter, when they are so careless as to wind up behind bars are socially very choosy—quite high hat; in prison they look down on the Communists, who may be their fellow tenants, as below the salt and a despicable lot with whom they will have no truck.

It has been said that at first we are kids and then we kid ourselves. Well, at least on two things I do not kid myself:

1. For many years I have declared that the gravest issue facing humanity is not nuclear warfare and all the horrible death-dealing weapons science has produced; the insidious dangers of inflation; budgetary and balance-of-payments deficits; the undermining of the private enterprise system; nor even the gradual erosion of our freedoms. Nor is it aggression and the threats thereof; or socialism which inevitably leads to some form of totalitarianism, usually communism in our day. No. The major threat to mankind is the breakdown in morality everywhere, including government, where morality, like memory, seems to fade with the passage of time. I further hold that the worst of all immoralities is communism.

2. I have reiterated time and again that while I hoped to live out my life in relative tranquillity, due to the twin evils of immorality and communism, I was sorry for my children and much sorrier for my grandchildren. Now, these malevolent forces have expanded and spread so rapidly that I no longer am sure that my declining years will be unperturbed and peaceful.

It is rash for a layman to dive into the subject of morals, which even in ecclesiastical hands can be very dreary. Also, morals vary widely according to time and place. A multiplicity of wives is highly respectable in some parts but not in others—at least not legally. As the Duchess said to Alice: "Tut, tut, child, everything's got a moral, if you can only find it."

I shall not now try to find and comment on generally accepted morals or flagrant immoralities. Most of us know what are good morals even if we don't always practice them assiduously. Instead, I shall point to a few random governmental actions and influence which are viewed widely with little or no criticism, but which I believe to be measurably immoral because they harm the whole community, individually and collectively.

1. Every responsible citizen is for the maximum possible equality of opportunity. But, to equate freedom and equality recently has become a popular pastime, especially by a galaxy of demagogs. This never can be done and to attempt to do so is silly, because given full equality, men stagnate, whereas given liberty they soon become unequal, energetic and progressive; incentives take hold; hard work replaces featherbedding; sciences, technology and the arts advance; income becomes proportionate to production, and honesty is self-imposed until it becomes almost automatic as one sure-fire essential for success. All of which make for the spiritual and material well-being of the public under the capitalist system.

2. Government is immoral when by excessive and discriminatory taxes and spending coupled with an autocratic and large bureaucracy, it claims to create "economic growth." Actually, it does no such thing, but on the contrary, robs Peter to pay Paul, hampers or destroys free, private, competitive enterprise which gives men the opportunity to develop their individual potentialities. Under a paternalistic and centralized government, men in all walks of life and of every calling increasingly seek aid or subsidies from the bureaucratic power; the inappropriate and indelicate, or even outright corruption seep in at all levels of society; pride of craftsmanship degenerates; people want something for nothing and "Give Me Liberty or Give Me Death" is reduced to a simple "gimme."

I do not consider it ethical for any government—such as we have experienced in the United States of America over the last three decades—to resort to the wornout and discredited ideas of a welfare state; i.e., in a word socialism, which the famous ex-socialist, Max Eastman, characterized as the "flop of the century."

3. Washington should not cover its confusion, lack of knowledge and blunders by employing thousands of public relations experts and spending hundreds of millions of dollars each year to write and feed self-serving stories, or enervating myths to the public, whose complacency in the face of serious problems too often flows from this type sedation known as managed news. This is a prime example of kidding ourselves.

4. Even our language under this process is distorted. "A curbstone guess" is dignified as "a calculated risk." "Human rights" are described as being far superior to and in conflict with "property rights," when in fact without "property rights" there can be no other "rights," human or otherwise. Only freemen, and never slaves, have "property rights."

5. Our farmers are called independent although the Federal Government tells them what and how much to produce, in what fields to plant, and determines their income. If they disobey they are fined and even sent to jail. In the end, when people are thus told when to sow and when to reap, they will lack for bread.

6. "Free workers," with governmental sanctions and legislative support, are compelled to join a union and pay dues. I question the ethics of this system. True, a union officer misappropriating funds may be brought to trial. But is it an any less henous immorality for labor leaders to use both the power of their unions and the dues for their own aggrandizement and to back politicians and policies to which, as individuals, the workers are indifferent or even opposed?

The few transgressions committed or licensed by the Government itself, which I have listed, at first glance may appear relatively insignificant; but they alarm me because not only do they harm the community and therefore are immoral, but still worse they: (a) typify the usages which have destroyed nation after nation through all history; (b) are precisely what the Communists try to inveigle us into doing because if we comply they hope to take over; and (c) weaken the United States of America domestically and thereby expose the country to conquest, at least by alien ideas and eventually militarily from abroad.

The Hammurabi code promulgated earlier than 2,000 B.C. by imposing controls over wages, prices, production, consumption and all the rest of the economy, wrecked Babylonia. Governmental extravagance and a bloated bureaucracy killed individual initiative and led to the fall of ancient Greece. A planned economy of state maintenance for the slothful and excessive taxation brought the collapse of the later Roman Empire and regression of a civilized society into the Dark Ages. The welfare state of the Incas became so delibitated as to become easy prey for Pizarro and his Conquistadores. In its turn, the great Spanish Empire broken when the throne so regimented every activity that no one could earn a living except by being a public employee, a priest, or a sailor. So Portugal, in its day, the richest empire in the Western World, disintegrated. For the same reasons the British Empire is now dissolving before our eyes. God forbid that the United States of America follow any further down these disastrous trails than it already has.

The details of recorded history may be full of falsehoods, just as romance is of truths. But it's broad movements over long periods of time prove that only nations committed to the principles of individual initiative and ownership of property have risen above penury, produced science, art and literature and promoted the general welfare. Moreover, no major civilization ever perished primarily because it was murdered by an external enemy. In each case, the victim first was weakened by its own internal measures; in effect, it really committed suicide.

We must heed these cruel lessons of the past lest we be condemned to live them again.

Amidst all of the confusions and surprises of the modern world, a bangup blunder may work out well—but only very rarely and by accident—after all there was the flier, "One-Way Corrigan"—who took off for California but landed in Europe. However, some of my less than favorite orators in the U.N. seem to feel that by following the absurd, better results will ensue than from logic. For instance, they denounce the United States of America and Belgium for humanely rescuing hundreds if not thousands of black and white hostages from the Congo, in the face of an official report to the U.N. that "Witnesses attended scenes in which victims were dismembered, disembowelled, and the heart later used for a ritual food."

Thus do Moscow, Peiping, Belgrade, and other Communist capitals make common cause with savages and cannibals.

As Talleyrand said of the trial of the Duke of Enghein: "This is not merely a crime: It is much worse; it is an imbecility."

Those words about size up the Communist conspiracy. It is not merely a gross immorality and a crime, but an imbecility. Communism while pretending to march toward progress actually is a reversion to a primitive system of tribal life and the morals of the ant heap. Never in the many times it has been tried through all history has it

benefited either its subjects or humanity. Basically, it is stupid in its impracticability and evil in ideology, performance, and effect.

Its system of government and way of life have been one long record of blunders, depravity and atrocities. Under this obscene conspiracy, there have been committed every known crime; broken promises and treaties, lies heaped on lies, thefts and tortures and individual and mass murders.

Yet in our epoch, because of mankind's ignorance, apathy and unwillingness to think, communism has grown in less than 50 years to its present size, huge power and vast wealth.

By their iniquitous but shrewd intrigues, the Communists have contributed measureably to the civilized nations weakening themselves. They have subverted the United States of America and other countries into adopting many of the socialistic regulations, regimentations and laws which have been corroding our fundamental freedoms.

Aiding this huge conspiracy have been countless innocent although well-intentioned sentimentalists or idealists. Stalin baptized these groups as "useful idiots." Even the Chairman of the Policy Planning Staff in the State Department has advocated in writing what Senator J. Glenn Beall, of Maryland, called an amazing plea for the destruction of our national sovereignty and our existence as a nation.

Starting from practically zero in 1917, the Communists have come to control about one-third of the earth's surface. Since 1946 they have been taking over and enslaving peoples at the rate of 7,000 per hour—mind you per hour—not per day or week. This paradox, that an absurd and cruel failure opposed to all logic should spread to the degree it has, justifies, I believe, my contention that communism is the worst of all immoralities.

An essential ingredient of the Communist conspiracy at all times has been to humiliate and weaken the United States of America, causing it to lose the respect of the world and to suffer ridicule as a rather cowardly "paper tiger." Beyond the many serious incidents such as in Korea where somewhere between 5,000 and 6,000 of our boys taken prisoners were brutally murdered, there have been the Berlin Wall, Vietnam, and Cuba. Moreover, the Commies, like the bongo drummers, keep up an incessant rat-a-tat-tat of both minor and major annoyances and worse, to embarrass our Government.

It has become an international sport—almost a monthly occurrence for mobs inspired by the local governments to storm and virtually wreck our Embassies and other establishments abroad. The Kremlin a few months ago set up a so-called solidarity fund with $100 million to finance student agitations, riots, and insurrections throughout the Americas. To these ends, Castro's Cuba is serving as an educational center and sort of clearinghouse. Eight thousand students from all over this hemisphere already have been trained in these subversion schools. While serving as Ambassador in Argentina, then under the police state dictatorship of Peron, I told a true story of an Ambassador who appealed to the Foreign Minister for protection of his Embassy building. When the latter offered to send more police, the Ambassador begged: "Don't send more police, but fewer students." Perhaps the antics of a very small number of students in Berkeley last month may be relevant.

A favorite Communist trick is to kidnap U.S. citizens, including our military. Our "no win" policies have prevented effective protests being made in these cases by Washington. The State Department has jettisoned an 1860 ruling of the Supreme Court that "the great object and duty of government is * * * the protection of the lives, liberty, and property of the people * * * whether abroad or at home * * * and any government failing in the object of the performance of the duty is not worth preserving."

My personal experience has taught me that the sole thing Communists respect is effective strength greater than their own. Accordingly, Moscow knows that for its conquest of the world, the United States of America first must be encircled and defeated, preferably from within. The Communists prefer to resort to armed conflict only as an extreme measure, when and if they are convinced they can win an easy victory. But the encirclement of the United States of America is taking place exactly as per Lenin's specifications. Eastern Europe, the Middle East, Asia, and Africa either have fallen, or are in danger of doing so. But the gravest threat to the security of our country lies in the Communist infiltration, espionage and insurrection throughout the Western Hemisphere and particularly in Cuba.

For a time the U.S. public was wrought up at the thought of a Communist bastion on that island, only 90 miles off our shores. Latterly, however, due either to the indifference of our leaders or their unwillingness to face and give the public the facts, this Cuban menace, despite the Bay of Pigs and the October 22, 1962, missile confrontation, has been lost in the shuffle of world events and pushed off the front pages, radio, and TV by Vietnam, the Congo, and other faraway trouble spots.

I am compelled to say the meanest thing that can be said, "I told you so," because several times in respect to the growth of communism throughout Latin America I have issued the strongest warnings, only to have them ignored. In 1945 I told about Peron along with his anti-U.S. attitude, as he collaborated with the Communists. In 1952 I spoke out against the Guatemalan Communist regime of Arbenz and the Marxist one in Bolivia. Finally, nearly a year and a half before Fidel Castro came down from the hills on January 1, 1959, to take over in Cuba, I warned that our then policies would lead to chaos and communism on that island. I alerted the State Department 6 months before the tragic Bay of Pigs defeat that, as then planned, it would fail. Far in advance of the October 22, 1962, confrontation, I declared publicly that there were missiles on the island of Cuba.

Frankly, I am tired of being a Cassandra and only recite these facts because I am convinced that my sources of information are just as accurate now as they were before. I am convinced there still are many missiles, at least of short and intermediate range, hidden on the island of Cuba and that there are submarine bases or pens, including those in underground caves opening on the surrounding waters.

King Phillip of Spain said: "He who controls Cuba controls the Americas." President Jefferson expressed the same thought, as did our own famous strategist, Admiral Mahan, when he declared the Carribean was vital for the defense of the United States of America.

Therefore, I make so bold as to say that unless the Communists are driven out of Cuba, that island, under Moscow and Peiping direction, more than any other part of the world, will continue to be a cancer eating out the very innards of the Western Hemisphere. The Cubans cannot save themselves; they cannot go up against machineguns, tanks, and gas unarmed. Hence, I maintain that the only way to drive the Communists (including Russian, Chinese, and African troops) out is by an invasion by patriotic Cubans, supported by other Latin American contingents, but with the main effort and responsibility falling on the U.S. Army, Navy, Air Corps, and Marines.

If we will take this positive action it will show that we mean business and so restore to us the respect of other nations and help galvanize freemen everywhere into action to regain their liberty. The encouragement thus given to our allies in southeast Asia and Africa might even bring victory and independence to them. Many neutralist nations well might throw out their Kremlin bosses and flock to our side because a brave and successful action in Cuba would convince them that ours was the winning side.

Never before has the United States of America feared to fight for justice and freedom. Never have we paid tribute as in the case of the Cuban prisoners taken at the Bay of Pigs; nor ransom to bail out of our citizens and soldiers from Communist prison camps. If the United States of America is to survive it is high time to stop being timid and once again to hold cowardice to be utterly immoral.

Ladies and gentlemen, in many ways I have drawn a gloomy and pessimistic picture. Yet, in the words of the South Pacific song, I remain a "cockeyed optimist," provided the United States of America returns to and stands firmly on certain unchanging principles, which for years past I have enunciated; i.e., whenever I could get anybody to listen to me.

I have maintained that foreign policy necessarily may change according to circumstances, times, and place, but that there are certain immutable principles which always must outweigh policy. These principles are:

1. Respect is the sine qua non of all foreign relations. Irrespective of every other consideration and under all conditions, the United States of America must demand and get respect. To do so we must first have self-respect and exact from our own and other governments respect for their obligations and the sanctity of agreements.

2. The sole reason for being of the State Department and Foreign Service is to protect and advance the legitimate interests of the United States of America. If ever they should become illegitimate, then they are unworthy of this great Nation and should not be supported.

3. Every policy and action must be moral. Leaving ethics to one side, only in this way will we win and hold the confidence and respect from other countries which are so essential for a solid and enduring amity between peoples.

4. While never attempting to impose our way of life or form of Government, our ideas or even our moral standards, on others, we should ourselves stand unswervingly for and practice the system of republican constitutional, representative government laid down for us by the Founding Fathers in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights.

We can adhere to these principles and help save our civilization by following the precepts set forth by George Washington in his Farewell Address, the finest statement ever made on both domestic and foreign policy. If with moral fiber we will dedicate ourselves to doing these things then, with God's help, the United States of America will defeat communism along with many other immoral forces. We will preserve our freedoms and insure peace for our children and grandchildren in, if not the best of all worlds, at least in a much better one than the present.

Liberia in Perspective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, on March 30, 1965, the Wilkes-Barre Rotary Club had as its speaker His Excellency, the

Ambassador of Liberia, the Honorable S. Edward Peal.

I was most happy to make the arrangements for Ambassador Peal's appearance in my hometown on that date and it is especially gratifying to me to learn from the club's president, Attorney Joseph Tomascik, that the Ambassador's address was an exceptionally fine one and was very well received by all the members of the club and guests present on that occasion.

In fact, President Tomascik thought so well of the Ambassador's speech that he forwarded a copy of it and requested that it be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

After reading it, I certainly agree that it should receive wider circulation and it should be of particular interest to those students and others whose attention has been turned in recent years to the new and emerging nations of Africa and their problems and programs of economic, social, and political developments.

As part of my remarks today, Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to include the excellent address of Ambassador Peal.

Address follows:

LIBERIA IN PERSPECTIVE

(By Ambassador of Liberia, S. Edward Peal)

Among the many pleasant surprises which an ambassador on assuming his duties in your Nation's Capital soon discovers is the multiplicity of opportunities available to him to travel around the country to address audiences. In a manner this eagerness on the part of the American people to hear the story of other peoples and in doing so to obtain an understanding of all sides of a question is deeply rooted in the American tradition of free speech. It is an attitude which amply conforms to one of the primary purposes of an ambassador's mission—to get to know as much as possible about the host country and its citizens, as he endeavors at the same time to explain the policies of his Government and the traditions of his own land and people.

This healthy curiosity which happily characterizes the American public deserves therefore instant and grateful recognition from me.

But in a special sense this should be welcome to African Ambassadors. What little is known of our continent was told until recently by foreigners, usually of another race, for motives which have not always been either honorable or wholesome.

No other continent has suffered so much from stories told with such flippancy as to make it clear that mockery was their only purpose. No other people have had to carry such a crushing weight of distortions and untruths—so that at times in their agony they have been tempted to cry out "To the torch" with every word written in the past about Africa. Thus any African must react with unusual appreciation not only to the fact that Americans want to hear about his continent but more especially that they should prefer to have that story told by Africans themselves.

At the risk of appearing immodest, I venture to claim this afternoon that no African is better qualified to begin to tell that story than a Liberian whose roots while reaching deep into American history are also firmly planted in Africa and who draws inspiration and sustenance from all things African—pure, proud and groping.

That is why I am grateful for the invitation extended me through Congressman FLOOD to address you today. Indeed I am glad to be among you, to share in your fellowship and the reaffirmation of the Rotary faith and ideal which have caused your organization to be held in high esteem around the world and have won the admiration of all progressive people.

May I also say that the joy I derive from my presence here today springs partly from the knowledge that from the sons and daughters of this great State came much of the energy which has made America a landmark of human progress in our world. By words and deeds you have nurtured the cause of freedom, equality and justice for all men. And Liberia, since she shares your ideals, will ever cherish the bonds which link her to the United States.

But there are also practical reasons for the pleasure any Liberian experiences in visiting the State of Pennsylvania. Bethlehem Steel, one of the great industrial corporations of this Nation, by helping to develop the iron ore resources of Liberia, is making a substantial contribution to our economic progress. As more and more of that ore pours into the blast furnaces in this State, it is but natural that more and more Liberians will follow with interest its destination and thereby come to know a little more of life in Pennsylvania.

So let me now give you a brief description of my country, and tell you something of its history and the motivation of our people.

Liberia can be found between 4½° and 8½° north of the Equator.

This is a land located well within the tropical belt with such typical features as shallow lagoons, white sand beaches and mangrove-covered marshlands. It rises gently from the shoreline to a vast undulating plateau, 2,000 feet above sea level. It is laced by many large rivers, threading through savannahs and heavy evergreen forests. This forest is known to contain 235 different species of marketable timber.

There are two seasons—the dry and the rainy—and an average temperature of about 80° F. The rainfall varies between 200 inches along the coast to about 66 inches in the interior, with a very high degree of humidity.

Liberia has an area of 43,000 square miles and a population of less than 2 million, broken down according to some ethnologists into 28 main tribes speaking some 20 different dialects. English, however, is the official language.

The founding of Liberia goes back into the history of slavery in the United States.

It is not necessary for me to discuss some of the lively arguments which centered around this tragedy in human relations.

Here was a people living in what was said to be a society where "all men are born free" finding it necessary to leave that society in search of freedom. Many in this audience are well aware of some of the burning issues raised during those times which led to a bloody civil war, some of the aftermaths of which, have lingered on much longer than Christian charity will tolerate.

Though the founding of Liberia was one of the solutions experimented with, it must be said with great emphasis that she never found herself outside the many manifestations of the ugliness of slavery until nearly half way through the 20th century. Out of every tragedy something good may be salvaged. It was the mighty political upheavals and great wars that ushered in an increased sense of international morality which made possible Liberia's acceptance by the world community and enabled her to broaden the scope of her striving for progress beyond the narrow limits of mere survival. The supreme test during those long dark years was to exist fully realizing that she must remain as a constant symbol of faith and hope to all black people.

The uniqueness of that struggle and survival will never lose its thrilling meaning in the annals of human endeavor. Poverty and its handmaiden deprivation were a long nightmare but the challenge had to be met. Thus, when the President of Guinea, Sekou Toure, in rallying his people for freedom, said, "We prefer poverty in liberty to riches in slavery," he was echoing a familiar sentiment because long ago his Liberian brothers had shown the way.

What other satisfaction could we Liberians want for having kept the faith than this defiant demonstration of the aspirations of all Africans.

That was the background against which Liberia was founded in 1822 by "88 free men and women of color" under the auspices of the American Colonization Society.

Among the moving spirits of this society were such distinguished Americans as Bushrod Washington, a cousin of your first President, George Washington, Francis Scott Key, author of "The Star-Spangled Banner," Robert Findley and Elijah Caldwell.

Administratively, Liberia is divided into nine counties and three territories with a system of government based mainly on American institutions.

An important development on the world scene today is the determination of peoples heretofore denied equality and justice to assert their rights and make their full contribution to progress. Such assertions are heard wherever denials in any form are practiced. And so it ought to be.

But let me say what a consolation it is if where such struggles are taking place there can be found men sharing ideals in which we believe. For so long as this pertains, we can have less fear of the outcome.

Thus, if some of the social and economic changes in this mighty country can command a consensus among the vast majority of Americans it is because they continue to operate within the broad spectrum of American traditions, sustained by ideals in which the overwhelming majority of the leadership in such struggles have never lost faith.

Changes of a vast nature are taking place in Africa. It is good to know that many of those involved in these changes have an economic, political, and social orientation along American principles.

This has been Liberia's role in an Africa coming into the fullness of freedom and building for a future. Drawing upon an experience profoundly influenced by long association with America and buttressed by institutions whose strength has been fed by ideals shared with America, Liberia wished to make a constructive contribution to an Africa grappling with the problems of economic and social development.

What are some of the preoccupations of Africa today?

First and foremost is the complete commitment to the eradication of every form of injustice from the continent. Speaking with one voice, we say that denial of human rights is indefensible and that any form of colonialism in Africa is intolerable to the independent States in Africa.

Let me therefore remind you of Liberia's initiative at the United Nations in focusing world attention on apartheid in South Africa and on Portuguese colonialism.

No other recognition for this record is needed than to say that Liberia was proposed by all the African States for election to the Security Council and was thus the first to represent Africa on that Council south of the Sahara.

Similarly, if the case on South-West Africa is fast reaching the stage of determination at the International Court of Justice at The Hague, where it is hoped justice will be given to the people of this African nation, it is because of Liberia's leadership in pressing the contentious proceedings, acclaimed and supported by the other African States, against South Africa.

Another preoccupation of Africa is unity. No doubt you have read of the many efforts

to achieve this objective. In this respect no African leader has striven harder and longer than President Tubman of Liberia. Soon after Africa began to win freedom and sovereignty President Tubman issued a call to all African leaders, promulgating certain basic principles for the achievement of unity and cooperation. In many ways differing from the catch-all phrases and glib political slogans these principles came to represent in the hard light of reality and experience the course which prudence and wisdom confirmed.

Beginning from the premise that success is more quickly achieved in those areas where agreement is easier to come by and the immediate needs are greatest, Liberia has never tired of impressing her sister States in Africa with the best methods for working out relations among them. Its reward was achieved at Addis Ababa, Ethiopia, in 1963 when the Charter for the Organization of African Unity was adopted, embodying the principles which had first been put forward by Liberia in an Extraordinary Gazette in 1959, then again at the Saniquelle summit conference later in July of that year between Ghana, Guinea, and Liberia and, a third time at the first Conference of Independent African States at Monrovia in 1961.

Let me say here that it has ben a strange phenomenon that our friends in this country should have been slow in appreciating President Tubman's contribution in this critical area of African progress, although the record has been so impressive. Fortunately, the reaction among African leaders has not been so reserved.

Shortly after these momentous developments in 1959, here is what the magazine Africa Report in its August 1959 issue had to say in assessing President Tubman's role and the part played by Liberia:

"Member States of the African bloc rallied behind Algerian nationalists this month in a special 5-day meeting at Monrovia, Liberia.

"The officially sponsored Monrovia conference was the latest in a series of history-making political and diplomatic meetings held by Africans on African soil, all designed broadly to foster African unity."

Tracing some of the steps along the path of unity, this reporter concluded:

"This month, with nine national flags flying over the Monrovia capital alongside the banner of the rebel Algerian government, Tubman's poised entry into the pan-African scene was complete."

That is why throughout Africa today, President Tubman is so widely acclaimed, a typical example being these words of welcome addressed to him by the President of Gabon when he visited that State:

"We are proud to welcome you as head of a country whose democratic institutions and steps toward economic and social progress constitute an example for us and for many others."

Nor should it be forgotten that the African Development Bank with headquarters at Abijan, the Ivory Coast, of which all African independent States are members, was first conceived in Monrovia and vigorously promoted into reality by Liberia.

Or consider his posture on the issue of war and peace. He was one of the first to call on world leaders to commit themselves as a matter of principle to a no-war pledge.

Also, fast gaining acceptance are Liberia's recommendations regarding the settlement of boundary disputes and mediation and conciliation among states.

What objective person would not stand in admiration at such a broad and constructive approach to crucial world and African problems?

But these contributions would have been unlikely had not the policies and commitments of Liberia as a Nation been guided by the best traditions of a free society.

So let me ask you to dismiss at once the myths you have read about Liberia. To understand Liberia and appreciate her value, as with most situations, she must be placed in the correct perspective in the struggle of man, the black man, for freedom, human dignity, and equality. These myths I should mention were part and parcel of that struggle and those times. Let Liberia be judged only by her record.

In economic and social development Liberia is emphasizing the free initiative of man, and no Liberian has done more in bringing that into full realization than President Tubman. On assuming office in 1944, he enunciated the open-door policy whereby foreign capital and skill would be invited to help develop the natural resources of the country. The response has been good especially among business people in this country. Let them continue to look to Liberia as a fruitful field for their investment. It has been profitable for them and us and we intend to keep it that way.

Where a few years ago, there were some doubts about the viability of the country, a modern society is now making an historic impact. Rubber, once the main export of the country, has yielded first place to iron ore, which is said to have the richest ferrous content to be found anywhere in the world.

Our economy is being diversified and our people now look to the future with increased confidence.

Let me turn to the words of President Senghor of Senegal for a present-day description of Liberia, given in the preface of a recent book by Lawrence Marinelli, entitled "The New Liberia," and published by Praeger. I commend this well-written study to those of you who may wish to know more about my country. Senghor said:

"To appraise President Tubman's grand design we must recall what Liberia was when he was first inaugurated in January 1944. * * * The situation of Liberia was that of a particularly underdeveloped African country. It had not been colonized by a great power, but by philanthropic endeavors with more good will than technical or financial means. The moral devastations that came with the breakup of traditional societies were the most terrible * * * but there is happily a positive aspect: the economic infrastructure, industrial cultures, schools, hospitals, and, above all, the modern spirit. * * * From these positive assets Liberia had scarcely benefited before 1949 * * * after all what could several thousand impoverished Americo-Liberians do? Very little—unless there appeared among them a great politician with a grand design offering them reasons for living, and, above all, for action, William Tubman was going to revolutionize Liberia and give it not only a modern ideal but modern means to achieve it.

"The most positive result of these activities is—I have witnessed it myself—there are no longer Americo-Liberians or natives. There is a Liberian nation to which all its citizens are proud to belong.

"William Tubman * * * open door is not the transposition pure and simple of liberal capitalism. * * * The development of resources on a cooperative basis presupposes concerted and flexible planning. * * * Today one can measure the positive results of this policy of economic expansion.

"Thus do we view William Tubman. Leader of his people, founder of the Liberian nation and creator of its modern economy he has done more alone than all his predecessors did together. We do not smile at Liberia the way we did before 1944. Today Tubman is among the African heads of state who are most listened to, most respected."

I hope these words of a world-known African statesman, poet, and writer, will help to lay to rest for all times the myths about Liberia.

Finally, let me say how much Liberia takes pride in her friendship and cooperation with the United States. But like most things if friendship is to remain fruitful and mutually beneficial, one must never become too complacent about it. A friendship that is allowed to turn stale is soon lost; a friendship that fails to find new sources of pleasure and enrichment will not last. There are so many things in so many areas in which Liberians and Americans can cooperate effectively to strengthen their democracies and make our world happy for all peoples. There is a rotary club in Monrovia. How splendid it will be if you will begin as of now to search out with that club some of the avenues along which our two peoples can explore the possibilities of making our friendship more responsive to the needs and aspirations which we share.

Ambassador Stevenson To Receive Eleanor Roosevelt Political and Public Service Memorial Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, Adlai E. Stevenson, our distinguished Ambassador to the United States, has been selected to receive the Eleanor Roosevelt Political and Public Service Memorial Award for 1965. The Ambassador has received many well-deserved honors during his years of outstanding public service. This particular honor, though, carries with it a special significance. It is given annually in memory of Eleanor Roosevelt to that person who best exemplifies her spirit.

The Eleanor Roosevelt Political and Public Service Memorial Award was conceived by a group of her friends as a fitting and lasting memorial shortly after her death in 1962. They formed an independent award committee consisting of the following distinguished citizens: John J. B. Shea, Francis W. H. Adams, Richard A. Brown, Eugene Callender, Stephen R. Currier, Irving M. Engel, Arnold L. Fein, Abraham Feinberg, Thomas K. Finletter, Eleanor Clark French, Lloyd K. Garrison, Mrs. Louis A. Gimbel, Jr., Milton A. Gordon, Mrs. Dorothy Hirshon, Thomas R. Jones, Mrs. Robert Kintner, Arthur B. Krim, Orin Lehman, Mrs. Dorothy Norman, Frederick W. Richmond, Curtis Roosevelt, WILLIAM F. RYAN, Dore Schary, JAMES H. SCHEUER, Henry D. Sedgwick, R. Peter Straus, Telford Taylor, Robert Wechsler. In 1963, the award committee made its first presentation to Lloyd K. Garrison, and in 1964 selected Anna Rosenberg Hoffman as the award recipient.

This year, the award committee unanimously chose Adlai Stevenson to receive the Eleanor Roosevelt Political and Public Service Memorial Award. The following essay, written by Dore Schary, beautifully expresses the intent of the committee in choosing an annual recipient for this unique award.

MRS. R.: POLITICIAN

All of us who loved Eleanor Roosevelt have spoken and written at length about her devotion to causes of good and welfare. Her labors on behalf of the conquering of diseases; her fight for better educational opportunity; her steadfastness in the field of civil liberties; her intolerance toward inadequate housing; bigotry; industrial discrimination and her allegiance to the humanities are documented for all to see.

Too little is said of her tough capabilities as a politician. In this area she was always surprising the opposition who were constantly misinterpreting her massive benevolence as a sign of political naivete or ignorance.

Her performance as a delegate to the United Nations and her contribution to the bill of human rights proved her competence in international politics. Her willingness to defy the less astute members of her own party is on the record. She has opposed private interests or Presidents if need be, if principle was being sacrificed for expediency.

She was unremitting in pursing principle, and in world affairs or national problems or State and city politics, she was willing to pick up the lance and give battle. There are a number of unhorsed opponents who bear witness to her skill and tenacity as a combatant in the political tournaments.

Eleanor Roosevelt's favority political theme was the responsibility of each citizen to participate in the affairs of his government at local, State, and National levels. It was her contention that our elected officials reflected the interest and devotion of the electorate; that, in effect, we got what we deserved or earned.

It is a credo that all members of every reform movement should repeat each day as a remainder of their basic obligation.

There was with the sweet smile and the soft voice of Mrs. Roosevelt an iron will and steely convictions that not only benefited the Democratic Party but could remain a shining inheritance to all of us who occasionally forget that principle must be pursued without considering the consequence.

The hand-illuminated parchment plaque being presented to Ambassador Stevenson contains the last photograph taken of Mrs. Roosevelt in her lifetime and reads:

Adlai E. Stevenson, whose devotion to and efforts for the cause of good government splendidly reflect those ideals and principles which dominated the mind and heart of Eleanor Roosevelt.

The award will be presented to the Ambassador at a dinner on April 12 at the Hotel Pierre in New York, sponsored by the New York Committee for Democratic Voters, the citywide reform Democratic movement, Mrs. Roosevelt's major political interest in the last years of her life.

Voting Rights Act of 1965 Is Bad Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, eligible Americans should have the right to vote, but it should not be done at the expense of tearing down the structure of State government. There are three provisions of the Constitution that affect the matter of voting. The first is article I, section 2, which reads as follows:

The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second Year by the People of the several States * * * and the Electors in each State shall have the Qualifications requisite for Electors of the most numerous Branch of the State Legislature.

The next one is amendment 15, which has this to say:

SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Subsequently amendment 17 was placed in the Constitution which has to do with the direct election of Senators and says this:

The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

The two constitutional provisions, one of which was amendment 17, which came after the adoption of amendment 15, lodged the authority in the States to set qualifications with respect to voting. Hysteria, propaganda, and hasty appeals for action do not change the effectiveness of the State authority with respect to voting unless the qualifications set out by the State would discriminate against segments of the population or are themselves unreasonable. Then such State provisions would be subject to being reviewed as to their constitutionality.

I cannot agree with the doctrine enunciated by President Lyndon B. Johnson in his recent message to a joint session of Congress which was based on amendment 15, and this alone.

The Congress is working under a high top priority rating on what is known as the Voting Rights Act of 1965. The bill brings under Federal jurisdiction for the first time State and county elections. As it is worded, it applies to six States which are: Georgia, Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Virginia. These States are covered because less than 50 percent of their people who are 21 years of age or over cast a vote in 1964, which was set up as a guideline in the legislation. The effect of the bill would be to deny those six States the right to invoke literacy tests such as knowledge, intelligence, education, or morality on any of the citizens of such States who may wish to vote. The result of directing legislation at six States and six States only is quite unusual and highly discriminatory in that a person can vote in those States even though he cannot read and write, whereas in New York State and many others in the Nation, he will be deprived of the right of franchise.

It is reasonable and most desirable that a voting citizen should have at least a little bit of sense and a person who has not been convicted of a felony. There are two main considerations when you speak of providing rights of all of our citizens to vote. They should be given the right to vote, yes, under reasonable standards, but such a system should adhere to the law of the land—the Constitution of the United States.

This bill which is now being studied in both Houses of Congress would lodge discretionary power in the U.S. Attorney General to step in and by the use of his appointment of voter registrars deprive the local citizens of the right to qualify voters within those six States. There can be little doubt that such authority in the Attorney General to supervise the registration of voting in this manner is not only irregular but runs counter to the expressed provisions of the Constitution which gives the States the full and complete authority to set reasonable voter qualifications.

This bill will be approved by a fairly good majority in both the House and the Senate it appears without doubt. When this happens it would ride herd over the privileges that States have always enjoyed in this country. That is bad—very bad legislation.

The Farm Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, agriculture is the Nation's greatest industry. It is the most important industry to the well-being of our people. The President sent to the Congress today proposals for legislation of great significance and meaning to our farm people and to the Nation. I have introduced this legislation as H.R. 7097 and, because of the broad interest, I am placing in the RECORD a statement I made to the press on this bill.

The statement follows:

THE FARM BILL

I have today introduced the administration's omnibus farm bill, and our Committee on Agriculture will consider the proposed legislation carefully, thoroughly, and expeditiously.

The administration is to be commended for the great amount of work it has done in an effort to develop policies and to improve programs with the overall objective of stabilizing farm income, revitalizing rural America, assuring abundant food and fiber for consumers, and bolstering the national economy.

However, I am certain the legislation contains many controversial provisions, and I regret that the administration is so late in presenting its farm recommendations to the Congress.

Moreover, I had hoped that the administration would by this time have submitted recommendations concerning cotton and the problems which will face our textile industry if the one-price cotton program is not continued. I have been assured that we will receive recommendations from the administration at an early date.

Our committee will do everything in its power to make up the lost time, to compose all differences, improve and refine the legislation wherever possible, and to bring about

the enactment of a bill that will be fair to our farmers and to all Americans.

The President through this new farm bill proposes, among other program changes, to place greater reliance on the market price for wheat and rice. For years, the American farmer as a result of his greater efficiency has not received a fair price for his products. Prices farmers receive are substantially below such farm prices 15 years ago.

Actually, a very good case can be made on the proposition that farmers now are subsidizing the consumers of the Nation by billions of dollars a year, because their income from their investment, management, and labor is much smaller and therefore they must accept lower standards of living than their customers who are engaged in the undertakings of other segments of the economy.

The bill submitted by the President attempts to deal with this inequity. As I understand it, by getting more of the farmers' income from the marketplaces rather than from subsidy at taxpayers' expense, as proposed in the new legislation, a slight increase in the price of bread will mean only $1.60 per person a year, and in the case of rice, only 30 cents per person per year.

Surely, this is a small price to pay a healthy and prosperous agriculture.

I personally am determined to improve farm income, and to protect our family system of agriculture.

We shall have the Secretary of Agriculture before our committee tomorrow to discuss the details of the legislation, and then the various divisions of the bill—such as wheat, feed grains, rice and wool—will be referred to subcommittees for separate hearings.

I am not certain at this time whether we shall take an omnibus bill to the House for action, or present separate bills as we make our determinations on the best policies and programs for the various commodities.

Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the following is the second of a series of articles on the poverty program written by Jo Ann Hardee, of the Detroit News:

NEW "POVERTY" DEFINITION WILL TIE IT TO LIVING COST

(By Jo Ann Hardee)

WASHINGTON, March 15.—A new definition of "poverty" will be announced by the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) within 2 months.

It will be more precise than that developed by the Council of Economic Advisers, which set the poverty level at $3,000 for a family and $1,500 for an individual.

It is expected to raise the poverty line for nonfarm families to $3,120 and lower it to $1,850 for farm families.

WEIGH COST FACTORS

Instead of a flat-income figure, the new definition will be based generally upon cost of living, taking into consideration regional location, urban versus rural life, farm versus nonfarm life, age, and educational level.

As a measure of cost of living, the OEO is using the Social Security Administration low-income budget for a four-person family. This allows 70 cents per person for daily food and $1.40 per person for all other expenses, including housing, clothing, school expenses, medical costs and transportation.

This index requires $3,120 yearly income.

But the OEO recognizes that the adequacy of such and income is related to costs of living in a particular locality.

SEEK BASIC STANDARD

Its figures show that a farm family which grows its own food could achieve the same standard of living on $1,850 a year, while some city dwellers would require more than $3,120 for the same standard.

"What we are developing is a minimum living standard," said Leon Gilgoff, Deputy Director of the OEO's Department of Planning, Research and Evaluation.

"If we meet this basic level we can move on. The program is certainly not designed to stop at an arbitrary income level of $3,120. Only the coldest hearted person would say that 70 cents per person for daily food is an adequate living."

The new definition is expected to answer critics who quarreled with the $3,000 to $1,500 evaluation of poverty.

* * * * *

Barry Goldwater, of Arizona, noted that more than 1 million members of the Armed Forces had less than a $3,000 annual income, including living allowances. They also said that retired persons on social security would be barred from that program if they earned more than $3,000.

Critics also said the definition did not take into account noncash income such as farm products.

Representative ROBERT P. GRIFFIN, Traverse City, Mich., Republican, said an older couple with 6,000 shares of International Business Machines stock would have a cash income of $3,000 annually, but their stock would be worth $300,000.

"Naturally, it would be ridiculous to include or exclude someone from an antipoverty program on an arbitrary income basis alone," Gilgoff said. "That's why we have placed emphasis upon community action programs.

"INDEX BY AREAS

"At the community level, persons are being screened on the basis of their need. They certainly shouldn't be excluded from the program if they make $3,121, are unemployed, poorly educated, and have six children.

"But we are trying to develop more accurate guidelines for screening," he added. "Eventually we hope to develop a poverty index for individual communities similar to the unemployment index now in use."

The U.S. Chamber of Commerce, an opponent of the antipoverty bill, is developing its own definition of poverty through a special task force of 100 business leaders.

It has urged a market-basket approach, using cost of living as the guide to poverty. Its definition, expected in April, is to be based essentially upon the same criteria as the OEO's.

BREAKING IT DOWN

Gilgoff's inventory of poverty is a complex breakdown of the 34 million persons designated as poor by the Council of Economic Advisers.

Those figures showed that 78 percent of the poor were white; heads of 60 percent of all poor families have only grade school educations, one-third of the poor families were headed by a person over 65.

Gilgoff's poverty inventory is designed to show a precise profile of poverty.

When completed it should reveal how many persons in a given geographical region are at the poverty level; their ages, sex, color, educational level, housing quality, health and whether they live in cities, rural areas or on farms.

This can be contrasted with the comparable standards of living of similar persons in the same geographical area.

HOPE FOR BATTLE PLAN

OEO analysts believe the new definition will not only answer criticisms that the previous flat-income level was too vague, but will pinpoint the methods needed to combat poverty.

"We realize that the definition of poverty used to develop the economic opportunity act was vague and transitory," Gilgoff said. "It was, however, wise as a jumpoff point for immediate action.

"We realize also that our programs were not developed on the basis of the effectiveness of one approach as opposed to another. They were built on the demonstrated need of 34 million people.

"With a breakdown of the poverty category into types of needs, we can evaluate the cost of a specific program in relation to its effectiveness."

HOW TO BREAK CYCLE?

OEO officials are primarily concerned with "breaking the cycle of poverty," Gilgoff said. They wish to move people out of poverty and keep them from slipping back into a poverty status.

The breakdown will give OEO officials a better idea of where to put its limited resources in order to do the best job. They recognize that $727 million is a very small sum in relation to the $40 billion now being spent by the Federal Government alone in antipoverty programs such as welfare.

As an example, Gilgoff's new poverty definition will show how many children under 15 live in poverty-ridden families. OEO analysts frankly admit that the best opportunity for breaking the poverty cycle rests with the young.

* * * * *

The breakdown also is expected to "give us a guide to the kind of person that works out best in an antipoverty effort," Gilgoff said.

EXCEPTIONS TO RULE

"There may be some classifications for whom the only answer is a transfer payment of increased social security. The elderly, as an example, have little opportunity to reenter the job market. Although we reject the transfer payment as a solution to poverty, the elderly are an example of the case in which it may be the only reasonable answer.

"Another case might be that of a mother, now on Aid to Dependent Children, who perhaps should have the option of working or staying home with young children."

In his planning and evaluation, Gilgoff is using the systems analysis methods of the Department of Defense where he was formerly employed.

"When we have a complete poverty inventory and as we gain fiscal and economic maturity, we can judge the cost of a specific program against its effectiveness," he said.

"If it doesn't work, we should be and intend to be, the first to reject it."

How We Reject Christ

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks and include extraneous material, I submit the following editorial from the Deseret News, published in Salt Lake City, Utah, and dated March 13, 1965.

The editorial points up the way in which we are drifting away from the laws of God; how this drift is even being encouraged by some members of the clergy; how this drift is being condoned and encouraged by universities and bar associations; how this drift is carrying us, day by day, farther and farther away from the moral precepts of our fathers; how this drift is losing for us the moral base on which our great Nation was founded and grew.

It is a thoughtful and thought-provoking editorial, Mr. Speaker. I believe it should be read by all who are concerned as to where we, as a nation, are going.

The editorial follows:

HOW WE REJECT CHRIST

There are various ways of rejecting Christ. We need not be atheists or pagans to turn our backs upon Him. We can even profess to know Him, and still deny Him by our works, as Paul has said.

America claims to be a Christian nation. We say "In God We Trust" on our coins, and sing about it in our national anthem, and yet we take many steps which oppose the very things we profess.

Preachers who appear to advocate Christianity teach doctrines which are directly contrary to the sacred precepts given us by the Saviour. Politicians pass laws which defy divine principles.

In New York, one of our greatest States, we now have a movement in the legislature to pattern after Illinois, another of our greatest States, in liberalizing morality laws.

The bar association there is asking the legislature to rule that "adultery shall no longer be a crime; homosexuality shall no longer be illegal; the age of consent shall be reduced to the tender age of 16 for any persons wishing to enter prostitution.

A minister in Baltimore told college students that sex is fun—relax and enjoy it. Fornication, he said, is not a sin, so stop feeling guilty about your sex activities.

England is entering the same road. A high official there favored the same kind of free love—advocating it publicly. Students at one of the best colleges in Britain may now keep girls overnight in their dormitories if they pay the school a fine of 3 pounds sterling.

When God says, "Thou shalt not commit adultery," what preacher can set the law aside and say this sin is "fun" and people should relax and enjoy it? When great states wish to legalize filth and say there is no sin in it, do they not reject the being who issued divine injunctions against it?

Christ denounced fornication. Can a "man of the cloth" remove the divine restriction? Are men beginning to consider themselves greater than God?

A recent religious publication bearing an official imprimatur, would make us think so as it says on another subject:

"Every day the priest obeys that command (meaning the celebration of the eucharist). He stands before the altar and cries out to God to come down from Heaven and take up his residence under the appearance of bread and wine. God obeys. The priest may be weak, or sick, or ignorant, or even evil. It makes no difference. When he gives command, Almighty God obeys. What an extraordinary power this is. No king, no dictator, no president ever possessed anything like it."

A Gallup poll in England, taken about Christmas time, showed that 65 percent of the people no longer regard Christmas with any religious significance.

Sunday in most countries, and certainly in the United States of America, is now a holiday for the vast majority. It too has lost its religious significance for most people. Some churches actually teach that if you attend a religious service on Sunday, the rest of the day may be given over to sports or frolic of your own choosing.

America is the land "choice above all other lands," but its divine protection rests upon the worship of Christ who is the God of the land.

Are signs such as those mentioned above significant?

Does the trend they portray have any bearing on our national security in these times of great world unrest?

To what extent may we hope to enjoy the blessings of Heaven if we reject the God of this land? What proportion of the population must join in the rejection before this Nation as a whole is considered recreant toward God?

Anciently Abraham bargained with the Lord for the preservation of a city. The Almighty was willing to spare it for a faithful few—if they could be found.

Can Latter-day Saints and other sincere Christians become a leaven in the lump to preserve America while the majority of its population seems to turn its back upon the Savior?

What better patriotic duty can they perform than to walk righteously before their God?

Backtracking on Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, all of New England was shocked last week by Secretary of the Interior Udall's abrupt about-face on the question of import controls on residual oil.

After assuring New England Representatives that a decision would be made to eliminate the quota on residual oil for New England, the Secretary's decision was reversed and he permitted only a slight increase in the current quota.

Since the Secretary himself has admitted that the national security interest in continuing the quotas is not a significant factor, it is difficult for us to escape the conclusion that our region is the victim of rank discrimination.

On Friday, April 2, the Boston Herald in a fine editorial asks "What is the justification for this extra fuel tax on New England?" It is a good question and one which deserves a good answer.

The editorial follows:

BACKTRAINING ON OIL

Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall has put himself in a completely untenable position by his latest action on residual oil import quotas.

Three weeks ago he told Senators testifying at Interior Department hearings: "The President has given me full and sole and complete authority to make this decision (on continuing or ending oil quotas) * * *. I'm going to make it on my own."

This week, after first deciding to exempt New England and Florida from all controls, he reversed himself under pressure from White House and Justice Department lawyers and announced simply that quotas for the east coast would be increased by 75,000 barrels a day.

The lawyers argued that, because the quotas were established for national security purposes, it would not be legally "viable" to treat some areas differently from others. But counsel for the New England Council had filed a brief showing that there was no legal barrier to such an arrangement. And Mr. Udall, until the last moment, had accepted this view.

Raising the quotas does not, of course, meet New England's problem.

This region is a heavy user of residual oil, consuming upward of 70 million barrels a year. And most oil users, such as our electric utilities, are not in a position to switch to other fuels. For New England, as Senator MUSKIE has said, it is not a question of residual or coal, but rather residual or disaster. The new import quotas barely make up for the decline in domestic production.

The squeeze comes on price. The quota system inevitably forces residual prices upward. The cost of residual oil is now higher in the United States, an energy rich country, than in many energy poor countries. Secretary Udall himself estimates that the quota system is costing U.S. consumers $40 million a year. And a substantial part of that bill is paid in New England.

And what is the justification for this extra fuel tax on New England? Ostensibly it is national security—protecting domestic oil and coal producers. But Secretary Udall, who is supposed to have the last word on the matter, says dropping the quotas in our case would not hurt the national security.

It is hard to avoid the conclusion, therefore, that this region is being victimized by selfish oil and coal interests who are bringing pressure on the Interior Secretary through the White House.

We hope that the strong protests made by the New England congressional delegation and other regional spokesmen will serve to counteract these pressures and bring about a settlement of the quota question on its merits. The whole quota system should be scrapped. At very least it should be scrapped in New England and Florida, where there is no significant competition between imported residual oil and domestic fuels.

Secretary Udall was right the first time. He should have stuck by his guns.

Don't Drown the Grand Canyon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, the Congress will be asked, in due course, to judge whether dams should be built on the Lower Colorado River, which would create a reservoir in the Grand Canyon National Park. This is such a frontal attack upon one of our Nation's most splendid and revered natural wonders that any projects which would lessen its majesty must certainly be reviewed with the greatest of care.

From my preliminary study, I am somewhat astounded to learn that these proposed dams would not actually add to the total volume of water for the area. In fact, the evaporation from the dams themselves would indicate a net loss of water. Perhaps in this great day of specialization there is a logical explanation for such proposals, but I have always thought that reclamation projects should have as their objective the reclaiming of

land or water. The proposals to build dams on the Lower Colorado do neither.

From my knowledge as of this moment, I view with alarm any project that would have such an adverse effect upon one of the jewels of this world which we are privileged to have within our country.

As part of my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Cleveland Press, which I believe expresses the views of a vast majority of our people:

DON'T DROWN THE GRAND CANYON

Congress should look long and hard at a California-Arizona proposal to spend $750 million to build dams above and below the Grand Canyon.

The lower dam would flood the canyon's inner gorge for 13 miles into the national park. It would spoil one of America's great scenic wonders. It would set a precedent for invasion of Glacier, Yosemite, Grand Tetons, Yellowstone, Big Bend, and other national parks on which Federal Engineers want to build dams.

There are other reasons for resisting this scheme:

The two dams would waste millions of gallons of water through evaporation in the hot, dry climate and through seepage in the porous canyon walls; water that could be used if permitted to flow naturally to Hoover Dam.

Though this is called a reclamation project, it would not reclaim a foot of land. The dams would be used only to produce expensive power, raising the cost of electricity in the Southwest. Coal-fueled steamplants—and the Mountain States are loaded with coal—could produce much cheaper power.

There is not now enough water in the Colorado River, which carved the Grand Canyon, to fill the reservoirs behind Glen Canyon Dam, at the Arizona-Utah border, and Hoover Dam, downstream at the Arizona-Nevada border.

The dams would make even saltier the salty, silt-laden water now delivered in the river to Mexico, by treaty. We have acknowledged our obligation to deliver usable water to our neighbor.

One beneficiary would be the Reclamation Bureau, which is pushing this lush new project to maintain its organization.

None of this makes economic sense. And it is a crime against nature. Congress should dismiss this proposal and go to work on more constructive ideas to bring water to the Southwest.

How Do We Justify School Aid?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in the Wasau Record-Herald in my congressional district which appeared on Tuesday, March 30, 1965, raises certain questions about equalizing educational opportunities across the Nation. Using a concrete example of the kind of tax break some States, like Lousiana, give to their industries, the Record-Herald makes the very sensible point:

If we can justify equalizing educational opportunities across the Nation it must be on the basis of whether the local tax base can or cannot bear the burden of adequate school tax—not whether it will or not.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, the editorial, entitled "How Do We Justify School Aid?" follows:

HOW DO WE JUSTIFY SCHOOL AID?

How can we justify Federal aid to education? In our mind, it can only be justified as a method of equalizing educational opportunity—and even then it is only justified if the variation in school funds is substantial. As we have pointed out many times in the past. it is most difficult for men sitting at desks in Washington, D.C., to be completely fair in determining need around this big country.

Thus, it was not too surprising when someone analyzed the administration school aid bill and found that 10 of the wealthiest counties in the Nation, with only 2 to 4 percent of their children in the so-called poverty category, would receive $8.9 million in 1966, while 10 poor counties, with 35 to 54 percent of their children in the poverty class, would receive about half of that—$4.5 million. As Congressman LAIRD pointed out, Wisconsin's Forest County will get far less than a Maryland county where family incomes average around $10,000.

The Southern States would put in the least amounts per capita and receive the greatest amounts per capita in return. Is this right? Is it true that the Southern States cannot bear their own education burden?

Take a look at an advertisement by the State of Louisiana Department of Commerce and Industry in the current issue of U.S. News & World Report. Under the heading "Long-Range Tax Protection," here is what the ad says:

"Louisiana grants 10-year exemption from property taxes on plants and equipment of new and expanding manufacturers. Now, under a 1964 act, these properties cannot be assessed—after the 10-year-exemption period—higher than the ratio that all property assessments in the area bear to actual value."

Take a $6 million new plant built in Wausau. If it went on the tax rolls at two-thirds of that, or $4 million, it would pay property taxes of $160,000 per year, more than half of which would be devoted to the cost of education. Over a 10-year period, such a plant would pay $800,000 in taxes for schools in Wausau; in Louisiana it would pay absolutely nothing—for schools or for anything else!

So what happens when Federal aid to educations is pased? The Louisiana plant again will get favored treatment, since far more Federal aid will go to Louisiana per pupil than to Wisconsin.

If we can justify equalizing educational opportunities across the Nation it must be on the basis of whether the local tax base can or cannot bear the burden of adequate school tax—not whether it will or will not!

Wisconsin citizens would be wise to protect their own interests by writing their representatives in Congress. Our education costs— already high— are going much higher because we are going to help schools in Louisiana and other such States which will not help themselves if Federal aid to education is passed.

No Biz Like Poverty Biz

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL FINDLEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, a dispatch from the New York battlefront gives a glimpse of how goes the war on poverty. As chronicled in the New York Daily News:

POVERTY—IT'S WONDERFUL

President Johnson's war on poverty, New York branch has finally got itself into high, or high-cost gear. Mayor Wagner is requesting another $10,300,000 in Federal taxpayers' money. First, though, some spoilsports are expected to demand an investigation of Harlem's controversial haryou-act program. This costly spectacular has long been the subject of equally spectular rumors of financial hanky-panky. Its books may have to be audited before our mayor is allowed to hand it another $1.5 million.

Then there's the fascinating case of Mrs. Mary Conway Kohler, a lady lawyer who, it turns out, is getting $500 per week as a poverty "consultant," whatever that is.

Queried about her new job, the lady says sweetly it's none of anyone's business. No biz like poverty biz.

A Terrible War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the real tragedy of the terrible war being waged in Vietnam is that the most commonly advanced alternatives lead only into blind alleys: to wider war or the surrender of independence. Neither it seems to me are acceptable; neither are consistent with mankinds goals of peace and freedom.

If we were to withdraw abruptly today, as some so vigorously advocate, South Vietnam would fall to a Communist attack which has increasingly been waged and directed from the north—from North Vietnam and Communist China itself. The independence which we have pledged to help a new nation maintain—the independence which is inherent in our own tradition—would be lost.

But the loss of South Vietnam to Communist pressures would do more than destroy independence in that country alone.

It would clearly menace neighboring Thailand and Cambodia. It would bring increased pressure on already beleagured Malaysia. It would open a side door into India. It would threaten the Philippines and even Australia. It would make impossible any alternatives for Indonesia. It would, in brief, imperil independence and freedom in all of southeast Asia.

But the other alternative certainly offers no better choice. If the war continues to escalate; if the United States continues to lead through its strength, which is in the sea and in the air, then the North Vietnamese, and the Communist Chinese, and even the Russians, can respond through their strength which is terror and massive attacks by land.

The bombing of the U.S. Embassy in Saigon is an example. The employment of thousands and hundreds of thousands

of Communist and American troops is another. And the devastation of millions through nuclear war, from which there would be no real victor, is an ever present possibility.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question in my mind that the only reasonable, sane and productive course of action is negotiation. But let us be sure of our grounds. Let us be sure that we have something to negotiate. And let us recall that the history of the world is replete with examples of disaster when negotiations were conducted from weakness. For weakness breeds contempt and the Communists have made clear their contempt for weakness.

Negotiations like the tango, furthermore, take two, and to date the Communists have indicated no desire and no willingness to remove the barriers—the aggression, the subversion and the terror—to meaningful discussions.

If the Communists can be persuaded to leave their neighbors alone, then peace is possible in South Vietnam and all of southeast Asia. For as the Washington Post stated on March 31:

The United States, on its part, wishes only a free and independent South Vietnam and North Vietnam, in the end, surely would have its essential purposes served best by a friendly, viable and productive neighbor from which the United States and all other foreign troops had departed.

The attainment of peace and independence, which are our abiding goals, has not and never will be easy. It requires patients, perserverance and persistence. But it is possible if we, in the words of John Kennedy, never negotiate out of fear, but never fear to negotiate.

Mr. Speaker, I call our colleagues' attention to the thoughtful article in the Washington Post of March 31, which I have already referred to briefly, and urge that it be read by all who are concerned with this most critical of problems:

A TERRIBLE WAR

The shocking terrorist attack on the U.S. Embassy in Saigon was hardly needed to demonstrate what a brutal and barbaric struggle is taking place in South Vietnam. That was already well known. Still, we need to note that this barbarous attack upon unarmed men and women, children, civilian employees and bystanders, American and South Vietnamese alike, was made by forces that have been protesting the methods of the South Vietnam troops in battlefield situations.

What is going on in South Vietnam is a war in which every living person is a combatant, in which no man, woman or child has any sanctuary, in which there can be no peace for anyone. It is not surprising that this sort of war can be waged most effectively by those who acknowledge no rules or restraints.

The Government of the United States, as it is frequently advised by many of its own people and by its friends abroad, is in a very disagreeable and difficult situation. Agreement does not extend very far beyond this self-evident conclusion. We know we are in a very difficult predicament. We know how we got there. The numerous advisers who pour their counsel on the Government are not so prolific with suggestions as to how we can alter our situation without incurring risks and inviting dangers as bad or worse.

The Government is advised that it should negotiate—but all the powers with whom it might negotiate have let it be known that they are unwilling to negotiate until the United States withdraws and leaves the country to the victors. The appeals for negotiation need to be addressed first to Hanoi, to Peiping, and to the Vietcong. There can be negotiation, no doubt, when they wish to negotiate but it is difficult to see how anything can be done as long as the departure of the forces of the United States is made a precondition to settlement.

The United States also is reproached for its failure to delineate its policy to South Vietnam. The reproach might be more aptly stated as a reproach for a policy that is disliked. That policy is to live up to our commitment to the South Vietnamese people, whom we have pledged to support as long as they wish to struggle for their independence and freedom. Those who dislike this policy, and the acknowledged distress and discomfort in which it has involved us, owe the Government, in all candor, an explanation of the alternative policy which they would pursue so that its discomforts may be examined. It is mischievous to simply denounce the situation at which we have arrived, the predicament that we are in and the policy to which we are committed without offering any specific alternative proposals. The essence of policy decision is in having a choice between available courses of action. Let the terms of the alternatives be made known. If there is a better course that this country can pursue with honor surely those in authority would be glad to learn of it.

It ought to be emphasized however that there are no time machines available. The events of the past 10 years cannot be extinguished. The future begins tomorrow and not yesterday or on some yesterday 10 years ago on which we might have elected to stay out of South Vietnam. The critics of the policy of the United States can be most helpful by suggesting what ought to be done next instead of proposing what should have been last year or 10 years ago.

In spite of the accelerating violence of the battle, the primary and legitimate interests of the major powers involved actually do permit a great deal of maneuver. Surely those interests, sooner or later, will assert themselves. The United States, on its part, wishes only a free and independent South Vietnam. North Vietnam, in the end, surely would have its essential purposes served best by a friendly, viable, and productive neighbor after the United States and all other foreign troops had departed. These are not irreconcilable purposes and after more or less destruction of life and property no doubt they will be put upon the negotiating table. It is too bad it could not be sooner rather than later.

U.S. Employees Face Exile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, here is more evidence of a shocking destruction of integrity in Government.

These are some of the basic facts in the shocking effort to engage in economic retaliation against those men who have been willing to agree to testify on behalf of Chief Security Evaluator Otto F. Otepka:

First. There were disagreements on security standards in the State Department, and Otto Otepka and some of his aids believed that security standards were being relaxed to the point that it was harmful to national interest. Otepka testified on the laxity.

Second. Conflicts developed as between the testimony of Otepka and some of his superiors, and he was told of the testimony of superiors who contradicted him.

Third. Faced with this challenge to his integrity, Otepka produced documents from his files to prove that he was telling the truth and that his superiors were lying about the handling of a security matter. Production of these documents, for a committee of Congress is being used as grounds for trying to fire him.

Fourth. Otepka's superiors put a wiretap on his telephone and made some recordings. John F. Reilly and Elmer D. Hill took part in this, and they informed David Belisle they were going to do it. Later they told Belisle what they had done.

Fifth. Reilly, Hill, and Belisle were called before a Senate subcommittee and denied they had taken part in any wiretap of Otepka or had any knowledge of any listening device on Otepka's telephone. This was untruthful testimony under oath on a material matter before a properly authorized subcommittee of Congress. This was perjury, according to Senator DODD.

Sixth. The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee obtained evidence that proved conclusively that there were wiretaps on Otepka's telephone and that Reilly, Hill, and Belisle knew of it.

Seventh. Then Reilly and Belisle admit they knew of the wire tap, but contend that there were no recordings made and that they believed it was an ineffective wiretap with only static.

Eighth. Later, Hill admitted that he made the wiretaps, with Reilly present, and that about a dozen recordings were made. He said that Belisle was engaged with conversations with him and with Reilly prior to the wiretaps and after the wiretaps.

Ninth. Reilly and Hill were permitted to resign without derogatory comment. Belisle has been permitted to remain on the State Department payroll. Since then, Reilly has been hired by the FCC where it is reported that the personnel record from State had no derogatory comment on Mr. Reilly.

This is an incredible story if one stops there, but it is shocking when one looks at what has followed:

First. The State Department continues to press charges to try to fire Otepka—charges that were filed by Reilly, the perjurer, the giver of untruthful testimony, the falsifier.

Second. In March 1964, six of Otepka's associates were transferred out of the security division into the Bureau of Inter-American Affairs for work on what was supposed to be a super secret project. At the time, these men contended it was a disciplinary move to get them out of security because they had continued to support Otepka and had agreed to give testimony on his behalf.

Third. A year later, despite William J. Crockett's assurance that the Bureau of Inter-American Affairs job was a bona fide job, two of these men—John R. Nor-

pel, Jr., and Howard Shea—are being transferred out of the Bureau of Inter-American Affairs. This important super secret project turns out to be not so important as Crockett said it was a year ago, and precisely what Norpel and Shea and others contended it was.

Fourth. Now Norpel is being transferred to El Paso, which he regards as a demotion and an "economic retaliation" against him by superiors who resent his support of Otepka. He is being transferred to a job that I am informed was slated to be abolished only a few months ago. Mr. Norpel is wary about accepting this job, transferring to El Paso where he may be left high and dry by abolition of the job.

Fifth. Shea is being transferred to Denver, in another move that appears to retaliation.

Sixth. Norpel and Shea resisted the efforts to transfer them out of the Washington area to a job that represents a demation, and which also represents a possible threat to their civil service rights. As of last Friday, these men had their State Department salaries cut off and were placed in a category of absent without leave. The State Department hierarchy is going to force them to take the demotion and to take jobs that could be abolished.

This is a most shocking set of circumstances. It is something the Congress should go into immediately, and call all of the witnesses to determine all of the facts and all of the reasoning behind the State Department actions.

This appears to be a brutal effort to coerce civil service employees who have had the courage to stand by Otepka despite the efforts of the State Department to oust this career security evaluator. Norpel was an FBI agent for 10 years with an excellent record prior to his transfer to the State Department security division in 1961. Since then he has worked on some important security cases with Otepka that revealed some major weaknesses in security operations. Apparently his only crime is that he sticks with Otepka and will tell the truth when it embarrasses his superiors. It appears that Shea falls in the same category, with an excellent record until he decided that he would tell the truth and back Otepka.

If this action against Norpel, Shea, and others is allowed to stand, then there is no civil service protection for honest career employees. We might well ask what this Government is coming to if the perjurers and liars are protected and coddled, and the men who tell the truth to Congress are harassed and hounded by bureaucratic superiors.

Mr. Speaker, the following article in the April 4, 1965, issue of the Des Moines, Iowa, Register provides further information on the unbelievable effort that is being made to crucify and exile courageous employees of the Federal Government:

CUT OFF PAY OF TWO OTEPKA FRIENDS

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The State Department has cut off the salaries of two security officers who supported chief security evaluator Otto F. Otepka and opposed what they call "disciplinary transfers" out of the Washington area.

John R. Norpel, 39-year-old former FBI agent, said Saturday that the State Department is engaging in "economic retaliation" because of his efforts to fight a transfer that can "destroy" his civil service job rights.

NEW POSTS

Norpel and Howard Shea, also a security officer who agreed to testify for Otepka, were notified in February that they were being assigned to posts in El Paso, Tex., and Denver, Colo.

Both filed objections on grounds that the new jobs represented demotions, and also because it appeared that the new posts might be discontinued at any time.

Neither Norpel or Shea has been able to obtain any more than curt replies from the State Department personnel office or from William J. Crockett, the Deputy Under-Secretary of State who is in charge of administration. Crockett has been a key figure in efforts to oust Otepka.

Otepka gave testimony before a Senate committee that was critical of his superiors, then produced three documents to prove he had told the truth and his superiors had not on a security matter.

Norpel and Shea wanted specific assurance that the new jobs would not be abolished within a few months after they took the job. They also wanted to know why they were being removed from positions in the Bureau of Inter-American Affairs, to which they were assigned only a year ago with assurances that this assignment required their expertise as investigators and security evaluators.

SIX-WEEK EFFORT

For 6 weeks, they have tried unsuccessfully to obtain written explanations of the reasons for the transfers, which were to be effective April 1. Instead of explanation, they have received notes indicating they have received all the information they will receive, and that the transfer decisions would not be changed.

Norpel wrote to Secretary of State Dean Rusk last week to appeal to him to examine the transfer decisions, but no reply had been received from Rusk when Norpel and Shea were informed they have been cut from the State Department payroll and must not visit the offices they occupied in the Bureau of Inter-American Affairs.

The notice, from G. Marvin Gentile, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Security, stated that Norpel and Shea are to be considered absent without leave from their Government jobs until they report to the posts in El Paso and Denver.

Norpel, who has a GS–13 civil service rating, received a salary of $13,750 a year. Shea, with a GS–12 rating, received a salary of $13,000 a year.

The letter of explanation from Crockett to Norpel stated that the assignment was made because of "the critical need for trained investigators in our field offices at this time."

"GOOD OF SERVICE

"Your previous background as an investigator, and your present availability for reassignment has led to my decision that your reassignment to El Paso is for the good of the service."

Crockett stated that the position to which Norpel is being assigned "is a bona fide one."

Norpel in his correspondence has pointed out that only a year ago Crockett shifted him and five other men who supported Otepka from the security division, and at that time assured them that it was because of the great need for their services in a special secret project in the Bureau of Inter-American affairs.

Norpel said Saturday that the assignment to the Bureau of Inter-American Affairs was "a farce," and that it appears that the assignment to El Paso is "merely to get me out of the way."

There have been assurances that Norpel will be permitted to return to Washington to testify on behalf of Otepka when his ouster hearing comes up in May. However, the transfer of Norpel and Shea would remove them from daily contact with Otepka.

SPECIAL PROJECTS

When he transferred to the State Department security division in 1961, Norpel started working on a special project that involved restudy of a number of security cases of some high-level State Department career officers.

The work of Otepka, Norpel and others on these special projects resulted in spotlighting laxity in the security procedures at the State Department followed by the highly critical investigation of State by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

Guns Do Not Commit Crimes

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the second amendment to the Constitution states in part, "the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed." In view of this I would seriously question the constitutionality of proposed legislation calling for registration and taxation of firearms. This sort of action would only harass the legitimate gun owner, and would not correct the critical crime problem existing in the United States today.

Guns do not commit crimes, Mr. Speaker; people carrying guns commit crimes. Instead of badgering the hunter, the gun collector, and other legitimate gun buffs, I believe a far better approach to the problem is the one proposed by Congressman CASEY, of Texas.

The gentleman from Texas has introduced a bill, H.R. 5462, which provides for a mandatory Federal sentence of 25 years for anyone guilty of using or carrying, during the commission of a robbery, assault, murder, rape, burglary, or kidnaping, any firearm which has been transported across a State line.

Many feel that punishment for armed crime should rest with the State in which the crime was committed. However, some courts do not adequately come to grips with the problem by the leniency shown to the criminal in all too many cases. Thus, a mandatory Federal sentence would be an active deterrent to any criminally inclined person since he would know that, should he be caught using or carrying firearms during the commission of a crime, a 25-year sentence would be the minimum that he would receive.

And, Mr. Speaker, there is precedent for this Federal action in the existing mandatory Federal sentences for trafficking in narcotics.

Registration of firearms would affect only decent, law-abiding citizens, and would not even inconvenience criminals. After all, who would expect anyone to register a weapon with which he in-

tended to commit a crime—particularly in view of the fact that any weapon being used by a hardened criminal was probably stolen in the first place?

Mr. Speaker, something must be done to curb our rapidly increasing crime rate; but legislation more oppressive to the decent citizen than to the criminal is not the way to achieve it.

South County Farmers Present Plan To Alleviate Labor Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, a series of articles is appearing in the Gilroy Evening Dispatch of Gilroy, Calif., written by Carmen F. Filice, concerning the effort of southern Santa Clara County farmers to improve working conditions in order to attract domestic migratory workers as a placement for braceros. Mr. Filice is an accomplished, longtime writer for the Gilroy Dispatch. In this series of articles, Mr. Filice's excellent literary style is enhanced by his intimate knowledge of the subject which can only come from a lifetime of close association with it.

The first article which appeared in the Gilroy Dispatch for March 30 is submitted herewith. I commend it to those who have only heard the side of the farm labor story which paints the farmer in a bad light.

Let us hope that the Federal Government now fulfills its promise and cooperates with the South County Association of Family Farmers and the Progressive Growers Association.

The article follows:

SOUTH COUNTY FARMERS PRESENT PLAN TO ALLEVIATE LABOR SHORTAGE

(By Carmen F. Filice)

(The following is the first in a series of articles describing the ambitious and revolutionary Camp for Migrant Farm Labor Families as proposed by a committee composed of members of the Progressive Growers Association and the South County Association of Family Farmers in accordance with the suggestions and counseling of various public officials and interested private citizens.

(If the attempt accomplishes nothing else—which would be deplorable because it opens a new avenue toward solving the controversial and critical farm labor problem—it has brought together to a common meeting table farmers and professional educators, laymen and religious, county, State, and Federal officials, all striving toward a common end.

(Bringing the proposed project to this point of development represents a milestone in the field of human relations.)

Embattled farmers of south Santa Clara County, facing a critical shortage with the loss of vital bracero labor, have thrown the ball back to the Federal Government in a now-it's-your-move action in an effort to ease the tightening farm labor squeeze.

A committee representing two grower groups, the South County Association of Family Farmers, and the Progressive Growers Association, headed by Mike Mayekawa, chairman, and Earl A. Garrettson, secretary, has formulated a detailed, rather complex, and definitely revolutionary plan for a migratory family farm labor housing facility of 100 units.

Constructing the migratory labor camp largely depends upon Federal Government financial support to the tune of 90 percent of the $309,000 projected cost; the sponsoring group, through one of a variety of means, would provide the other 10 percent.

The plan emphasizes the needs of the family, providing in addition to adequate shelter, sanitation, health, and educational benefits over the 5-month period the camp would be in use extending from June 1 to October 31.

Goal of the project would be the housing of 100 migrant families providing a labor pool of up to 250 workers. Priority would be given to families with the most adult workers wherever possible, according to the policy outlined in the request for Government financial assistance submited to the Office of Economic Opportunity of Santa Clara County, which is headed by Arthur Potts.

The project, which will be presented to the full memberships of the grower groups involved in the near future, after a few final details have been worked out, is actually the result of (quoting directly from the official request):

"Many hours of meetings and conferences between the executive committee of the farmers association, the secretary-manager of the Progressive Growers Association, the California State Division of Housing, the South County supervisor (Sig Sanchez, who has followed the progress of the project step by step), Santa Clara County Health Department and (officials) of the Gilroy public school system."

One of the primary sculptors of the program, and the person who fashioned the official request for Office of Economic Opportunity assistance was Father John T. Dwyer, pastor of St. Mary's Catholic Church. The complicated task Father Dwyer accomplished can readily be appreciated as the migrant camp program is reviewed in this newspaper in subsequent issues.

The overall program, however, committee members are quick to point out, is a composite of opinions and suggestions made by many interested individuals, officials, and groups. No one faction or segment, religious affiliation or business organization dominated any of the proceedings, they state.

Basic aim of the camp facility originally was simply to provide housing for an augmenting labor pool. Obviously, even if the optimistic maximum of 250 workers were achieved it would be a mere drop in the bucket compared to the overall South County needs at peak harvest season. But the camp would be a start and might well initiate a trend.

However, a coined word soon made itself felt in the deliberations—"upgrading." It soon became apparent that the farmer representatives, officials, and interested consultants were going to shoot for something in the way of a summer housing facility which was to be much more than the minimum required by Federal regulations.

The Federal Government, committee members point out, requires only that tents erected over board flooring, a community cooking area and rather rudimentary sanitary accommodations be provided for a family crip. This was not sufficient for the South County pioneer project, it was decided, although the cost would be doubled and then tripled as planning neared completion.

Again quoting two sections from the official request to the Office of Economic Opportunity, it can be readily seen what the prevailing opinion was throughout the planning deliberations:

"A genuine, sincere effort has been made on all sides to upgrade [capital letters are used in the official copy] those who use the camp. Quarters had to be provided which gave some privacy * * * easy supervision and maintenance * * * that were of a kind in which families would be able to take some pride."

The second quote: "In order to upgrade the residents during their stay at the camp, a complete program was worked out with the Santa Clara County Health Department."

Perhaps the best indication of the high degree of interest of all involved in this pioneer project was the attendance of the professional educators invited to the conference table. Gilroy superintendent of schools, Edmond Bullard, his assistant, Edmund Richard, and every principal of all the schools in the city system were on hand. The educators were present in unanimous force.

Along educational lines, upgrading included offering 2 months of schooling to migrant camp youngsters aged 7 through 11. They would be transported daily during July and August to a regularly conducted school program in the local public school system.

Bullard requested that he be notified by April 15 if the program was to go into effect.

Another outstanding educational upgrading innovation is that children entering first grade, kindergarten age, and perhaps younger would be enrolled in a language enrichment summer school program. This phase would be designed to acquaint with English children who come from predominantly Spanish-speaking families.

This program would be under the sponsorship of the Interfaith Migrant Committee, a nonprofit incorporated group which worked in this field last year.

Children 12 years of age and over would be permitted to work in the fields with their parents. Those below schooling ages would be cared for during the day in a day care center in the multipurpose building.

Part of the multipurpose building—another upgrading innovation—would be devoted to a medical clinic which, it is hoped, would be staffed on a full-time basis by county medical personnel, including a physician, nurse, and clerk.

It is doubtful if any other summer migrant camp has ever gone to such great pains to provide for the health and education of its occupants as has the south county pilot project. To the knowledge of the committee members, no other camp in existence or contemplated offers extensive services of this type.

And at a cost of $1 per day per family which includes service charge for the housing unit and all utilities.

Subsequent Gilroy Evening Dispatch articles will deal with the physical plant of the migrant family labor camp—how it is constructed, its supervision and administration, and the pressing need for facilities of this nature.

It is to be remembered that as in all first-time projects there is much groping in the dark. Some of the questions that have arisen have never before been encountered and therefore the answers have not been readily available.

Needless to say, all connected with framing the program feel that if it receives Federal approval and is subsequently put into operation, it will be a boon to the south county as an expanding source of farm labor.

And will be a firm blow at the "poverty pocket" stigma applied to this area of late. Who ever heard of an economically depressed area where the temporary summer workers had modern up-to-date housing, built-in babysitting, and medical services available within a few steps?

Debauchery in Selma-Montgomery March

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES D. MARTIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, eyewitness accounts continue to come in attesting to the debauchery and immorality which was a part of the Selma-to-Montgomery march. The incidents which were so much a part of the march have disgraced the entire country and put a label of shame upon those who would tolerate indecencies for whatever reason.

I hope the clergymen who were present and clergymen throughout America will rise up to condemn the activities which took place and the kind of people who were responsible for the activities as well as those who excuse them.

The following news story from the Huntsville News, Huntsville, Ala., tells the story of the march as seen by one of the State troopers who was there:

TROOPER TELLS OF MARCHERS' DEBAUCHERY

(By Hollice Smith)

State Trooper Capt. Lionel Freeman, who returned here this week after being in Selma and Montgomery for 3 weeks, said he saw "a little bit of everything" while assigned there.

Activity carried on at night was "something scandalous," stated Captain Freeman, head of the Huntsville district of State troopers.

Sex acts between Negroes and whites occurred on the ground in Selma every night for about two and a half weeks prior to the march to Montgomery, the veteran State trooper said.

Captain Freeman said he witnessed some of this activity and heard numerous reports from news reporters and photographers.

Some of the reporters from northern papers were among the observers. "We asked them if they wrote about the immoral activities that went on. Some said they did, but that it was cut out before it got in their papers."

While assigned to keep the Negroes in a certain area in Selma with the "Berlin rope," Captain Freeman said he witnessed one sexual relationship where a priest stopped a couple and made them "come up to the front line by the rope." The couple had been about 30 rows behind the rope.

Asked if it seemed to bother the priest, Captain Freeman said "not too much."

The trooper said he could not do anything about the act because he, as well as other officrs, were there only to retain and keep the demonstrators from going up town.

He described a majority of the white persons participating in the marches as filthy, dirty, and beatniks.

The marchers "purposely mixed," the trooper related. "They absolutely tried to get us to harm them. One tried to get officers to knock the devil out of him by saying he was going to sleep with a white woman that night" and by making other similar statements.

The marchers knew the troopers and other officers were there to restrain them from running wild, Captain Freeman explained, and many of them seemed to take advantage of that. They didn't seem to try to hide their immoral activities, he added.

About 2 hours before the Reverend James Reeb of Boston was beaten, Captain Freeman said he and a large group of other persons saw two white men dressed as priests walk across U.S. Highway 80, each holding hands with two Negro girls—about 14 to 16 years of age. This sort of stuff may have triggered the beatings, the officer said.

He continued that he did not think half of those dressed as priests were actually priests. Captain Freeman reported that 34 persons dressed as priests went upon a sidewalk in front of the capitol building steps in Montgomery about 10 o'clock one night and said they wanted to pray. They were retained on the sidewalk—and kept off the capitol steps. They stayed until about 3 a.m. "Some of them used some of the most vile language I have ever heard," the trooper captain stated. "If they were priests, they need to go back to schools."

Some of the white beatniks in the group told officers they were being paid $10 a day, being fed three meals a day, and allowed to sleep with a female companion.

Captain Freeman said, "Some of our investigators knew some of the marchers to be card-carrying Communists."

He was in Montgomery when Mrs. Liuzzo, of Detroit, was killed about 20 miles west of the capital while shuttling marchers from Montgomery to Selma.

There were 35 troopers from the Huntsville district assigned to the Montgomery and Selma area. Twelve of that number were from Madison County. Only Cpl. C. H. Lowery and Trooper H. P. Sexton were left to carry on duties of troopers in Madison County.

"Dear Uncle Sam"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH J. SCOTT
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the RECORD two letters, one addressed to me and another to "Uncle Sam," by one of my young constituents, concerning the tragic death of her brother, Owen Lawson, in the service of our country in South Vietnam. The closing sentence of her letter to "Uncle Sam," I have found, expresses the feelings of a substantial number of my constituents:

WOODSDALE, N.C., *March 31, 1965.*

Hon. RALPH J. SCOTT,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: My family wishes to thank you for your kind expression of sympathy occasioned by the loss of our son and brother in Vietnam.

Please accept the enclosure which expresses just how I feel about the crisis in Vietnam and our loss.

Yours truly,

VICKIE LAWSON.

AN OPEN LETTER TO UNCLE SAM

WOODSDALE, N.C., *March, 1965.*

DEAR UNCLE SAM: I am 14 years old and in my second year in high school. Today, I returned to school after attending the funeral of my brother on yesterday. I am not able to concentrate on my lesson because my heart is so heavy with grief. Only 4 years ago he was at the same place preparing for his future. He had achieved his goal of becoming an aircraft mechanic, but he only had a chance to enjoy it for a short length of time.

He was killed on February 10, in a hotel blast at Qui Nhon, South Vietnam, as a result of a sneak attack by the Communist forces. Uncle Sam, I cannot tell you how sad this incident has made my family and me even though he did die a hero's death. As time passes we know that God will lighten our hearts, but if this situation is allowed to go on at the pace it is going now, there will be many more families throughout the United States whose hearts will be heavy, because they have lost a son or a brother in Vietnam. Uncle Sam, is it worth the price that these young boys are paying? How many more young men will be cut short of their goals because of Vietnam? How many more young ladies like my sister-in-law will be made widows in their late teens and early twenties by this war? How many children will not remember or know their fathers because they have been taken away from them by this war?

How many more families will receive the dreaded telegram that we received? It was even worse for us because we had seen the debris of the hotel in the news even before we were notified and every time there was a knock at the door, we hated to open it because we thought it was a message from you that he was among the casualties at Qui Nhon. Finally, we did receive the unwanted message.

Uncle Sam, I'm very young, and I don't understand all the diplomatic treaties that control our relations with other countries. But what I would like to know is what happened on that fatal day, February 10, when the hotel was bombed? How did the Vietcong get past the guards and the protective fence to plant this bomb? Was it a lack of troops or were we depending on the South Vietnamese to stand guard for us?

Although I am young, I believe my country can prevent the spread of communism in South Vietnam in a much better way than it is doing. As I see it now, five or six young men are sent over in the disguise of "advisers," killed and replaced by five or six more only to be killed. Uncle Sam, I have read in the paper and seen in the news where Russia is sending ground-to-air missiles to North Vietnam. I believe that the United States is the strongest Nation in the world military-wise, and that it can protect its interest in South Vietnam in the same way that the Russians are now doing.

Uncle Sam, if we are going to remain in South Vietnam, please send enough troops and equipment over there so that we can fight on the level with the Communists.

When the first issue of our paper came out, my heart swelled with pride when I read the alumni news, "Former Student Assigned Vietnam Duty." This headline had referred to Owen, my 21-year-old brother. Imagine my feeling as we are editing this issue's alumni news, "Former Student Killed in Vietnam Duty." Just a few short days between the issues.

I should like to close, Uncle Sam, by saying, please fight like the Nation we are, if we must fight, or bring our loved ones home.

A grief-stricken young girl.

VICKIE LAWSON.

House Un-American Activities Committee and the Klan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the House Un-American Activities Committee's announced intention to investigate the Ku Klux Klan has raised many ques-

tions as to whether this committee is the proper one to carry on such an investigation. On March 31, the New York Post published an editorial concerning this proposed investigation which I urge all my colleagues to read and consider.

The editorial follows:

HOUSE UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES COMMITTEE AND THE KLAN

The decision of the House Un-American Activities Committee to launch a "searching investigation" of the activities of the Ku Klux Klan warrants no capricious cheers.

The House Un-American Activities Committee has traditionally been unable to distinguish between opinion and act, between unorthodox ideas and incitements to terror and violence. It has operated on the crude theory that radical ideas and protests were a product of an international Communist conspiracy. Its files and inquiries have, in fact, been used to bolster the wild KKK contention that the civil rights movement is a Communist plot.

That the committee now turns its attention to the KKK is hardly reassuring.

Dangerous as Klan violence is, detestable as are its doctrines, any moves to combat the organization must accord fullest protection of due process to Klan witnesses and scrupulously refrain from infringing upon the rights of free speech and association.

The House Un-American Activities Committee, as the record has shown, is incapable of conducting such an inquiry.

Legislation is needed to combat Klan-inspired violence. But it is essental to distinguish between stamping out KKK terrorism and outlawing the Klan.

Any effort to do the latter will inevitably revive the problems encountered in enforcing the Smith Act, where it has proven virtually impossible to root out a political organization without infringing upon the individual rights guaranteed by the Constitution. There is the additional practical problem: the Klan can circumvent efforts to outlaw it by simply setting up business under a new name at a new address, or enlisting under the banner of the Birch Society.

The target is not private prejudice but overt, systematic terror—the murders, whippings, vandalism and harassments to which civil rights workers, supporters and sympathizers have been rejected.

There is everything to be said for the administration plan to increase the penalties and broaden the scope of the 1870 statute. This prohibits efforts to violate the civil rights of any person. Putting new and sharper teeth into this statute is a meaningful proposal which should be urgently considered by a congressional committee.

But the House Un-American Activities Committee is not the group to undertake this serious business. There are far more responsible congressional bodies to which the mission can be entrusted.

Voting Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, in our fair State of Hawaii people of different races take pride in the fact that they have proven that racial prejudices can be overcome. Whenever intolerance rears its ugly head anywhere the people of Hawaii rise to protest. So it was that the Maui Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution denouncing the violent action taken by governmental authorities against the civil rights marchers in Selma, Ala.

The resolution follows:

Whereas civil rights demonstrators in Selma, Ala., who have been trying to organize an orderly and peaceful march from Selma to Montgomery for the purpose of obtaining voting rights have been harassed, intimidated, coerced, brutally beaten, and even shot at by Alabama police officers; and

Whereas the rest of the people of the United States, and people throughout the world, have been appalled by the vicious and cruel conduct of the government authorities in Alabama in their treatment of the civil rights demonstrators; and

Whereas said civil rights demonstrators are only asking that they be given the same right to vote as other free Americans; and

Whereas President Lyndon B. Johnson has requested Congress for the swift passage of new voting rights legislation to assure Negroes and other minority the right to vote: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Maui, That it does hereby go on record denouncing the violence used by Alabama governmental authorities against the civil rights demonstrators; and be it further

Resolved, That the members of Hawaii's congressional delegation be urged to vote for the swift passage of new voting rights legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be transmitted to Senator HIRAM L. FONG, Senator DANIEL K. INOUYE, Representative SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, and Representative PATSY T. MINK, Washington, D.C.

South Africa: A Bright Spot on a Dark Continent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, on March 5 of this year, South African Ambassador, H. L. T. Taswell, addressed the Commonwealth Club of California in San Francisco on the subject "South Africa: A Bright Spot on a Dark Continent."

I am sure all of the Members of the House and those who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will be particularly interested in the comments which Ambassador Taswell made:

SOUTH AFRICA: A BRIGHT SPOT ON A DARK CONTINENT

During the last few months, the American flag has been torn to pieces and defiled in certain countries in Africa and Asia. There have been violent demonstrations against American embassies, and abuse has been hurled at the American Government.

I am sure you will have noted that none of these violent anti-American demonstrations have taken place in my country, the Republic of South Africa. We in South Africa remain friendly and well disposed toward the United States of America, and anxious to strengthen the natural bonds of friendship we have with you.

Many of those who have been hurling abuse at America are the very ones who have been so rigorously maligning and criticizing us in recent years.

DEVELOPMENTS IN AFRICAN COUNTRIES CAUSE CONCERN

I have entitled my talk today, "South Africa: A Bright Spot on a Dark Continent."

Let us take a look at some of the things which have been happening in certain other parts of Africa during the past year or two.

In many newly independent African states, the Story has been one of the establishment of one-party dictatorships, of the suppression of justice and freedom of the press, of falling standards of living, health, and education, of collapsing economies.

In one country, the white non-Arab population has dwindled since independence from 1.2 million to 100,000 as a result of shocking and ruthless discrimination.

Not so long ago, a small African island state received its independence in what was termed a classical handover of authority. Only a matter of days later, its government was deposed by armed revolution which resulted in the slaughter of hundreds of Arabs and Asians. A Communist regime took over. A satellite tracking station operated by the United States was forced to close down.

In three independent African countries there were mutinies in the armies. Unable to cope with the situation themselves, their African governments had to invite white troops to come in to restore order.

Serious border clashes took place between several African countries, resulting in many people being killed or wounded.

Tribal warfare in a central African country resulted in the slaughter of an estimated 8,000 men, women, and children.

The recent barbarous atrocities committed by rebel forces in the Congo have made the civilized world shudder with horror. Thousands of people were shot or savagely beaten to death. They included many whose only crime was that they could read and write, and accordingly fell into a class termed the intelligentsia, which the rebels wished to exterminate. The loss of life in the Congo revolt is put at 40,000.

REACTION TO AMERICAN-BELGIAN RESCUE OPERATION

You will, I am sure, recall the details of the humanitarian operation undertaken in November 1964, to rescue the American and other white hostages who were held and threatened with death by the rebels.

America and Belgium were roundly condemned for the operation by Communist sources, and particularly by the Red Chinese.

But isn't it most significant that so many African states took a line that so closely followed the Communist one?

For several years we in South Africa have been warning against Communist penetration and subversion in Africa. Our warnings have fallen on ears not so deaf as unwilling to hear.

Every month now brings fresh evidence that we have been right.

In the last 5 years there has been a most marked expansion of Communist influence in Africa. Russia is now represented in about 21 African States, European Communist countries in about the same number. Red China is represented in about 16. Roughly one-third of Peiping's total diplomatic missions abroad are in Africa. Communist China is extending its influence with financial aid, with arms, guerrilla training, and direct subversion. Chinese policy is based on color. It is antiwhite.

In recent years we have been accused of being out of step with developments on the rest of the continent. But let me ask this question. With development in so many parts of Africa taking the turn they have, who would want to be in step with them?

We are not prepared to adapt conditions in our country to suit the whims and fancies of hostile politicians in African countries who cannot bring about stability in their own lands.

We in South Africa do, however, have great sympathy for the African peoples and understand their ambitions. We are ready and willing to cooperate and develop sound and friendly relations with all responsible African countries which feel the same way toward us.

INTERNAL RACIAL POLICY

Let me turn now for a few minutes to our internal racial policy.

When looking at our racial picture in South Africa, do not try to equate it with the position in the United States. Our country is made up of a number of national groups, still preserving their own customs and traditions, talking their own languages. Our problem is more of a multinational one.

When the first white people settled in South Africa over 300 years ago, the country was virtually unoccupied. At about the same time that the whites moved northward into the interior, black people—or Bantu, or Africans—were moving southward from central Africa. The two groups met for the first time in the vicinity of the Fish River in about 1779.

About the turn of the last century, roughly half of an area, extending southward from the Limpopo River and constituting British South Africa, was occupied by whites, and half by blacks.

What has happened since? Three areas within this general sphere were set aside by the British Government as areas within which the interests of certain black national groups, or nations, were paramount. They today constitute the Protectorates of Bechuanaland, Swaziland, and Basutoland.

In 1910, the remaining territory in this general sphere became the Union of South Africa. In 1913, those areas within the Union in which the interests of the various black peoples were paramount, were set aside for them by the Union Government. They have consistently been preserved ever since as the homelands of the various black national groups or nations.

So the position remains that that part of the whole sphere which was occupied by black national groups at the turn of the century, is still occupied by them today.

Apart from the white and the black people who originally settled in South Africa, we have two other main groups. One is the colored community, comprising people of Malay descent and others of mixed blood. They live principally in the cape. The other group is our Indian community, centered principally in Natal.

What is our basic policy?

We believe that there should be no domination of any one race by another. To achieve this, our policy is aimed at the creation of separate states for the national groups which originally settled in South Africa, and the development of the greatest possible degree of governmental separation for the groups which have grown up in our midst.

In this way, each group can have a future of its own, in this way, the various groups can live on an equal footing. In this way, we can form a consultative body in which the leaders of all races can meet on a basis of equality to consider matters of common interest and ways of removing friction. In this way, we can create a multinational commonwealth or common market, with political independence and economic interdependence.

POSITIVE PROGRESS

Positive progress has been made in this direction. The Transkei, centuries old home of the Xhosa people, already has its own all-Bantu African Legislative Assembly. It is composed partly of traditional leaders, partly of members elected on a one-man one-vote basis by all Xhosa citizens. In area, the Transkei is about the same size as the Netherlands or Switzerland, but larger than Belgium, Israel, or the Protectorates of Basutoland or Swaziland.

Executive power is vested in an all-Bantu African Cabinet, consisting of a Chief Minister and five other Ministers.

The Transkei serves as a model, toward which the other Bantu national groups are progressing, in keeping with their own traditions.

The South African cape colored people have a national council, currently consisting of appointed and elected members. The basis of the council is to be expanded and its powers increased.

For the Indian population group, a national Indian council has been formed.

With all these bodies, the Government of the Republic maintains the closest contact.

Race relations are improving, harmony is increasing in South Africa. Internally, our country is one of the most peaceful in the world.

SOUTH AFRICA HAS HIGHEST STANDARDS

Nowhere in the other independent countries of Africa do people, regardless of their race or color, have as high a general standard of living, education, or health as they do in South Africa. What is more, the gap is widening; we are racing ahead of the rest of independent Africa.

There are already over 2,000 Bantu African university graduates. In 16 years, South Africa produced more Bantu African graduates at local universities than 9 African States, with a combined population of 70 million, have succeeded in doing during the past 50 years. Three Bantu university colleges in our country are now swelling the number of our university graduates.

Already there are 29,500 Bantu African teachers. Each year an additional 2,000 graduate from 47 teachers training colleges.

There are Bantu African doctors, lawyers, professors, nurses, etc. Over 12,000 Bantu Africans own their own businesses. One of the largest gasoline service stations in the Republic is owned by a Bantu African. Some businessmen bank as much as $2,800 a day. Three are reputed to be millionaires. The purchasing power of Bantu Africans today is roughly $1.4 billion per year. A solid middle class is developing.

A similar story of success may be told in connection with the colored and Indian communities.

Striking proof of how favorable conditions are in South Africa is given by the fact that thousands of Africans are constantly streaming illegally across our borders in order to seek the superior benefits which South Africa can offer. Over 1 million foreign Africans are in our country—that is 10 percent of the Bantu population.

A further indication of South Africa's advance is that, with only 6 percent of Africa's population, we generate 20 percent of the continent's total geographic income.

Our country produces six times as much steel as the rest of the continent combined twice as much electricity, and four times as much coal. Our railways carry as much freight as the rest of the continent combined. We have almost as many telephones, cars, buses, tractors, trucks, as the rest of Africa. The nonwhite people in South Africa, incidentally, own more motor cars per capita than do the citizens of the Soviet Union. We take nearly 18 percent of the continent's total imports, and supply about 20 percent of its exports.

Our economy is booming, we are marching vigorously ahead on a path of dynamic progress.

SOUTH AFRICA—WHAT DOES IT MEAN TO THE UNITED STATES

What does South Africa mean to our friends in the United States?

The United States is encountering a serious balance-of-payments problem. This is imposing a severe strain on the dollar and on American gold stocks.

Instead of drawing money away from the United States, South Africa is actually contributing to the strength of the dollar and helping the United States in its balance-of-payments problem.

It is doing this, first, by importing far more from the United States than it sells to the United States. Our imports from you in 1964 reached a record figure, estimated at $385 million. Considerably more than you imported from us.

Incidentally, about 33 percent of all U.S. imports to the African Continent go to South Africa.

We are aiding your balance-of-payments position in a further way, for South Africa is a lucrative field for American investment. Your investments in our country, which have been built up over a period of many years, now total about $450 million. On these investments, your annual dividends, interest, and transferred profits give you a return of 13 percent. When you include your reinvested profits, your total return is 17 percent.

Is there any country in the world where you get a better return?

American firms investing in South Africa include many of the largest and most highly respected firms in American business and financial circles. They invest, not because they like us or dislike us. They invest on sound business principles.

Some of your industrialists are increasing their investments in our country—not with dollars, but by raising funds out of investment capital generated in South Africa.

Total American and foreign investment in our country is equal to that in the rest of the continent of Africa put together.

South Africa has never asked for, nor received, foreign aid. Your proposed expenditure on foreign aid in Africa this year is about $145 million. Not one penny of this finds its way into my country. We do not increase your balance-of-payments problem, we lighten it by standing on our own feet.

We are one of the very few countries in the world which have paid all their war debts.

My country is the world's largest producer of gold. Our annual production has reached the record figure of 29.1 million fine ounces, valued at just over $1 billion. This gold flows into the free world. It enables Western countries to bolster their currencies, it contributes to stability, and promotes international trade.

One final point: I mentioned earlier that an American satellite tracking station was forced to close down in an African country now cooperating with Red China. In South Africa, an American satellite tracking station and an American missile tracking station are doing valuable work for you with the fullest cooperation and help of the South African Government.

In the First World War and in the Second World War, men of our armed forces stood shoulder to shoulder with men of the American Armed Forces. Since then, South Africa has again on two occasions responded to the call and come to the assistance of the United States and the free world—once was during the Berlin airlift, the other was in the Korean war.

In many other parts of independent Africa, chaos is gaining ground and a power vacuum is forming. In South Africa, there is prosperity, stability, and hope for all peoples of all races. What is more, South Africa stands as a guardian of the strategic tip of southern Africa.

The Pattern of Coming Events in Southeast Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish to include a radio address by Dr. W. S. McBirnie, speaking over Voice of America radio on April 2, 1965. Dr. McBirnie has just returned from southeast Asia, and his address is most timely and should be given great consideration by the administration in determining the policy that America should follow in the very near future:

THE PATTERN OF COMING EVENTS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

(Based upon an extensive series of interviews in southeast Asia, in March 1965)

It is rather a sobering experience to know that something of great consequence is going to happen, and to know that your own country's Government does not know it.

The odds are all against the likelihood of a private citizen, however careful a student of foreign affairs, pitting his interpretation of coming events successfully against the opinion of the most powerful government on earth, with all of its superb intelligence sources upon which to draw. And to do so might seem presumptuous, or preposterous, to say the least.

Yet that is the position in which this program finds itself. I know, or to be more restrained, I believe I know the pattern of future events in South Vietnam. Evidently the Government does not know. A conference of historic proportions is underway, right now, in Washington. Ambassador Taylor is there for reports, recommendations, and consultations. You, the listeners, may judge for yourselves, or wait for history to prove the accuracy of our analyses and predictions—but this is what this program believes is now to come.

As James Reston writes:

"The immediate question is clear enough. The President's decision to bomb North Vietnam has not achieved its objective. It has not persuaded the Communists to stop their infiltration and military subversion in South Vietnam.

"It has committed the prestige and power of the United States in a war against the North Vietamese Communists, without success, and the question now is whether to increase the military pressure or withdraw.

* * * * *

"The British explored the prospect of a Vietnamese settlement with the Soviet foreign minister, Andrei A. Gromyko, in London, but he brushed them off. The Johnson administration has made many more private inquiries about a negotiated settlement than it cares for political reasons to admit, but these have been rebuffed.

"President Johnson has been in touch with Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson, of Canada, who has a representative on the International Control Commission in Vietnam, on the prospect of useful negotiations, but Pearson has had to report to the President that the North Vietnamese are not interested, at least for the present.

"Even the French, who have been leading the campaign for a negotiated settlement in Vietnam, concede privately they received no encouragement either in the North Vietnamese capital of Hanoi nor in the Communist Chinese capital of Peiping.

"The issue, therefore, it not whether President Johnson is ready for negotiations. The North Vietnamese Communists have been rejecting a negotiated settlement for months.

"The issue before the President and his associates, including General Taylor, is therefore, much more complicated than the national argument about negotiations would make it seem. In fact, the North Vietnamese insist on seeing the struggle in southeast Asia not as a local war, but as a test of the cold war all over the world." (Los Angeles Herald-Examiner, Apr. 1, 1965.)

Look carefully at the chain of events:

1. The Vietcong had driven us to the wall, because we were fighting on their terms—not ours. They were expecting a negotiated settlement as a result of their growing victories in their "native" jungle warfare, fought as it was on their own ground.

2. The President made the right decision, temporarily, to shift the technique of fighting the war on our terms; not theirs,—to turn our big weapons on the Vietcong war-related targets in North Vietnam. The Reds did not expect this, and it threw their hopes and plans for negotiation on terms favorable to them back several months. The United States, in effect, had been willing, even anxious, to come to the bargaining table, but armed with much more strength than the Vietcong expected.

3. At this point the United States has made a strategic error—too obviously our intention and goal was negotiation, not victory. But there is really nothing to negotiate; not now, at any rate. For the Reds won't negotiate at present on terms unfavorable to them, since we cannot accept less than their retreat. They therefore will not relax their program of terrorism in South Vietnam, nor will they (presently) negotiate, for this would cause them to lose face in the eyes of the world Communist movement.

4. The Reds were all set to announce a big victory on March 10, at the Afro-Asian Conference in Algiers, but our attack on North Vietnam upset their timing. So they quietly canceled the Afro-Asian Conference, postponing it until June 19, when it is rescheduled. This means that they expect to have a new plan in operation by that time. What plan? This is what I believe that I know, and that the U.S. Government, I fear, does not.

5. The Red Chinese must find a way to get us to the negotiation table when their strength again becomes relatively greater than ours. They never negotiate to make concessions, as we almost always do. This simple principle has not yet penetrated widely into liberal Washington thought, because Socialist liberals are evidently unable to face communism realistically and comprehend its nature and methods. For example: Communism never negotiates differences. It always seeks victory in negotiations, either in part or in whole. This is unvarying Communist procedure. So now they are unwilling to really negotiate on South Vietnam because the increased U.S. strength there gives them no advantage, and they must always find an advantage before they will enter into serious negotiations on any issue, particularly one so important as this.

6. The plan is to wheel large land armies from China into position, to threaten to flood South Vietnam with waves of soldiers, inundating the South Vietnamese and Americans by sheer numbers. But to make this threat viable they must also demonstrate atomic capability, and have maintained a propaganda campaign in the press expressing their professed willingness, at whatever cost to themselves, to bomb South Vietnam with atomic bombs, as well as to invade in great ground army strength. Then the Reds are counting on the unwillingness of the United States to fight an atomic war, and also knowing the public outcry in the United States over annihilation of all Americans in South Vietnam, they will then have their bargaining cards.

7. Therefore we must expect an atomic development, testing of bombs, the announcement of a surprising stockpile of ready bombs, and the means of delivering them, all, I would think, before June 19, 1965, though the date again may be postponed if the Reds feel it necessary.

8. So the Reds are preparing to shake the world by a two-faceted thrust, and then, confronting us with this thrust, they are counting on world pressure, and public opinion expressed in this country, to get us ready to negotiate from a position of relative weakness.

Of course we are not really weak, just unable to bring ourselves to risk the death of all our troops in Vietnam, and to engage China in an atomic war. Leftwing opinion molders are now softening up public sentiment in this country, hence the ads in newspapers emanating from leftist groups' appeals for peace by abandonment of South Vietnam.

9. It will be Russia that will, at the moment of highest tension in the approaching United States-Red Chinese confrontation, step in, offering to negotiate. Red China does not really want war, but they are determined to drive us out of southeast Asia by this threat. Furthemore, they wish trade concessions for all Communist lands, since all are in economic and agricultural trouble. It is, therefore, to get America out of South Vietnam, and to open the West for trade with Red China, that the Russians and the Red Chinese have plotted together the coming confrontation.

As mediator, Russia knows she will get, in return, much in trade concessions for Red China, and in gratitude for bringing about a peaceful settlement, she will be granted the relaxation of our trade barriers with the Soviet Union herself.

So now you know what we believe is in the wind. Many things can upset this whole scheme of the Communists, but I believe this is the way their immediate Communist planning is headed. And so I look for: (1) the massive threat of war; (2) the mediation of Russia, followed by the conference table; (3) the resulting sizable trade concessions for both Red China and Russia; (4) a seat at the United Nations for China—which means the end of free China, since it will involve diplomatic recognition by the United States; (5) then, a great going out of the tide of war threat, a period of false security based upon the illusion of peace; (6) and what will this have cost the Soviet Union and China? Just some planning, some propaganda words against each other, to make us believe they are enemies and that Russia is inclined toward friendliness with us as a result of their phony split, all of which is a preposterous bluff.

That is all it will have cost the Red bloc, and they will receive everything they want from us and will be in a much stronger economic position to continue the war of subversion and revolution around the world. And most deplorable is the fact that we seemingly do not realize we are being drawn into this Red trap. We are very likely to end up paying for the strengthening of our enemies and underwriting the advancement of communism from its Russian and Chinese bases.

A Woman Legislator's View on Consumer Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Washington, CATHERINE MAY, recently delivered a notable address to the 38th annual convention of the Soap & Detergent Association. The speech, entitled "A Woman Legislator's View on Consumer Protection," is a forthright expression by an eminently forthright person and contains all of the elements that make the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY] an effective and articulate legislator—humor, candid analysis, and good, commonsense.

I commend the address by the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY], delivered on January 28, 1965, to the attention of all my colleagues and under unanimous consent include it in the RECORD at this point.

The speech referred to follows:

A WOMAN LEGISLATOR'S VIEW ON CONSUMER PROTECTION

(By Hon. CATHERINE MAY)

I have been asked to speak to you today as a congressional housewife on the subject of the consumer versus Congress. I do so in the full realization that the main problem on your mind today concerning the American housewife is how in the dickens to keep her from wondering where the suds went. But that's your problem and Madison Avenue's.

I feel I have a few problems of my own in speaking to this group today. I have come here with a mild suspicion that you good people may have asked me to speak in the belief that my views on public affairs correspond in some degree with your own. My speech will concern itself with a theme that I have been reiterating over and over this past year before groups similar to your own and I suspect some of you in the audience have already suffered through one or two versions of it. In any case, I am assuming that most of you have divined my political and economic orientation from those speeches of the past year.

But I must remind you that, since I last spoke in your interest area, a rather violent political upheaval has shaken our country from coast to coast. As a result of that political upheaval I stand before you today as a member of the "Whooping Crane Society," i.e., a survivor Republican. And, as such, I feel compelled to admit honestly that there are growing indications that the Republican Party may not be as dominant today in the Nation's affairs as it was in the heyday of Lincoln, Teddy Roosevelt, and Dwight D. Eisenhower.

This last year we made a major blunder. We transgressed a political axiom: Never ask a question in public unless you know in advance what the answer will be.

We Republicans asked our countrymen, "Why not victory?"

The answer came roaring back, "You're short 16 million votes, that's why not victory."

Maybe we should have stood in bed.

So, let there be no mistake about it—I stand before you today minus a union card in the Great Society. In addition, I humbly confess I may never qualify for membership because I am having so much difficulty understanding some of the messages that are being sent up to us on Capitol Hill by major spokesmen for the Great Society. As I am sure you know, they are telling us that America is a paradise lost, to be federally regained. Within the context of one public statement we are told that American people are poverty ridden, ignorant, pressed into slums, our water poisoned, our air polluted, our food contaminated, and our cosmetics defiled. But, at the same time, thank goodness, in only 4 enlightened years we have become the richest, strongest, best educated, and healthiest people in all the world. Obviously, this means we must embark upon a realistic and businesslike program—in short, frugally extravagant and cautiously bold—for only through liberal conservatism can we ever achieve chronic deficits that are fiscally sound.

In addition to being very busy trying to understand the "blueprint for the grand design," I have, since the calamitous day of November 3, also been much involved with the "sage of good fellowship" that has been going on in the Republican Party as we immediately began, in traditional Republican style, to close our ranks and build party unity. You know, those fellows who say the Republican Party is dead and gone just haven't been reading the newspapers. We Republicans haven't had such fun since the cadets at The Citadel, in Charleston, lofted the first shells into Fort Sumter 103 years ago.

The sport we have been having among ourselves makes the uncertain probings of Secretary McNamara in Vietnam look like a friendly, dynastic game of touch football.

Never before has so small a party so greatly bled.

Clearly we Republicans are vital and strong—so much so, to paraphrase Thomas Jefferson, we are drenching the tree of liberty with the blood of our own patriots.

Considering all this, if I seem a bit edgy on your platform today, put yourself in my position: A fellow Republican might be in the hall.

And now, quickly before you think I am trying to make a partisan speech here today, I am going to bring in mention of the Democrats. Maybe we Republicans do have a little family spat now and then. Maybe we do dote on party slack fill and on fractional political weight. But, really, this is as nothing as compared to our political competitors who wear the brand L.B.J. The Democratic Party is having great troubles with truth in packaging. And, furthermore, the Democrats are detecting a little fraticide in their own party. With Lyndon to the right of them, HUBERT to the left of them, into the valley of 68 will charge BOBBY and TEDDY.

As I said when I began my remarks, a significant political upheaval has occurred since I began stressing the theme and philosophy that I have been asked to repeat here today. I feel, therefore, that in order to preclude any possibility of misunderstanding, I owe it to you to make this very clear:

If you think I shall go on resisting Federal intrusion into areas constitutionally and traditionally reserved to the States, the communities and individual citizens; if you have asked me here on the supposition that I shall continue to oppose Federal harassment of private enterprise; if you count me among those pledged to fight the cult of consumeritis and politics in the pantry—and determined also to defend the intelligence of American housewives and uphold their freedom of choice; if you expect me, in these remarks today, to decry paternalistic government and the baleful doctrine of bureaucratic infallibility—then, my friends, I must in all candor tell you this: Relax, your expectations, will be relaxed.

And, in this context I will now make some comments as a Member of Congress concerning the shape of things in your industry's areas of immediate concern.

To begin with (though, admittedly, my congressional crystal ball is often clouded) I think you are home free on water pollution. Though, naturally, Congress will want representatives of your industry to retestify on the progress you have made.

This victory you have fashioned yourselves, by your own aggressive and foresighted effort, through the creation of the new biodegradable detergents. I warmly congratulate you of the soap and detergent industry on this achievement valuable to our Nation and important to yourselves. The best way anyone has ever devised to forfend Federal intervention is to remove the excuse by forehanded action.

And, this brings me to the heart of my speech (no pun intended). Or, rather, the speech I have been giving so often about the virulent outbreak of consumeritis in Congress over the past few years. To recap I shall quote myself in placing before you some of the viewpoints I have been stressing.

I have been saying that I am opposed to further extension of Federal regulation into the marketplace. I have been expressing my alarm that since coming to Congress I have noted that the voices of the self-appointed champions of the consumer have become evermore vocal and militant in their demands for investigations and hearings and new Government authority to set up rules and regulations in the field of the free market. These apostles of regimentation of the marketplace have been out in full cry for 3 years. In spite of the overwhelmingly ample Government safeguards that already exist certain people in Government, aided by specially set up organizations, keep insisting that Mrs. American housewife and her consumer husband are wandering, baffled, uncomprehending, and empty headed through dangerous clip joints, i.e., better known as supermarkets, being constantly robbed by Simon Legree, the storekeeper. Bills have been introduced in Congress that cannot help but imply that manufacturers of food and fiber products are taking every possible advantage of the consumer through deception in sizes and weights of packages and with misleading label information printed on them. Another Government agency, charged with consumer protection, has been urging housewives, through many means of communications plus public meetings, to submit their complaints to the Government concerning things that displease them at the buying counter.

A National Commission on Food Marketing was created in the last Congress. I am a member of this Commission. I am proud to have been appointed to it. But, I have not been proud of some of the irresponsible statements that have been made concerning its purposes. This Commission is barely beginning its study in the very important field of learning more about how our modern marketing system works to get food from farm to table. Yet, these statements imply that conclusions have already been reached and these conclusions, of course, assume that there will be a scandalous exposé of dishonest practices by the manufacturers and the middleman. This Commission could provide our country with one of the most important and helpful studies ever made by a congressional commission. But, only if it is allowed to work in an atmosphere of openminded and honest inquiry without prejudgment.

This type of governmental and political activity, over such a long period, has resulted in creating many misleading impressions and it is no wonder that a lot of good people are being fooled into joining the hue and cry for legislative action in Congress. Because of my concern, about a year ago, I set myself the task of trying to do what I could to balance propaganda with perspec-

tive. To try and get through to the American public, particularly women, with the warning that they should always take a good look at what the government may be doing to them while it says it is doing something for them.

I have been using the famous truth-in-packaging bill as introduced in the Senate last year as one example. This bill, as you know, would give the Federal Government the right to dictate weights and other standards for product containers. Here is a bill that has been recommended by the President's Consumer Advisory Council and one which is being supported by the Assistant Secretary of Labor, Mrs. Esther Peterson, in her position as Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs. And, don't ever mistake it, at first glance it has tremendous appeal for any American shopper. Why shouldn't a woman be entitled to adequate information printed on the label which would help her decide on one can of beans over another can of beans, or one package of detergent over another package of detergent? She should have good labeling but I just happen to think that the company that produces that product should provide the labeling information for his package, and I also think that the American housewife is entitled to something more flexible and something more informative than a Federal yardstick used in Washington, D.C. Just as I think that the product manufacturer should have the flexibility to package his own product in the way that will make it most competitive in the market place when Mrs. Housewife comes in to select. Of course, this gives him the freedom to mislead his prospective customer if he wishes to do so. But, heaven help him if he does. To quote myself again:

All the Government officials and all the government laws in the world are as nothing compared to the impact Mrs. America has on Mr. Manufacturer and on Mr. Storekeeper when she makes up her mind to buy one brand over another. And when she makes that decision, no power on earth can save the businessman or the producer of the product who made the mistake of displeasing her. She has done and is doing a wonderful job in needling, inspiring and in regulating American business enterprise.

And, to reward her, I want to protect her. Not with more government regulations and laws—I want to protect her freedom of choice."

Now I know that you in this group today are on my side in this battle. The big question is how are we doing as we face the 89th Congress in the year 1965? It ain't good.

Our legislative difficulty is not concerned with the truth or the cogency of our shared views. Frankly, I think the American people, once they had the facts, would be with us in overwhelming majority. But, we are hampered by the disproportionate publicity of the opposing views (and, if I weren't trying to be a diplomatic lady, I would say at this point—where were some of you guys these last 3 years?") combined with the disproportionate political division in Congress. In both Houses of Congress every Republican is now flanked by two Democrats. Each one of the 20 House committees and nearly all Senate committees are 2-to-1 Democrat. Add this to these facts: The Democratic platform promised enactment of the packaging and labeling bill—last year the President demanded its enactment—labor has made this item a legislative "must"—four Members of the House have already reintroduced last year's Senate bill—and the report from the Senate side is that this year Senator HART will try to have his bill sent to the Senate Commerce Committee where it is presumed that it has a greater chance for favorable action.

It would seem indeed that the consumeritis virus has a very fertile congressional field in which to work these days.

So, where do we go from here? Well, I would like to end this message today by sharing a few thoughts on this and with your permission, offer some advice.

First, I repeat that the best defense against Federal skullduggery is for you yourselves to clean up any known trouble areas which can be seized upon to justify the use of the Federal shillelagh.

Deceit of any kind in the marketplace, even in isolated instances, is indefensible. I know you have patiently stated time and time again that you feel exactly the same way. I know we are agreed also that marketplace chicanery is not the rule but the exception. But where you can—wherever you can—if you of industry will yourselves root out these problems, correct them and prevent their recurrence, you will have done the best possible thing to keep your enterprises free of public criticism and restraint.

Second, you cannot imagine how disheartening and confusing it is to your friends in public life when industry, with its cherished anarchy, comes to us with a label of conflicting voices. Believe me, labor unions march up Capitol Hill lockstep and in unbreachable phalanx on every issue of real importance. As one who in private life has known the problems of business firsthand, I understand how difficult it is to achieve harmony on any issue that cuts across the great complex of individual companies—but again, where and when you can, you should strive for unity on the overriding issues. For only then can your views become clearly comprehended by people in Government; only then can your combined power and influence be brought fully to bear; only then can you develop an effective counterpoise to the relentless forward march of the disciplined collectivistic forces arrayed against you.

As for specific legislation—such as the Hart bill—I have never seen a legislative fight lost until the vote has been counted. In other words, if you will move tirelessly and vigorously and in concert with industries allied with you on this issue, you have no reason to be defeatist about it. Here, I must, of course, enter this reservation: all bets are off if the President, who is virtually enthroned politically, moves this legislation front and center. He has, with this Congress, a whim of steel.

Third, you of industry should unify your position on this legislation to the maximum possible degree and then advance that position in the proper places with all the persistence and energy you can command.

Fourth, you should move in many media, and continuously, to bring the pitfalls of this legislation home to the American people and thereby counteract the claims of its proponents.

Finally, I very earnestly repeat this suggestion: Do your best—your very, very best—all of the time, to pinpoint the areas that invite criticism, and then move with the kind of boldness and decisiveness you have so commendably demonstrated in the pollution area to purge yourselves of error.

It would overtax your patience if I attempted now to cover the many other areas that give you concern—antitrust probabilities for example, and taxation, restrains on advertising, and enlarged regulatory powers for such agencies as the FTC and FDA.

But all of it can be lumped into this one generalization: In Congress, due to the 1964 election, all systems are "go." Restraint in the National Government at this point is the restraint the President is disposed to exercise. Our system of checks and balances has become a blank check with an unlimited balance. That part of business leadership which in the last campaign helped to saddle America with unbridled executive power might well burn a few candles before the altar of making L.B.J. stand for "let's be judicious." I wish them luck.

And, my friends, for all of you I wish much more than luck. I wish you continuing prosperity in an environment of freedom kept hospitable to vigorous and healthy competition. Those of us in public life who have pledged ourselves to the preservation of a system of free enterprise will, I assure you, stand firm in the frontline of the battle to save our system. May it be your disposition, now and in the future to do no less. May S O S become your battle cry as well as our own.

Now I must ask you, please, to excuse me. I just glimpsed a Republican. If I don't stop right now, he may get away.

Thank you for your courteous attention.

U.S. Language School Readies Servicemen for Oversea Posts—Monterey Center Gives Short Vietnamese Course; Student Tries Albanian on "Dentist"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, our most important and everlasting military victories will be won with "words" more than guns. Today we send troops abroad inferiorly "armed" if they cannot communicate with our allies and enemies. To speak another language is to be "twice armed."

No school anywhere teaches oral communication better than the Army Language School.

A recent article by Glynn Mapes, of the Wall Street Journal, tells some of the story of the Defense Language Institute, Monterey branch. All Members should know this extraordinary school well.

U.S. LANGUAGE SCHOOL READIES SERVICEMEN FOR OVERSEA POSTS—MONTEREY CENTER GIVES SHORT VIETNAMESE COURSE; STUDENT TRIES ALBANIAN ON "DENTIST"

(By Glynn Mapes)

MONTEREY, CALIF.—Seated in a dental chair, a U.S. Army private hesitantly asks: "A eshto e nevojshme te m'a hiqni dhembin?" That's Albanian for "Must you pull my tooth?"

Back comes the answer in Albanian: "Me duket se po," which means, in plain English: "I'm afraid so."

Fortunately, the soldier's toothache is no more real than his dentist, a Navy seaman equipped with a pair of dental pliers. This visit to the dentist is just a training exercise at the Defense Language Institute (DLI) school here, where the soldier, the sailor, and thousands of other American servicemen are being taught languages they will use on oversea assignments.

The make-believe dentist's office is part of Realia City, several buildings at the DLI school with rooms fixed up to resemble banks, shops and restaurants. While an instructor stands by watchfully, students act out various roles in these settings, ad libbing in the foreign tongue they are studying. "In this way we allow the students to actually apply their language skills in realistic surroundings," says Yukata Munakata, a member of the faculty.

THIRTY-THREE LANGUAGES

The Realia City exercises are designed to supplement classroom instruction at the

steadily expanding Monterey school. Founded in 1941 to teach Japanese to Army intelligence agents, the school now offers instruction in 33 languages and dialects spoken by more than 75 percent of the world's population. This year its 500 civilian teachers will train about 3,700 servicemen, up from 2,400 in 1960.

The DLI, which is run by the Army for all the services, is headquartered at Anacostia, District of Columbia. A branch there trains about 200 students a year and several thousand other students are farmed out on a contract basis to Syracuse, Yale, and Indiana Universities and to commercial language schools. But DLI's biggest single facility is at Monterey.

The number of servicemen studying a particular language at Monterey tends to reflect U.S. involvements overseas, so now the school is getting a good many students assigned to learn Vietnamese. About 1,000 servicemen will get training in Vietnamese this year, five times more than the number 5 years ago.

To handle this heavier load, school officials have set up a 12-week subfluency course aimed at building a primarily military vocabulary in the southern, or Saigon, dialect. This condensed program glosses over the Hanoi dialect of the north and the nuances of Vietnamese culture which are normally covered in the standard year-long course.

STRATEGIC SWAHILI

There's also a considerable buildup in the number of students studying Swahili, a common tongue for nearly 40 million East Africans. "Swahili is not just another peculiar, exotic tongue," says Milan G. P. de Lany, chairman of the Swahili department. "It's now among the top 10 languages of the world in strategic importance." Most graduates of the Swahili course are assigned to U.S. embassies and consulates in East Africa where they work with their African counterparts, or serve as interpreters.

In its classrooms, DLI gives precedence to speaking and understanding a language rather than to reading and writing skills. "Whether he likes it or not, a student must first memorize phrases and learn the sounds of the language," says Shigeya Kihara, director of DLI's research and development program.

From the first day of class students are encouraged to speak the new language constantly; as their vocabulary grows, they encounter written forms. The time lag between speaking and writing might run a few weeks for Spanish or French but stretches to several months for some Oriental languages whose calligraphy—the writing of the thousands of symbols—is an art in itself.

No one who hasn't finished high school can get into a DLI course and nearly 85 percent of the students have been to college. There are no draftees at DLI; most students selected to attend have volunteered for a type of duty which requires foreign language ability.

Enlisted graduates often wind up with one of the Defense Department's intelligence organizations. There, many of them translate foreign military documents.

Some officer graduates go on to universities to study the political and social climate of the country whose language they've learned. Then they are assigned to that country as "foreign area specialists." But most officer graduates are sent immediately to one of the nearly 50 countries where U.S. Armed Forces are stationed for service as attachés or as staff members of military advisory groups.

Instructors say that some of DLI's poorest students have turned into outstanding graduates. "In these few cases," says research director Kihara, "we must wait until the men put their training to work in the field before we can see the proof of our teaching methods."

He cites Maj. Joseph Hennigan who was assigned to the Korean Armistice Commission after completing a DLI course in Korean last year. "He was an extremely poor student here, but now he speaks Korean like crazy and rebutts the North Koreans in their own language," Mr. Kihara says proudly.

As the Monterey student body grows, DLI has been having trouble finding enough qualified instructors. Both the Vietnamese and Swahili department now are seriously undermanned. The institute hopes to solve this problem by an intensified recruitment drive among the large foreign student population in the United States.

Once hired, a new instructor is required, as part of his training, to study a language that is as foreign to him as the language he teaches will be to his students. With future Russian teachers studying Burmese and Turkish recruits taking Serbo-Croatian, school officials believe all concerned will get a student's eye view of linguistics.

Use of Gas in Combat Remains Clouded Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Washington Post published an article by Howard Margolis which represents, in my judgment, one of the most thoughtful analyses of the implications of the use of gas by United States or South Vietnamese forces that I have seen.

It appears from Mr. Margolis' researches that there is conflict within the administration as to the possible effect of our use of even nonlethal gas. As he points out an argument can be made that "any use of gas in combat necessarily involves a serious risk of escalation."

I commend this article to the attention of my colleagues:

USE OF GAS IN COMBAT REMAINS CLOUDED ISSUE

(By Howard Margolis)

U.S. endorsement of the use of riot-control gases in Vietnam is being interpreted by many subordinate military and civilian officials as a step toward the general approval of the use of nonlethal gas warfare.

Whether this was the intent of recent statements by the President and the Secretaries of State and Defense is not clear.

Their statements were much more narrowly worded, stressing that only commercially available riot-control gases were used, and then primarily in situations where appropriate to save civilian lives, not for general combat.

From what was said, officials opposed to promotion of nonlethal gas see the administration as backing away from a position it had stumbled into.

But officials favoring the promotion of the gases appear to view these same statements as a diplomatic retreat in the face of the sharp public reaction around the world, but nevertheless a step toward the adoption of a progas position.

The central issue is the risk that promotion of the use of nonlethal gas might break down inhibitions against general gas warfare.

No one could be found in the administration who seems to favor the use of lethal gas. Equally, almost no one seems opposed to bringing down political inhibitions against the use of nonlethal gases, provided there could be assurance that there would be no escalation to poison gas.

What the opponents of such a policy question is how a reliable line is to be enforced against the use of poison gas once the general idea of gas warfare has been accepted.

Those favoring the use of the gases see them as a substitute for bullets and bombs and napalm and hence a step toward more humane means of warfare.

Those opposed doubt that use of such gases would, on net, make warfare much more humane. More important, they fear it would have the contrary effect by eroding inhibitions on the use of poison gases, which are a singularly undiscriminating and cheap means for mass slaughter.

None of the officials interviewed who were knowledgeable about the subject appeared to believe that the lines presently laid down by the administration were very likely to hold.

Several of those favoring the use of gas stated that the real line lay between gases that are known to be nonlethal and experimental gases about which there is still doubt. In their view, nominally nonlethal secret gases are not yet classed with "riot control agents" simply because there is not yet sufficient proof they are nonlethal.

In this view, the line delineated by Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara between civilian and military gases seemed at best unenforcible and at worst meaningless.

According to a military riot-control manual, for example, the vomiting gas included by Rusk and McNamara in the tear gas family will make its victims violently sick, with a splitting headache, for periods of up to 24 hours.

So it can readily be argued that secret military gases that merely put people to sleep for 24 hours are more humane than vomiting gas, and that the real distinction is that there is not yet adequate evidence that all those put to sleep will wake up.

To officials favoring the use of gas, the essential problem is to overcome irrational public distaste for the idea of gas warfare by educating the public to understand that the gases that would be used, unlike those of World War I, would not kill or impose permanent injury.

A general who was interviewed stated that he believed there was no chance at all that use of nonlethal gas would lead to the use of lethal gas.

A higher ranking civilian official was less emphatic. But he felt there was no question but that a clear line could be drawn today between permissible and nonpermissible gases—nonlethal and lethal—and that if, in the future, this line were blurred it would be possible to go back to the no-gas position.

Officials opposed to the encouragement of gas doubted that any such line could confidently be expected to hold.

The problem, in this view, is the pressure that would exist on combatants to use the strongest gases they thought they could get away with, as the Vietnamese chose to use vomiting gas rather than ordinary tear gas. The pressure would presumably be much stronger when both sides are using gas. Thus, an argument can be made that any use of gas in combat necessarily involves a serious risk of escalation first to gases that occasionally cause lasting injury, or occasional death to victims exposed to unusually heavy concentrations, and then to outright killing gases.

Although the likelihood of such escalation cannot be determined, opponents of a progas policy judge the risks sufficiently severe to outweigh any realistic military or humane advantage of promoting the use of gas.

Appendix

Legislators' Policy Statement on Traffic Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HAYDEN
OF ARIZONA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, on behalf of the Western Interstate Committee on Highway Policy Problems of the Council of State Governments, located at 211 Sutter Street, San Francisco, Calif., I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "Legislators' Policy Statement on Highway Traffic Safety."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEGISLATORS' POLICY STATEMENT ON TRAFFIC SAFETY

A CALL FOR LEGISLATIVE LEADERSHIP

Traffic accidents are relentlessly killing and maiming more and more of our citizens, day in and day out. The economic costs of these mishaps are staggering.

In spite of this situation, we seem to show no great alarm and have generally failed to take strong countermeasures. Perhaps we have become immunized against the "little" tragedies on our highways by the greater horrors of past wars and by the major catastrophes of earthquakes, floods, hurricanes, and similar disasters which result in large-scale destruction of life and property. Conceivably, we may have even become hardened by the frightening possibilities of the nuclear age.

The irony in this thinking is that while highway fatalities and injuries do not have the dramatic impact of the all-at-once tragic disaster, in cumulative results we have killed and hurt more people in traffic than in all our wars, hurricanes, floods and earthquakes and similar calamities since this country first was founded.

I refuse to believe that the American public has become callous to the tragedies that occur on our highways every day.

This senseless waste of our resources must be stopped—and it can be by forthright legislative leadership.

The Western Interstate Committee on Highway Policy Problems has taken steps to exercise such leadership through this policy statement, developed by the subcommittee on traffic safety. Approved at the committee's annual meeting November 18, 1964, at Cheyenne, Wyo., this document outlines four basic policies for legislative action.

These policies are, in fact, a challenge to every legislator which the citizens of his State expect him to meet. Their adoption and support will set the stage for significant advances in the traffic safety efforts of all the Western States.

Senator BEN ARNOLD, of Arizona,
Chairman, Western Interstate,
Committee on Highway Policy Problems.

FOREWORD

The growing problems manifest in the traffic accident records of the Western States, and projections of future highway use, raise new challenges to legislative leadership. New courses must be charted and greater application of proven methods must be supported if the rising tide of death and injury on our highways is to be turned back.

This document recommends four basic legislative policies which are designed to meet this challenge. It strongly urges every legislature of the western region to:

1. Adopt a broad statement of legislative intent concerning those functions of government relating to motor vehicle ownership and operation.

2. Sponsor motor vehicle law studies to insure that the best legal tools are available to administrative and enforcement officials.

3. Plan now for meeting urgent immediate needs and the expanding needs of the future.

4. Support needed research in the motor vehicle field and encourage adoption of valid research findings.

Highway accidents have increased sharply in every State and community. Current accident prevention measures, obviously, are failing to keep pace with the growing problem.

This should be a matter of grave concern to every State legislature here in the West, and throughout the Nation, for as policymakers, legislators have primary responsibility to establish, give direction to, and support effective traffic safety programs.

Nationally, new highs have been reached in each of the last 3 years (1962–64) in traffic fatalities and injuries, and in economic costs. The annual death rate (deaths per 100 million vehicle miles) also has climbed during this period and represents the first upward change since 1955. Traffic accident statistics for the Western States are part of this grim picture.

These facts all point to an inescapable conclusion: Traffic accidents and costs will accelerate even more rapidly unless aggressive action, spearheaded by legislative leadership, is taken immediately. Long-range forecasts predict that by 1975 this Nation will have 31 million more licensed drivers, 34 million more motor vehicles, and will travel 450 billion more vehicle miles. Economic losses resulting from traffic accidents are expected to increase by $2.7 billion. (Present figures: 93.7 million drivers, 82.6 million vehicles, 798 billion vehicle miles, $7.7 billion in accident costs.)

While all branches of Government—the legislative, the executive, and the judicial—share the responsibility for protecting the public from bodily harm and economic loss in using the roads and streets, the greatest burden falls upon the legislature. This is because law is the foundation of all official programs and lawmaking is the exclusive responsibility of the legislature. This is a prerogative that cannot be delegated.

Through legislative directives and appropriate fiscal policies, the lawmaking body creates the climate and provides the blueprint for the State's accident prevention programs. The officials can carry out their responsibilities only within that framework. The public, on its part, will be responsive to the demands placed upon it only to the extent it understands and is sympathetic to the laws that apply. Thus, the operation of the highway transportation system—its safe and efficient use—depends largely upon the legislative mandate.

LEGISLATOR'S POLICY STATEMENT

In approving and implementing the following four basic policies, the legislatures of the Western States will lay a solid foundation for more effective and productive traffic safety programs in each State and throughout the region.

1. Statement of legislative intent needed

Adopt a statement of legislative intent declaring in broad terms the purpose of those functions, normally included in motor vehicle codes, which govern the ownership and use of motor vehicles.

Such a statement would recognize the huge public investment in our highway transportation system and would provide general guidelines for officials with specific responsibilities under the law to insure its safe and efficient operation in the public interest.

It would also set forth for the information of the judiciary, without limiting in any sense the power of judicial review, the broad framework within which the specific law is expected to be administered and enforced. It is intended that this declaration of legislative purpose would be incorporated in the body of the law and not be subject to deletion by the revisor of statutes.

In substance, the statement would recognize that these functions perform a vital public service in safeguarding and facilitating the use of the roads and streets; that in performing such services, the officials are expected to adopt reasonable policies, rules, and regulations, based on recognized standards and consistent with the need for insuring safe and efficient highway use.

It would state that officials responsible for interrelated functions will cooperate with each other, engage in research and planning activities as may be necessary to keep pace with new developments and growing needs, and where appropriate, cooperate with local officials, and officials of other States and the Federal Government; and, finally, that it is the intent of the leigslature to equip each function with the necessary authority and budget to maintain an adequate level of performance in all functions, consistent with the expanding needs of highway transportation. (See text of "Suggested statement.")

2. Sponsor traffic law study

(a) Sponsor a comparison of the State motor vehicle and traffic laws with the nationally recognized Uniform Vehicle Code.

(b) Take such action as may be appropriate to bring about greater uniformity with the provisions of the code, and thereby with the laws of other States.

(c) Insure that study findings are kept up to date as changes are made in the State law or in the Uniform Vehicle Code, in order to maintain a current inventory.

(d) Enact legislation providing for a model traffic ordinance for cities and authorize its adoption by reference.

To be currently adequate, in the sense of providing the needed degree of service and safety to the public, the law must be responsive to changing requirements resulting from the greater number of vehicles and drivers using the highways, technological advances and improved concepts of traffic control. The need for a high level of uniformity among the Western States in area of common concern long has been obvious and has become even more evident with increasing volumes of interstate travel.

Present motor vehicle laws cover a wide range of subject matter. Keeping abreast of the best existing law in all its complex aspects is difficult, if not impossible, without a current, running inventory in comparison with the provisions of the Uniform Vehicle Code, which is the nationally recommended guide for motor vehicle legislation. The studies should be kept current to reflect changes made in the law from time to time and in the uniform standards, to provide an up-to-date, reliable guide for the information of the legislature.

The lack of uniformity in traffic regulations among cities, both within the same State and nationally, also constitutes a major problem to the traveling public.

The recommended model traffic ordinance for cities is consistent with the provisions of the Uniform Vehicle Code relating to municipal traffic control.

States with laws that conform closely to code provisions affecting municipalities facilitate the adoption of the model traffic ordinance by their constitutent cities. In States where this is not the case, the model can be adjusted to meet constitutional and statutory restrictions.

In either case, however, the adoption of uniform traffic ordinances by all municipalities within a single State would be advanced materially by legislative enactment of a suitable traffic ordinance, based on the recommended model, together with authority which would enable cities to adopt it by reference. Authority to adopt the ordinance by reference would reduce substantially publication costs which often times are burdensome to many local jurisdictions.

3. *Plan now for meeting present and future traffic needs*

Sponsor and support a comprehensive study of all State functions governing the ownership and use of motor vehicles to the end that sound plans and programs are developed to meet present and growing future needs of each function.

It is necessary to the current and future effectiveness of the traffic safety activities of each of our States, and regionally, that legislative action be on a planned basis, guided by full and complete knowledge of all the facts which apply. It means, logically, that legislators, in addition to lawmaking, should accept responsibility for leadership in assessing the impact of these activities on people, and in determining what must be done to bring about desired improvements, now and in the forseeable future, to keep pace with the ever-increasing demands of highway transportation growth.

Such determination can come about only through factual study of present and anticipated future highway safety problems with which the State must deal, and through the administrative functions of Government assigned to cope with these problems.

Under legislative auspices and leadership, and with the cooperation and assistance of State officials and representative private and public groups with a stake in highway transportation, problems and needs can be studied factually, and realistic plans can be developed to meet current and future traffic demands. This joint approach, which brings together in a common effort the legislative and executive branches of Government, working in cooperation with informed professional and citizen leaders, provides a sound organizational structure for the conduct of an effective program.

Our Western Interstate Committee on Highway Policy Problems, by resolution, advocated such a factual study approach in this area of concern at its meeting in Seattle in 1958.

This committee reaffirms the resolution of 1958, and again urges that its recommendations be put into effect.[1]

4. Support research

(a) Support and encourage research in the motor vehicle field by providing funds, if needed, by pooling funds with other States, or by using funds available to the States from the Federal Government or from private sources.

(b) Consider the need for a continuing appraisal and inventory of research conducted in each State, as well as regionally.

(c) Foster use of research findings in carrying out future planning and programing.

The need for research and practical application of its findings has been recognized for many years as vital to sound highway development. In addition to substantial sums spent on planning in the highway field over the years, considerable sums have been used for research in guiding construction and improvement programs.

This is in sharp contrast to the relatively small amount of funds devoted annually to research on subjects related to the regulation and control of motor vehicle use, and to the safety of the motoring public. Much more money and far more effort must be directed to research in those areas.

There are many problems relating to highway use which cannot be solved because of the lack of adequate definitive knowledge. Pertinent facts in these troublesome areas must be developed through research in some depth. Only then can answers be found to vexing questions plaguing legislatures and administrative departments in the States.

The need for such research transcends State lines and is common to every State. Some of the needed research can be accomplished by the individual States, and certainly efforts should be made toward that end. However, no one State can be expected to accomplish all that is needed, and, further, individual action can result in duplication if proper means of coordinating those efforts are not exercised. It seems logical that steps should be taken for States to pool their funds for research on common problems, with other States or with the Federal Government, in a coordinated program.

A number of States have established research facilities in their governmental structure and are financing and conducting many worthwhile special studies and research projects on their own initiative. A number of research centers and technical institutes in universities and colleges are workng in cooperation with State governments on many projects. In addition to State funds, the assistance of grants from Federal Government agencies or private organizations is being used to carry out research projects.

Our colleges and universities should be encouraged to bring their full resources to bear on this problem. Further, we should support such research efforts by our own motor vehicle agencies on an individual, joint, or regional basis, as may be most feasible.

SUGGESTED STATEMENT OF LEGISLATIVE INTENT

The legislature recognizes that the development of a modern and integrated highway system which is so essential to safe and efficient highway transportation represents a large investment of public funds.

To insure maximum public benefits from such investment, authority has been vested in appropriate agencies of Government for the establishment, construction, maintenance and operation of needed road facilities, within the limits of funds made available.

Additionally, the legislature recognizes that other functions of government, hereinafter established to govern the ownership and use of motor vehicles, also are supported by public funds and render important public services which contribute to the safe and efficient use of roads and streets.

These responsibilities of State government include such functions as vehicle registration and titling, driver licensing, safety responsibility, police traffic supervision, accident investigation and reporting and use of accident records, traffic operations, and similar functions conducted under motor vehicle laws and affecting motor vehicles and their use.

In fulfilling these responsibilities, it is expected that the officials will adopt such reasonable policies, procedures, rules, and regulations as may be necessary, within the authority granted by law, and in so doing shall make appropriate use of recommended standards developed by recognized official groups to insure a desirable level of uniformity throughout the State and with other States. Such uniformity is especially important in the use and application of uniform signs, signals, and markings.

It is expected, further, that the officials will cooperate with each other where such cooperation is essential, and not otherwise prescribed by law. Moreover, there is also need for more effective coordination of activities among all branches and levels of government in carrying out their respective traffic safety responsibilities, including the Governor's office, the State legislature and city councils, and administrative, enforcement, and judicial officials of the State and its political subdivisions. In all matters of mutual concern, and where appropriate, cooperation also is encouraged among State officias, officials of other States, and the Federal Government, and other responsible groups, both public and private.

Highway transportation is a dynamic force in our society and is influenced by new developments and changing public needs. To keep abreast of foreseeable adjustments, it is expected that the officials will engage in such research and planning as may be necessary and as may be provided for hereinafter. Such efforts should be conducted in cooperation with all interested public and private groups, and directed toward the development of realistic traffic accident prevention programs to guide legislative decision and enlist public support in meeting immediate and potential needs.

In keeping with the policies herein enunciated, it is the intent of the legislature to equip each function with the necessary authority to maintain an adequate level of performance in all functions concerned with the ownership and use of motor vehicles, as they are hereinafter established, consistent with the expanding needs of highway trans-

[1] Copies of the resolution and information about States which have undertaken or completed such studies may be secured from the Council of State Governments, Western Office, 211 Sutter Street, San Francisco, Calif. 94108.

portation, in order to protect the public safety, promote the general welfare, and advance the economy of the State.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TRAFFIC SAFETY OF THE WESTERN INTERSTATE COMMITTEE ON HIGHWAY POLICY PROBLEMS

Senator A. Woody Hewett, chairman, Colorado.
Representative Magnus Aasheim, Montana.
Senator Ben Arnold, Arizona.
Senator Lee Backstrand, California. (Deceased.)
Assemblyman James C. Bailey, Nevada.
Representative W. J. Beierlein, Washington.
Senator Ray O. Burge, Idaho.
Representative Raymond W. Davenport, Jr., New Mexico.
Senator Robert Elfstrom, Oregon.
Senator Robert M. Holcomb, New Mexico.
Representative Norman E. Howard, Oregon.
Representative Elmer C. Huntley, Washington.
Senator Gordon McGowan, Montana.
Senator Andrew McMaster, Wyoming.
Senator Gordon E. Melody, New Mexico.
Senator Warren L. Monroe, Nevada.
Representative Ward Myers, Wyoming.
Representative Norman W. Ohlson, Colorado.
Representative Max D. Rogers, Idaho.
Speaker Charles Welch, Jr., Utah.

GUIDES AVAILABLE

As an aid to legislative judgment and decision a number of guides and standards have been developed by professional and technical groups in the highway transportation and traffic safety fields. They include:

"Action Program for Highway Safety of the President's Committee for Traffic Safety" which includes recommendations on all activities of State and local officials responsible for safe and efficient use of the highways.

"Uniform Vehicle Code and the Model Traffic Ordinance" developed by the National Committee on Uniform Traffic Laws and Ordinances as guides to States and municipalities, in the field of motor vehicle and traffic legislation.

"Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices," prepared by a joint committee of National, State, and local officials and other authorities, to provide engineering standards for uniform signs, signals, and markings.

Interstate compacts, developed on driver licensing and vehicle safety equipment by the Council of State Governments to encourage greater uniformity among the States in these matters.

Annual inventory of traffic safety activities of the National Safety Council, which measures the performances of States and cities.

Driver education achievement program, conducted by the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety.

National motor vehicle traffic experience

Category	1960	1961	1962	1963	1964	Percent change, 1963–60 [1]
Deaths	38,137	38,091	40,804	43,600	[2] 47,500	+14
10 months	31,134	30,788	33,372	35,380	39,250	+26
Injuries	1,400,000	1,400,000	1,500,000	1,600,000	[2] 1,700,000	+14
10 months	1,100,000	1,100,000	1,150,000	1,250,000	1,400,000	+27
Property damage accidents	9,500,000	9,500,000	10,000,000	10,500,000	[2] 12,500,000	+11
Economic loss (in billions)	$6.5	$6.9	$7.3	$7.7	[2] $8.2	+18
10 months (in billions)	$5.3	$5.5	$6.0	$6.4	$7.1	+34
Types of accidents, deaths:						
Pedestrian	7,850	7,650	7,900	8,200		+4
Collisions between motor vehicles	14,800	14,700	16,400	17,600		+19
Noncollision	11,900	12,200	12,900	13,900		+17
Collision with railroad trains	1,368	1,267	1,245	1,340		−2
Collision with bicycles	460	490	500	570		+24
Collision with fixed objects	1,700	1,700	1,750	1,900		+12
Other collisions	85	85	90	90		+6
Number of or increases in—						
Motor vehicles (millions)	74.5	76.4	79.7	83.5	[2] 87.0	+12
Drivers (millions)	87.4	88.9	92.0	93.7	[2] 96.0	+7
Mileage (billions)	718.8	737.5	767.8	800.0	[2] 838.0	+11
10 months	598.8	613.1	639.0	664.8	699.0	+17
Mileage death rate	5.3	5.2	5.3	5.5	[2] 5.7	+4
10 months	5.2	5.0	5.2	5.3	5.6	+8
Population death rate	21.2	20.8	22.0	23.1	[2] 25.0	+9
10 months	21.4	20.6	22.2	22.9	25.3	+18

[1] For figures for 10 months the percent change is for 1964–60.
[2] Estimated January 1965.

Source: Data reported to National Safety Council, December 1964.

How Handicapped Are Overcoming Barriers to Employment in My Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE SKUBITZ
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the Appendix of the RECORD the full text of a theme entitled "How Handicapped Are Overcoming Barriers to Employment in My Community," by Miss Anita Kenison of Iola, Kans.

Miss Kenison, a 17-year-old senior at the Iola High School, is the 1965 winner in the Governor's committee on employment of the physically handicapped "ability counts" writing contest. Her theme is a cheerful and appreciative commentary on individual victories over physical handicaps by people in her community and a tribute to the handicapped worker throughout the Nation who with courage and perseverance fulfills a contributing role in our society in the face of personal misfortune.

The essay follows:

HOW HANDICAPPED ARE OVERCOMING BARRIERS TO EMPLOYMENT IN MY COMMUNITY

Handicapped heroes of the past and present are familiar to many: Demosthenes, a stuttering, stammering boy who developed into a golden-tongued orator; Beethoven, who composed treasures in music while totally deaf; Franklin D. Roosevelt, the nationally loved President who was stricken with infantile paralysis; and Helen Keller, blind and deaf since a child, who is undauntedly proving today that barriers to the handicapped person can be overcome.

The small community in which I live takes pride in its handicapped overcomers. The minister of a local church is a kind, understanding man who enjoys the pleasant days of the year when he can stroll to his church office, his white cane tapping the sidewalk ahead of his feet. A cheerful widow lives in a small brown house on Sycamore Street. Though confined to her bed, she is busy creating crossword puzzles for a major newspaper and visiting with her friends. Retiring after successfully serving my community, the head librarian has read the lips of children and adults for 31 years. Her tireless efforts have won our library national recognition as one of the outstanding midwestern libraries. The list continues telling of a magazine agent whose legs are stiffened with arthritis, an accountant whose curved spine does not limit his accuracy, a foreman at the cement company, a farmer, a fieldman at the milk company, a teacher, a taxicab driver, and many other respected citizens who, while unknown to many in the world, have displayed courage and determination in the fight against barriers to employment.

Though the impaired worker's road to success has been blocked in my community as well as in others across the Nation, the 81,000 handicapped workers who were rehabilitated into employment in 1960 are living testimonies of the fact that the barriers are being overcome.

One of the employed handicapped people, a jeweler in our town, has surmounted many obstacles. Growing up on a ranch in western Kansas, he lived a normal childhood until polio struck. It paralyzed him from the waist down, leaving him with useless legs and confining him to a daybed and the part of the house in which he could maneuver a cumbersome wheelchair. During the endless hours he lay in bed, he decided to build a life of his own. He wanted to be fully independent.

Many barriers suddenly confronted him. How would he be able to get a job? He was not able to climb stairs or curbs, he had no skill or profession, and he might not be accepted in a community. Determined to achieve his goal, he invented a unique cart with which he could scale and descend curbs by himself. Instead of needing two people to help him down a flight of stairs, now, with the aid of the cart, he needed only one. Faced with the problem of transportation, he bought a car for which he invented a handbrake and hand accelerator. With his cart, he could get into the driver's seat, pulling the cart in after him. He had overcome the architectural barriers.

Taking advantage of specialized training, he graduated at the top of his class for certified stainless steel workers and also became skilled in the jewelry profession. After being successfully employed in several jobs, he bought his own jewelry store in our town where he now has a prosperous business, a loving family, and the respect of the community.

Among the various barriers he has overcome, his biggest fight was with his own morale. "It was hard for me to go down the street on my cart," he said. "I have to remember humans are curious creatures. When they stare at me, they are not ridiculing me."

Many other handicapped people in my community and across the Nation have also come a long way. Faced with the task of finding a way to climb stairs, open and close doors, and maneuver in a place of business, they have usually discovered, with the aid of their

own creative ideas, new devices, or medical improvements, a way to surmount the difficulties. By developing their abilities in specialized training and rehabilitation programs, they have been able to obtain employment in jobs which they can do as well, or better, than anyone else. Conquering their wavering morale, they have been accepted in their communities. The handicapped workers of my town who have met and conquered these obstacles have gone on to live happy and successful lives which have aided my community in its desire for betterment. Handicapped workers, in my community, as well as in others, are overcoming barriers to employment.

March 19 Designated as "Aviation Day" by Seattle Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, March 19 was designated "Aviation Day" by the Seattle Chamber of Commerce. It is appropriate that an organization concerned with the promotion of commerce should salute aviation since commerce and aviation have gone hand in hand from the very beginning. Seattle and the State of Washington can testify to this partnership because the financial benefits that flow from aviation have done a great deal to form a solid economic base in the Pacific Northwest.

The Seattle-Tacoma Airport is the area's hub for air commerce and here the economic benefits can be easily seen. There are 12,000 men and women directly and indirectly involved in supporting the airborne traffic generated by the airport. Adding their dependents, it means that some 31,000 King County residents—men, women, and their children—are dependent on the operations at the airport for their livelihood.

Air transportation means aircraft and Washington has always been a leader in the manufacture of commercial and military planes. The Boeing Co. is the No. 1 supplier of jet airliners; almost 80 percent of all of the jets operated by the U.S. airlines were made by Boeing. Last year was one of the busiest ever for Boeing; they sold more than 1 billion dollars' worth of jet aircraft to airlines in this country and abroad. This, too, adds to the total value of aviation to the area, creating new jobs and spreading the payroll dollars of the Boeing family to thousands of retail outlets throughout the State.

As chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee, I am deeply interested in the development of aviation and I know that this interest is shared by all of my colleagues, especially the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma, A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, the able chairman of the Aviation Subcommittee.

The rapid growth of aviation has had a significant impact not only on the development of the Pacific Northwest, but on the development of all other areas of the United States and the committee has long been conscious of the economic value of our air transportation network.

A day does not go by that one airline, or another, does not announce an order for new jet aircraft. All told, the airlines have on order some 300 new jets, and I know that there will be more orders placed this year and in following years.

Along with the new flight equipment, the airlines are investing in new reservations equipment, improved airport services, and other systems that will benefit both the passenger and the shipper. The airlines are putting more than $100 million into all-weather landing systems and this will greatly improve the reliability of operations in bad weather.

These are all wise investments for the airlines and it will enable them to maintain their leadership in world aviation. Fortunately, the airlines have now turned the corner and their earnings are going to make possible better and more reliable service to the public. We are glad to see this happen.

The improved financial picture is a good sign and one that will encourage the airlines to go full speed ahead with their improvement program. The benefits of a financially sound air transportation system are many and varied, and it is to be hoped that the airlines will have more years like 1964 so that they will be able to continue their investment in improving the national network of air transportation. It is one of the best investments I know.

A description of what the airlines are doing to build a new airline system was spelled out in an Aviation Day talk given to the Seattle Chamber of Commerce. It was given by Jack M. Slichter, vice president for traffic, of the Air Transport Association of America. I ask unanimous consent that the highlights of his remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts of remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIR TRANSPORTATION MOVING INTO HIGHER GEAR

(By Jack M. Slichter)

Seattle is the cradle of commercial aviation. It is an articulate proponent of our present system of scheduled air service, a leading supplier of airline aircraft and has an immense stake in the future of the airline industry.

You all have an unparalleled role in the past, present, and future of the airline industry, and it's nowhere more exemplified than in some current figures concerning the Boeing Co., which last year became the first manufacturer in history to sell in 1 year more than $1 billion worth of commercial airliners and spare parts to the U.S. scheduled airlines and their foreign-flag counterparts.

Transportation is but one facet of the many-sided nature of the airlines. To say that it is the main purpose of the airlines' existence is to neglect a vital contribution to your economy.

Today, every third person in Seattle owes his livelihood to the aircraft, airlines, and associated industries.

The impact of the airline industry in Seattle can be measured in very definitive terms. There are 6,000 men and women who work directly for the airlines, the port of Seattle, the Federal Government agencies, commercial establishments at the airport, and other direct airline oriented industries. Their combined yearly paycheck exceeds $40 million. Airlines based at the airport disbursed about $45 million for the purchase of services and supplies in the Seattle area. Of this sum, $26 million was paid directly in wages and salaries to their Seattle area operational and sales personnel.

Yearly, the commercial air carriers purchase about 60 million gallons of aviation gasoline and kerosene, and about 380,000 gallons of aviation oils. The value of just this one airline purchase amounts to over $17 million annually.

Sales, which the Seattle area industrial and commercial enterprises realize because of the scheduled airfreight services, are in excess of $12 million, and because of the constant availability of fast and efficient air service, your products are selling in markets throughout the world that a few short years ago would have been impossible to reach. Your salmon is on display in Belgian stores, your chickens and oysters are daily flown to domestic and international marketplaces. More often than not, these Seattle products are on the shelves and counters in less than 24 hours after they are picked up from the processing plants.

Besides the direct economic activity generated by the airlines, there is also a secondary value attached to the service they bring to King County. It is also estimated that about 550,000 airborne visitors spend more than $30 million in the Seattle area for downtown accommodations, food, amusements, and shopping. This injection of $30 million in the local economy creates as many as 3,000 more jobs per year.

The airline industry presently operates a fleet of some 450 pure jet aircraft. Of these, 357—79 percent of the entire jet fleet—were Boeing 707's, 720's, and 727's. During 1964 the airlines took delivery of 125 new pure jet aircraft and presently have on order about 280 jets. Thus, in just a little more than 1 year, the airlines have added, and are committed to add, just about as many jets as were acquired during the first 5 years of the civil jet age.

Today, some 60 U.S. cities, or every city with a population of over 350,000, receive jet service. It is the airlines' intention, when the new jet aircraft are operative in the system, to bring jet service to as many or more cities, and the local service carriers will be the ones to bring the benefits of the jet age to the many intermediate American cities which have only seen a jet passing overhead on its way to a metropolitan airport.

The price tag on this investment for better service is more than one and a half billion dollars, which is one of the heaviest single rounds of equipment orders undertaken by the airlines. As a new investment, consider that of the total $5 billion in flight property now owned by the airlines, one-half was acquired in the last 5 years.

Looking beyond into the next decade, of course, there is the supersonic transport, a project which has already captured the interest of your aviation industries, and will see Seattle as a key hub in the supersonic transport development program. The airlines are interested in this aircraft because it promises greater speeds and speed of transport has always been the No. 1 passenger demand. The supersonic transports will not be inexpensive. Our best estimates are that they will cost some $30 million each. And this is just the beginning. To buy the supersonic transports and put them into service will cost the airlines billions of dollars, both in direct capital investment and in training crews, operational personnel, and ground handlers. While the Government may well advance much of the initial cost, present

plans call for repayment of the Government advance out of supersonic transport earnings.

There has been a great deal of publicity about the airlines' current prosperity. The airlines are indeed in a period of reasonable earnings and it is about time. Just mentioning dollar figures is not an objective measurement of the airlines' economic situation. It does not really make a great deal of difference whether or not the airlines last year made a net profit of $150 or $200 million. What's important is to put airlines' earnings into proper perspective and it is right here where we run into our first roadblock.

We feel that the domestic trunk airlines' rate of return in 1964 will reach 10 percent. It is a marked improvement in earnings, but I feel that it is more important to consider that in the first 6 years of the jet age, and this includes 1964, the domestic trunk airlines had an average rate of return of only 4.9 percent.

After years of disappointing results, topped by a loss of $35 million in 1961, the scheduled airline industry has regained some of its lost ground, largely as a result of gains in traffic, and a very heavy emphasis on cost control and effectiveness.

Our Government regulatory agency, the Civil Aeronautics Board, has recognized the need for the airlines to overcome the financial inertia that has plagued them for these many years and has said that the industry must have adequate earnings "for an extended period of time."

Much can flow from the airlines' changing of gears: more jobs, certainly, and more benefits to the economy of a Seattle, and Seattles throughout the country. But more than that, when national prestige has never before been so important, it is critical that we reassert our longstanding leadership in aviation. We cannot afford to let that leadership go by default just because the true value of aviation has not been realized.

Seattle has long recognized the value of aviation. That is one good reason why your city has long been a leading community of the United States, and of the world. I know that this leadership will continue.

Editorial Supporting Congressman Harley O. Staggers' Proposal To Increase Federal Income Tax Exemption from $600 to $1,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES KEE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have this opportunity to share with the Members of the House the 6 p.m. editorial given by Mr. Joseph McCaffrey on WMAL–TV "News 7" on March 30, 1965, in which he endorses the proposal by the Honorable HARLEY O. STAGGERS, our distinguished dean of the West Virginia congressional delegation in the House of Representatives, to raise the Federal income tax personal exemption from $600 to $1,000 per year.

The gentleman from West Virginia, Congressman STAGGERS, has labored diligently to achieve this objective for the past 15 years, and it is my hope that the editorial which I cite will be of some small help to the gentleman from West Virginia, Congressman STAGGERS, in obtaining favorable action in the House of Representatives on this matter of importance to every American family.

The Great Society is moving to help those who have nothing, and every administration has done something to help those who have a great deal, but it is about time that somebody tried to help those who are trying to help themselves but haven't gotten very far.

Even the well-to-do Douglas Dillon, the retiring Secretary of the Treasury, recognized this last week when he said that there should be a tax reduction for the low-income families. In his last formal speech as Treasury Secretary, Dillon said that the low-income families have not been given adequate tax relief.

Congressman HARLEY O. STAGGERS heard the retiring Secretary loud and clear. STAGGERS, a West Virginia Democrat, said this is what I have been talking about, and he asked for some support for a bill he has offered in almost every Congress for the last 15 years.

Raise the personal exemption from $600 to $1,000, STAGGERS believes, and you have helped the small-income earner better than any other way. Not only that but it is the quickest way to bring about relief.

Other Members of Congress have long plumped for a boost in the personal exemption and now that there is a recognition of the problem of the low-income family building up, perhaps Congressman STAGGERS and the others who support a boost in the exemption will get help in the House and Senate.

Tribute to Col. Glenn Balch, Author

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CHURCH

OF IDAHO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, those of us who have the privilege of living in our great West all have a secret fear that the magnificient traditions of the frontier lands that challenged American dreams and ambitions, may someday be buried and lost under the steamroller of modernization.

But these fears are laid to rest so long as men like Col. Glenn Balch take pen in hand to capture forever in graphic words the wild splendor and beauty of the great West.

This month, Glenn Balch will see the publication of his 28th book in a series that has captured the imagination of young Americans for more than two decades. Another of his books is being made into a great film. A brief account of this outstanding American author and Idaho resident appears in the Salt Lake City Tribune of March 9, 1965.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL A BIG MONTH FOR IDAHO AUTHOR

(By Carl E. Hayden)

BOISE.—April will be a special month in the horse-dog-boy life of Glenn Balch, Idaho's literary Gary Cooper.

For a motion picture based on his book, "Indian Paint," will be released, and his 28th book, "Western Horseback Riding," will be distributed.

BORN IN TEXAS

Mr. Balch, who has the physical appearance of the late actor, began writing novels (his latest is one of his few factuals) about boys, dogs, and horses in 1937.

Mr. Balch was born in Texas, and this might have had something to do with his selection of Houston Avenue in Boise as the site for his home.

Except for one violent interlude—World War II—his production has been fairly steady.

In the war, Glenn served in the 10th Combat Camera Unit in the China-Burma-India theater. He concluded his military career as a lieutenant colonel and commander of his unit.

Mr. Balch, who was a forest ranger and a roaming newspaper reporter before going under contract to the Thomas Y. Crowell Publishing Co. with his book, "Riders of the Rio Grande," holds medallions presented him by Freedoms Foundation for "outstanding achievement in bringing about a better understanding of the American way of life," and by Boys Clubs of America for "Lost Horse."

While studying under novelist Oliver La Farge at Columbia University, Glenn met his wife-to-be, Elise Kendall, a Floridian.

"TIGER" TO START

"Tiger Roan," the story of a wild horse that became a rodeo outlaw, firmly placed the Boisean as a keen man with a pen.

Two volumes later the military notified Glenn it had a uniform that was just right for him. That was the end of his pennings—and the beginning of his shutterings—for 4 years.

Back in Idaho, Mr. Balch studied the mustangs roaming Twin Buttes Mesa in Owyhee County and wrote "Wild Horse," "Christmas Horse," "Lost Horse," and "Winter Horse."

Mr. Balch's books have been republished in England, and have been translated into Swedish, German, Norwegian, Spanish and Dutch.

The 175th Anniversary of the Granting of the First U.S. Patent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Speaker, this year is the 175th anniversary of the granting of the first U.S. patent.

George Washington granted that first patent to Samuel Hopkins, of Philadelphia, on July 31, 1790, for a new way of making potash and pearlash.

Since that time the American patent system has protected millions of inventions, and been an important factor in the progress of American science and industry.

In commemoration of this anniversary, a full-page ad recently appeared in the Wall Street Journal, sponsored by N. W. Ayer & Son. It explains the advantage of our patent system and cites good reasons why we must retain this system.

Mr. Speaker, the text of this important statement on patents follows:

"ON THE 175TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FIRST U.S. PATENT, THE UNITED STATES

"To All to Whom These Presents Shall Come, Greeting:

"Whereas Samuel Hopkins of the city of Philadelphia and State of Pennsylvania hath discovered an Improvement, not known or used before, such Discovery, in the making of Potash and Pearlash by a new Apparatus and Process; that is to say, in the making of Pearlash 1st by burning the raw ashes in a Furnace, 2d by dissolving and boiling them when so burnt in Water, 3rd by drawing off and settling the the Sey, and 4th, by boiling the Sey into Salts which then are the true Pearlash; and also in the making of Potash by fluxing the Pearlash so made as aforesaid; which Operation of burning the raw Ashes in a Furnace; preparatory to their Dissolution and boiling in Water, is new, leaves little Residuum; and produces a much greater Quantity of Salt: These are therefore in pursuance of the Act, entitled "An Act to promote the Progress of useful Arts," to grant to the said Samuel Hopkins, his Heirs, Administrators and Assigns, for the Term of fourteen Years, the sole and exclusive Right and Liberty of using, and vending to others the said Discovery, of burning the raw Ashes previous to their being dissolved, and boiled in Water, according to the true Intent and Meaning, of the Act aforesaid. In Testimony whereof I have caused these Letters to be made patent, and the Seal of the United States to be hereunto affixed. Given under my Hand at the City of New York this thirty first Day of July in the year of our Lord one thousand seven hundred & Ninety.

"G. WASHINGTON."

This is a document you've probably never seen.

It has had millions of descendants and they have done a great deal for your income, health and enjoyment of life.

This is the first U.S. patent, issued on July 31, 1790.

A man named Samuel Hopkins got the first patent, on a new way to make potash and pearlash. George Washington signed the patent, indicating a matter of some importance to the whole country.

And so it was, and still is.

THE IDEA BEHIND IT ALL

The founders of our country wanted, as they said, "to promote the progress of science and useful arts."

They realized, however, that few people are going to invest time, labor and their savings in working out new inventions if others—without the need of recovering this investment—can simply copy new things after they have proven their success. Under that rule, there would be very few real advances and the public would be the loser.

So the Founding Fathers wrote into the Constitution a provision for a patent law, one of the earliest for any nation. This law was enacted on April 10, 1790.

The cotton gin, the reaper, the telephone, the automobile, electric light and power, electrical appliances, the tractor, the airplane, the radio and TV, the safety razor, new metals, glass ceramics, petroleum products, chemicals, and computers got their start through the encouragement of the inventive spirit. These and thousands of other innovations have made America the top industrial power in the world.

There is something more of tremendous importance.

BETTER HEALTH, BETTER FOODS

Countless lives have been saved and the cost of illness reduced through new medicines developed by the pharmaceutical and drug industries in cooperation with doctors, scientists, government, hospitals, and universities. New nutritional values have been added to foods and new varieties of food products introduced through the research and inventions of the food and dairy industries.

Progress in many fields continues to be advanced by the patent system and the way it works with fairness to all.

In return for the inventor's right to exclude others from making, using, or selling his invention for a specified period of time, the details of each patent are made public. For a nominal fee anyone can get a copy of the drawings and specifications, study them, and try to make an improvement on what has been learned. Competition thereby is fostered and our technology expanded.

Over the past century we have served many businesses that have started with nothing but an idea.

They have grown to be big businesses because they have had, and continue to have, management with the brains, steadfast purpose, and vitality to take an idea and put it to work.

These are among the businesses that are now providing ever-improving products for millions of people and jobs and wages for millions of workers.

Beyond this they are supplying a substantial part of the taxes that support cities, States, Government, and defense; billions of dollars a year.

Where once there was only an idea there are now countless plants and services across the land and new things with each rising of the sun.

THE EVERLASTING QUEST

Vital to all progress are the encouragement of adventuring minds and the hope of rewards for risk and performance. It is this hope that provides the incentive for investors to put their savings into new ventures and the expansion of those already established.

The everlasting quest of business is to make great dreams come true.

Pacific Fisheries Competition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, expansion of Russian and Japanese fisheries is the subject of the leading editorial in the Sunday, February 28, issue of the Seattle Times.

"Pacific Fisheries Competition" is the title of this outstanding editorial, which points out that this country has been quick to act in behalf of its interests in Africa and southeast Asia, and then asks:

Why there is not a greater sense of urgency regarding an international problem as close to home as the North Pacific fisheries?

The editorial, which I shall shortly ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, also notes that Red China in the not-distant future may join other Asian nations depleting the resources of the Northeastern Pacific.

The Seattle Times editorial reflects the growing concern of our Pacific States over the increasing menace of foreign encroachment in waters adjacent to the United States, a concern which also exists in other coastal areas of our Nation.

This concern is justified by facts of the growing strength of Communist fishing fleets, and by reports in Soviet Russia's controlled press and official publications.

In January of this year, the Fisheries Research Institute of the College of Fisheries, University of Washington, Seattle, published one of its periodic series of translations from Soviet newspapers and periodicals.

I shall quote only a few brief excerpts from this extensive 67-page single-spaced report, but these will give an indication of the Soviet buildup:

Vodnii Transport, December 15, 1964: "In a speech before the Supreme Soviet, the Minister of Fisheries, A. Ishkov, said that the 1964 catch will exceed 5 million metric tons as compared to 1.8 million in 1950. In the same time period, the number of fishing vessels has doubled, and the horsepower of the fishing fleet has increased 400 percent. More than 82 percent of the 1964 catch was taken on the high seas. The target catch for 1965 is 5.6 million tons of fish and other sea products."

Vodnii Transport, September 17, 1964: "Radio facsimile apparatus has been installed in a number of trawlers fishing in the North Pacific. The vessels are able to receive timely weather data from weather centers in Khabarovsk, Tokyo, Pearl Harbor, San Francisco, and Kodiak Island. Such weather forecasts provide a safeguard on long passages and during cargo operations at sea."

Vodnii Transport, June 30, 1964: "After a 3-month trip, the trawler *Bikin* has returned to its home port, with a catch of 3,200 tons of fish from the gulf of Alaska."

Rybnoe Khozyaistov, August 1964: "Commercial fishing for shrimp has begun in the Pacific Ocean. Two vessels are now in the Bering Sea near the Pribilof Islands that were specially constructed for shrimp operations."

Vodnii Transport, September 17, 1964: "The first Soviet tuna mothership, the *Leninskii Luch*, has arrived in Vladivostok from Japan. She was constructed at the Hitati shipyards. The 5,000-ton vessel carries six catcher motorboats and is equipped to receive and process 1,200 tons of tuna."

Mr. President, competition for the protein-rich fisheries resources of the oceans of the world will continue to grow. As it grows the United States, as the Seattle Times editorial states, has been steadily falling behind. As the editorial further indicates fisheries will be one of the great international growth industries of the immediate future, and it asks:

But will Uncle Sam share in that growth?

The answer to that question must be affirmative. The Congress should and must take such legislative steps as may be appropriate to assure that the answer is affirmative.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, titled "Pacific Fisheries Competition," appearing in the Sunday, February 28 issue of the Seattle Times, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PACIFIC FISHERIES COMPETITION

This month New Zealand joined the list of nations that have expanded their jurisdiction over fisheries from 3 to 12 miles offshore—a move of small international consequence, by a small nation, but illustrative of the way in which some countries act decisively to protect their home-spawned fisheries resources from wide-ranging foreign fleets.

New Zealand fishermen had become alarmed at the presence of Japanese fishermen on their coasts. The New Zealand Government promptly acted.

Our own Government has been far less decisive in its response to a far greater expansion of foreign fishing off Alaska.

With the approach of a new fishing season, the problems raised by the expansion of Russian and Japanese fishing in the northeastern Pacific are more acute than ever.

Nor is it likely that Russia and Japan alone will supply all the foreign competition for North American fishermen in harvesting fish on this side of the Pacific.

Writing in the February issue of the Fishmen's News, Dayton Lee Alversen, base director of exploratory and gear research for the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries in Seattle, makes this thought-provoking observation:

"Do not be overly surprised if someday a mother ship and catcher vessels sail out of Shanghai through the Sea of Japan and set a course for the North Pacific area * * * Japan is constructing fishing vessels for Red China. Where these are to be deployed is anybody's guess."

Alversen might have added that Red China already outranks the United States as a fisheries power—as do Peru, Japan, and the Soviet Union.

The sorry fact is that since the Second World War this country has been steadily falling behind in fisheries competition with countries that heavily subsidize and protect their fishermen in somewhat the manner that Uncle Sam does many of his farmers.

The protein needs of a steadily expanding world population provide assurance that fisheries will be one of the great international growth industries of the immediate future. But will Uncle Sam share in that growth? Alversen says:

"If we are to improve or even maintain our competitive position in harvesting living resources from the sea, it will be necessary to modernize our fishing methods, vessels, and tactics."

This country has been quick to act in behalf of its own interests in such remote areas as southeast Asia and Africa.

With spring in the air and a new fishing season about to begin, it is pertinent to ask, surely, why there is not a greater sense of urgency regarding an international problem as close to home as the North Pacific fisheries.

Maybe there will be a greater showing of concern when Red China joins other Asian nations in depleting the resources of the northeastern Pacific.

Address of Edwin M. Hood

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDITH GREEN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1965

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, in mid-February, Edwin M. Hood, president of the Shipbuilders Council of America discussed the uncertain state of our maritime position in the world. His speech was delivered to the Propeller Club of Portland, Oreg., whose members are capable, leading personalities in port and allied activities in Oregon. The speech of Mr. Hood is informative and his views are worth the closest consideration.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include the address in the Appendix of the RECORD:

A FORMIDABLE MARITIME CHALLENGE

(Speech by Edwin M. Hood, president, Shipbuilders Council of America, before the Propeller Club, Port of Portland, Portland, Oreg., Feb. 13, 1965)

As a major power, the United States is geographically isolated from much of the world. The oceans virtually surround us. It has been said that in time of emergency 95 percent of all materials would have to be moved by sea. The importance of seapower should thus be self-evident.

Without a strong Navy, supported by a complementary strong merchant marine, under its own control in such time of emergency, the United States could well be fenced off from its allies and oversea bases. With the tremendous buildup of naval and merchant strength presently taking place elsewhere in the world, particularly in Russia, the case for an effective U.S. merchant marine—at defensible costs—on the grounds of national and international security alone is overwhelming.

With others, we of the private shipyard industry have long believed that the maritime needs of our country must be considered, evaluated and fulfilled within the framework of total seapower requirements. In that sense, seapower is recognized as including merchant ships as well as naval vessels, shipyard capacity, trade and commerce, and the ability to use geography and the oceans to advance national objectives.

To us, all of these separate parts must be coordinated to enhance our national interests, and it is for this purpose that we have continued to recommend the establishment of a Presidential Advisory Commission on Seapower Superiority. The Maritime Advisory Committee, worthy though its purposes may be, is directed to only a single facet of our present seapower dilemma.

Here is what I mean by a sea-power dilemma.

The Soviet Union is moving rapidly to control the oceans and trade routes of the world. As a naval power, she is already second only to the United States. As a maritime power, experts predict she will surpass the United States in less than 2 years. Because of her enormous fleet expansion program, the Soviet Union will soon be able to manipulate ocean freight rates at will, and through a superiority in terms of numbers of ships in-being and mobility, she will be well on the road to economic domination of the world, and the weight of numbers will soon begin to tell.

As of November 1, 1964, 673 merchant vessels of various sizes and types—mostly dry cargo ships and tankers—totaling 6,450,000 pennyweight were on order or under construction for the Soviet Union. With her own shipyards fully utilized, this tremendous building program is being accomplished by awards of sizable contracts to shipyards in East Germany, England, Finland, Holland, Hungary, Japan, Norway, Poland, Sweden, and Yugoslavia.

As of December 1, 1964, there were 40 commercial vessels, totaling about 615,000 pennyweight, on order or under construction in the United States. These involved 3 tankers, 34 cargo vessels, and 3 ferryboats. In other words, the Russians are building 16 times as many merchant ships as we are. In terms of tonnage, they are outbuilding us by a ration of better than 10 to 1. And, I might add, the Soviet Union is committing large domestic resources and a substantial portion of its foreign exchange to enlarging its merchant fleet.

While the Communists are building a new and modern seapower potential, almost half of our naval fleet is composed of 20 vessels 20 years of ago and older. In less than 2 years, more than two-thirds of our Navy fleet will be over age. About 90 percent of all U.S.-flag dry cargo ships and 55 percent of our U.S.-flag tankers are 20 years of age or older. Our fleet of dry cargo ships engaged in domestic trades is virtually extinct. The average age of the ships in our Great Lakes fleet is 47 years. Our private shipyards are more than 50 percent idle. And, U.S.-flag shipping is carrying only 5 percent of our export and important commercial cargoes.

This comparative inventory of seapower resources presents at once a threat and a challenge.

Two months ago, the Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. David L. McDonald, defined seapower as including both merchant and naval vessels plus "the mix of military, technological, and industrial capabilities related to the sea which crosscuts and intersects almost every aspect of our society." He said "the sciences of the sea may be on the threshold of an era of enormous expansion" and called for "a renaissance of American maritime capability."

We wholeheartedly agree that a maritime renaissance must be approached with the objective of obtaining a dollar's value for every dollar spent. This objective, however, should be accomplished on the basis of not how much or how cheap, but how good. From what I have already outlined, it should be clear that the quality of our total seapower effort leaves much to be desired.

But, when we talk about cost, to what do we really refer? Surely not only the financial statements showing the dollar value of assistance given by the Government.

Nothing creates such a wide diversity of employment, in such a variety of other industries and geographic locations as does the construction a ship. Furthermore, maritime activities represent a joint venture undertaken by Government and industry, for the public good, and much is returned to the taxpayer and the public treasury in the form of employment, tax revenues, trade, balance of international payments, and national security.

Not too many years ago, in 1957, the then Maritime Administrator demonstrated with actual experience statistics reflecting governmental expenditures on the one hand, and with generated tax revenues and other offsets on the other hand, that U.S. maritime activities, from 1936 through 1957, had cost the American taxpayers not one red cent. No doubt the same case could be made today.

A regiment of economists and accountants, however, could not unravel and estimate the true financial cost, or take into proper account the multitude of indirect advantages to a nation building and operating its own merchant marine. The question, then, to be decided at this point and time in history would appropriately seem to be "what is the present and possible future cost to this Nation of not having an adequate shipbuilding and shipping capability?" We of the private shipyard industry suggest that this cost may well be beyond all comprehension.

Admiral McDonald also said in his speech before the Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers in New York on November 13, 1964, that "each generation of Americans takes a perverse delight in scuttling the merchant marine."

Even at this moment, there are those in Washington and elsewhere who are valiantly trying to promote the notion that all or part of the ships for the U.S. merchant marine should be constructed in foreign shipyards rather than in U.S. shipyards. The ultimate consequences of any such idea seem to have escaped them. Their proposed actions, if put into motion, could lead to the complete destruction of the U.S. private shipyard industry and ultimately to the complete demise of U.S.-flag shipping. The destiny of

our cherished way of life could well be at stake.

It should be almost axiomatic that under existing world tensions, and with the rapid technological progress taking place on so many different fronts, the United States cannot afford to become dependent, even slightly on other nations to provide modern ships for our merchant marine. Obviously, any "build abroad" or "buy abroad" alternative for our shipbuilding and shipping requirements would only aggravate the present situtaion, lead to further deterioration in the Nation's maritime posture, and severely weaken our seapower capability.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt began his 1938 message to the Congress on the U.S. merchant marine with this statement: "I present to the Congress the question whether or not the United States should have an adequate merchant marine. To me there are three reasons for answering this question in the affirmative. In substance, they were national security, national economy, and national prestige. Last week, a quarter of a century later, President Johnson, in his state of the Union address, indicated that he would soon send to the Congress a new policy for our merchant marine. As he approaches this formidable task, we hope he will present these three affirmative reasons as to why the United States should have an adequate shipyard industry:

1. The Secretary of Defense has said that from a purely military standpoint, a shipbuilding capability in this country is essential. If a shipbuilding capability is essential, it follows that the capability to repair and overhaul ships is equally essential.

2. Shipyard activities generate jobs, equipment sales, and production of material in every State of the Union.

3. If shipbuilding work is purchased abroad, these jobs and their consequent economic effects disappear—U.S. Treasury receipts decline accordingly and the balance of international payments is adversely affected.

The Chief of Naval Operations put it more concisely on November 13 last when he said:

"We all know that the more ships we have constructed for us in other lands and the more foreign bottoms we use to transport our exports and imports, the less need we have for shipyards in our own country. This, of course, means slow but certain death of those precious skills and know-how so essential to any seapower industry. This we cannot afford. We must become vitally—let me repeat, vitally—concerned with preserving and maintaining our repository of trained manpower resources found in our shipyard facilities.

"The reasons are fairly obvious. From this bank of sea technology will come the hundreds of specialized ship types we need to hold our status in the world. And if this talent bank be sufficient, we can, in the future, prevent the mad scramble of World Wars I and II to get our seapower cabin in order."

Even more concisely, the General Court of Massachusetts in 1641 proclaimed that the building of ships was "of great importance for the common good." But, the building of ships in the context of modern days, still "of great importance for the common good," is a vital taproot of vast national strength.

The question of size of the merchant fleet, the degree of reasonable control of the seas, and the degree of control over our own trade and commerce, together with the effective competitive use of merchant shipping to offset our adversaries, are proper matters for high national strategy determinations. The use of the merchant fleet as an economic weapon, just as the Soviet Union is now doing, should be given to priority consideration by the best authorities of the United States on a coordinated basis. No country in history has ever held a leading position without at the same time holding a reasonably dominant position on the seas. The relationship between seapower, shipping, and shipyards is equally historic. The sum of commercial ship operations—use and deployment—plus shipyard capacity and efficient use, then, must be contained proportionately in the total concept of seapower.

Accordingly, we urge that a program for maritime renaissance be carried to the highest levels of Government and to the citizenry. To this end, we again urge the appointment of a Presidential Advisory Commission on Seapower Superiority, composed of knowledgeable persons from both public and private life, for the purpose of recommending requisite steps to insure that the United States will long maintain supremacy on the high seas. Only on a top-level, coordinated basis can this basic challenge be faced effectively, realistically, and reasonably. We fervently hope that this concept will be included in the emerging design for the Great Society.

Democrats Introduce 100-Year Water Plan Study—Statement by Hon. Charles Moon, Member, House of Representatives, State of Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by the Honorable Charles Moon, a representative of the 39th District of the State of Washington House of Representatives. This statement contains relative and pertinent information which probably could be well considered by other States of the Union in the very important matter of water resources.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMOCRATS INTRODUCE 100-YEAR WATER PLAN STUDY

(By Hon. Charles Moon)

Because of increased interest in a Federal level to examine the possibilities of diverting excess waters from the Pacific Northwest to the Pacific Southwest, it is vitally necessary that the State of Washington embark immediately upon a complete and comprehensive study of the magnitude and distribution of our water resources, uses of this resource, and projections of future supplies and uses for the next 100 years in the State of Washington.

At the present time there are five water plans proposing to make use of our State waters to help States in the Southwest United States. Determination to divert Washington State water is, in the final analysis, a decision which will be made in the U.S. Congress. However, without factual long-range study plans and information, we in Washington State are helpless to tell Congress whether or not we have or do not have a surplus of water for our long-range needs.

We and the Democratic leadership of both the house and the senate are right now drafting a bill, to be introduced tomorrow, which will, when passed provide the necessary facilities and appropriations to get such a study underway immediately.

Purpose of this study will be to identify and project for the next century, Washington's water requirements for all beneficial uses which will include irrigation, mining, manufacturing, domestic municipal, power development, industrial, recreation, and wildlife and fish uses.

The purposes of the information developed in the study are: For the determination of whether or not Washington State does or does not have water which is surplus to its future and long-range needs.

To determine any benefits or detriments to the State of Washington which can and will result from future proposals to divert our water to the States in the Southwest.

To provide sufficient information to enable Washington State to develop means of meeting long-range water requirements for all the beneficial uses for the entire State.

To make this study it will be necessary that the responsible agency cooperate with all affected State agencies, local governments, Federal agencies, and other entities concerned.

It is envisioned that the agency which is made responsible for this study will enter into contracts with the State department of agriculture for studies relative to long-range irrigation needs; the department of natural resources and others to deal with water needs for their purposes. The State pollution control commission would be called in for water quality requirements necessary in our total resource picture for the next 100 years; fishermen's and sportsmen's and recreation groups would assist in recreation and fishing information details, and our State colleges and universities would be called upon to lend their talents and research capacities to making this a factual, comprehensive study.

In a letter recently received from our senior Senator, WARREN G. MAGNUSON, he urged that this legislature immediately consider, in the light of the necessities on the Federal level, commencing with the collection of this necessary information. He further stated that the entire Washington State congressional delegation is interested in this proposal and the reaction of this legislature to this matter.

We sponsors, both senators and representatives, feel that we cannot wait any longer to commence this study. Our neighboring State of Oregon has paved the way—recently appropriating more than $300,000 for the start of their study. It is our feeling that we in Washington should do as much, or more. We would envision that the agency made responsible for this study would utilize an outline and format similar to that developed by Oregon, adapted to our own unique resource needs, in the implementation of this program.

An appropriation and study of this kind is not setting a precedent in Washington State government. The department of commerce and economic development is at the present time embarked on such a program dealing with the economic future of our State. Their progress has been notable and the study which we propose, dealing with water resources, will be a valuable supplement to their work.

The legislation which will create this study plan does not require any broad and sweeping changes of existing State government structure. It is not necessary that additional boards or commission be established, or nebulous and undefined powers be given any agency.

Our bill, as it will be introduced, will simply call for the immediate implementation of this long-range study along the lines already described. It would clear the way for the State department of conservation to concentrate its energies on our water resources, on the studies, inventories, and management practices necessary to insure the orderly and

rapid development of needed resource information.

This legislation would transfer the departments of mines and geology which are now in the department of conservation, to the department of natural resources. It would transfer the soils and water conservation committee to the department of agriculture, and would change the name of the department of conservation to the department of water resource conservation. It would outline the objectives of the study and direct that department to conduct the study, and would call for sufficient funds for them to do the job.

The idea of this study is neither new nor original for this session. A number of resolutions have been drafted which would make such a study possible, but have not been introduced, but nowhere has a proposal come before the legislature which is as sweeping in scope and benefits for the State of Washington.

Other legislation introduced this session would have created a board and department of water resources but it was cumbersome, complicated, and nonspecific to the needs of the State. As stated, this need not involve nebulous, nondirected boards, and commissions, or vast sweeping departmental changes. Done in this straightforward fashion there is no reason why both parties cannot join with us and immediately get to work on a century of progressive planning for Washington State.

First Lady of Home News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons the Home News, of New Brunswick, N.J., is one of New Jersey's great daily newspapers is the fine caliber of its officers and employees.

Recently the Home News published an editorial entitled "First Lady of Home News."

It is with deep pride, pleasure, and honor that I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD this editorial, because Miss Melicent E. Perkins represents the high degrees of competence, character, and dedication that have contributed to the success, progress, and greatness of the Home News.

The editorial follows:

FIRST LADY OF HOME NEWS

Today is a day unique in the history of the Home News.

Today Miss Melicent E. Perkins begins her 66th year of association with this newspaper.

It was on March 26th, 1900, that Miss Perkins accepted the position of stenographer for the late William B. Boyd, father of Hugh N. Boyd, who is now publisher. She rose steadily up the ladder holding successively higher positions, becoming secretary of the Home News Publishing Co. in 1923 and later becoming secretary-treasurer, a position she holds today. She is also a director of the company.

Hundreds of reporters and printers have come and gone during Miss Perkins' association with our newspaper. Hundreds of millions of copies of the Home News have been printed and read. And with simple majesty Miss Perkins has been a part of all this. She has over the years helped four publishers make difficult decisions. She has been a warm friend and wise counselor to hosts of us, present and former members of the Home News family.

Miss Perkins' handclasp is firm, her laugh hearty, her sense of humor strong, her participation in the management of our newspaper active, inspiring, and effective. She's at her desk every day, and on payday her signature is on the checks.

Newspaper people are often slow to praise their own, but we are proud and honored to be able today to salute Miss Melicent Perkins, a fine friend, First Lady of the Home News.

Are the Civil Rights Demonstrations Leading to Totalitarianism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, because so many Americans are moved to compassion when it is believed any people suffer injustice, many of our citizens are being misled in the current demonstrations of Martin Luther King. Hailed as nonviolent and strictly for the purpose of securing voting rights for Negroes, the true character of the riots is becoming clearer each day. There is a strong odor of totalitarianism connected with the demands of Martin Luther King. If he has his way, not only the South, but all America will be his victims as we lose our system of Government under a dictatorship made possible by the revolutionary tactics now encouraged and condoned.

A warning of what lies ahead is contained in a column by William S. White which appeared in newspapers this past week.

Mr. White's article follows:

IN WASHINGTON

(By William S. White)

WASHINGTON.—An odor of totalitarianism is rising from the supposedly nonviolent leadership in the Negro civil rights movement of the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr.

Just as it seemed that the men of reason and restraint, in North and South, were at last to be able to raise their heads in this tragic business, Dr. King's call for an economic boycott of the entire State of Alabama has shocked the sensible North, repelled and sickened the moderate South, and maddened and rearmed those irreconcilable southerners who resist all concessions to the Negro.

It is an act hardly less damaging to the cause of true civil rights than the acts, on the other far end of the stick, of such men as Gov. George Wallace, of Alabama, and former Gov. Ross Barnett, of Mississippi.

For what Dr. King proposes is tactically indefensible and morally intolerable. It is nothing less than the application of the principle of total warfare—against the just as well as the unjust, against Alabama Negro as well as Alabama white. A man who appeals so often to the higher moral law now urges what is in principle the economic bombing of defenseless cities.

Its timing is, moreover, provocative and mischiefmaking beyond ready belief. For Dr. King summons up the forces of unreason and the technique of the general strike at the very moment when the entire Johnson administration and a great majority of Congress are engaged upon a historic program to secure Negro voting rights. And it is this man, this holder of the Nobel Prize for Peace, who has so long been presented as the chief voice of responsibility and reason within the Negro movement.

If his demands were not already being met as fast as elementary orderliness and a decent regard for the minimum rights of dissenters in a free society could possibly meet them, his position might to some extent be understandable, even though wrong. In all existing circumstances, his attitude surely cannot be adopted even by advanced civil rights advocates unless they believe that a single, unelected person, granting him the highest motives, is entitled to pronounce a judgment of economic strangulation upon a part of the Union.

Those who sit comfortably and righteously in the North and tirelessly condemn not merely the entire South, but also every man who attempts to raise the smallest word in its defense, will reject all this, as they always do. But what they are doing and what Dr. King is now doing, for the first time in his case, so far as this columnist has seen, endangers the very goals toward which they give such endless lip service. For there is in this, as in every poignant controversy, a human limit of tolerance. Let it be transgressed long enough and harshly enough and irremediable chaos is the only result.

It is not pleasant to be in the middle of such an issue. For such a man becomes the chosen villain on the same day of both sets of extremists, and has no friends any more. When the mail comes each morning, it is like being hit in the face by twin sacks of wet sewage. At one and the same hour a man is a southern Tory Bourbon and a hireling of Yankee carpetbaggers. This is perhaps a too personal way of saying that most Americans are not even remotely aware of the depth of bitterness being fomented in this Nation by the George Wallaces—and also, let northern people recognize, by the Martin Luther Kings.

All the same, the middle way is the only way if justice and national union and national order are to be preserved; for justice never lies with men of passion and violent tongue.

That part of the South which will not submit to fair play for the Negro is demonstrably being forced to its knees by lawful process. Is it not now time, in all conscience, for an end to, or at least a suspension of, the long pilorying of one tortured region of this country? Is it not now time to put a period to marches and demonstrations, and now to end an outright effort to destroy the economy of a whole State, at least until Congress has had a chance to work its will?

A Government Lottery as a Revenue-Raising Device

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a resolution to establish a select committee of the House of Representatives to study the advisability of using a Government lottery as a revenue-raising device.

I urge the Congress to establish this committee to investigate the lottery.

Surely, the obvious trend toward the lottery device in this country indicates that the national lottery idea is at least worth investigation.

For my part, I am fully convinced that investigation of the lottery mechanism will indisputably prove its merit. I urge the Congress not to shrink from social and financial reality.

First International Hangar Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MORRIS K. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, during March 19–21 in my congressional district in Arizona, we established a first of which Arizonans and the Nation may be proud. Various aviation groups, the Tucson Airport Authority, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, and the Director General of Civil Aeronautics of Mexico cooperated to hold the First International Hangar Session. This project is significant not only because it is the first of its kind on an international basis, but because it should bear fruitful results in terms of our relationships with our Latin American friends.

Mr. Najeeb E. Halaby, Administrator of the FAA and Senor Ramon Perez Morquecho, Director General of Civil Aeronautics in Mexico, met with 500 pilots and representatives of general aviation from Southwestern States and Mexico.

Administrator Halaby inaugurated these fly-in-type hangar sessions soon after taking office. The Tucson meeting provided unprecedented opportunities for those citizens active in aviation in Mexico and the United States to meet face to face with local, State, and Federal public servants charged with the responsibility of regulating aviation. The session was an example of genuine government-to-people and people-to-goverment democracy.

I commend Mr. Halaby and Senor Morquecho for their initiative in making the meeting a success.

Those who attended the fly-in were provided answers to their questions and the reasons and the philosophy of the actions taken by each Government on both routine and controversial matters.

Senor Morquecho paid tribute to the Federal Aviation Agency and Mr. Halaby for contributions toward the advancement of aviation, including establishment of well-equipped airports throughout the United States and development of a common system of air traffic control and navigation aids for both civil and military aircraft. He cited the exemplary safety record of aviation in the face of an ever-increasing load of activity.

Mr. Halaby said in part:

We chose this city as the site of the First International Hangar Session because we believe its symbolizes to a great extent the spirit of friendship and understanding between nations and between people which we are trying to further here today.

We are grateful to the Tucson Airport Authority also for sponsoring us here today. We have found these hangar fly-in sessions to be extremely effective as a two-way communication vehicle between the Federal Aviation Agency and the public it serves. I might add that I personally have learned a great deal through these give-and-take sessions.

All of our previous sessions, however, have been aimed exclusively, or at least primarily, at U.S. pilots. This is our first venture in the international area.

I trust it is not the last, for I believe meetings such as this can help cement the historic ties of friendship and good will which bind the United States and Latin America.

We are honored to have with us today my counterpart in the Government of Mexico, Senor Ramon Perez Morquecho. His presence here and mine emphasize the importance which both of our Governments place on informal meetings of this kind.

This First International Hangar Session served to resolve many local problems. In addition, it established a rapport between two major Government officials that will serve both countries well.

All of us benefit from better relations and an improved understanding of the problems of our Mexican neighbors. International air travel offers citizens of both countries a way to exchange ideas, learn each other's customs, and broaden understanding.

I congratulate the Tucson Airport Authority and its manager, Mr. Charles H. Broman, and Mr. James Vercellino, director of the Arizona Department of Aeronautics, and all of the Government and industry officials responsible for sponsoring this unique meeting.

Water Pollution Along the Niagara Frontier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following resolution relative to the prevention and control of water pollution along the Niagara frontier, which was adopted by the Erie County Board of Supervisors, Buffalo, N.Y., on March 13, 1965:

STATE OF NEW YORK, BOARD OF SUPERVISORS OF ERIE COUNTY, CLERK'S OFFICE,
Buffalo, N.Y., April 1, 1965.

To Whom It May Concern:

I hereby certify, that at a session of the Board of Supervisors of Erie County, held in the county hall, in the city of Buffalo, on the 30th day of March 1965, a resolution was adopted, of which the following is a true copy:

"Whereas, Stanley P. Spisiak, chairman of the water resources committee of the State conservation council after appearing before a congressional Committee on Pollution, has called for an international investigation public hearing in the city of Buffalo on Lake Erie and Niagara River water pollution. Mr. Spisiak requested action by the United States-Canadian International Joint Commission 'to analyze and survey the international waters along the Niagara frontier and to hold a public hearing preferably in Buffalo in the near future to gather current information pertaining to the pollution of these waters'; and

"Whereas each year the incidences of water pollution along the Niagara frontier becomes more and more acute causing more and more bathing beaches to be closing on the American side of the waters; and

"Whereas there is a great need for the enactment of more stringent Federal laws preventing and controlling water pollution along the Niagara frontier: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That this board of supervisors express and intent to support Mr. Spisiak and join with him in requesting that a public hearing be held here in Buffalo by the United States-Canadian International Joint Commission concerning water pollution."

Attest:

WALTER A. HOLZ,
Deputy Clerk.

The Memphis Commercial Appeal on Murder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES D. MARTIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Memphis, Tenn., Commercial Appeal:

A NATIONAL CRIME

The ballyhooed Selma-to-Montgomery march had been completed without trouble. The Alabama Governor was commending his State for its restraint under heavy pressure from the outsiders. Suspense had faded from the story and the Nation was willing to take the spyglass off of Alabama. Just a few days before, a reporter named Jimmy Breslin had written in the New York Herald Tribune of how New York should be worrying about its own race and crime problems instead of sending pilgrims to Selma.

There things stood. A bit of daylight was showing.

And then a murder and a return to the headlines of the despised name of the Ku Klux Klan.

Not that the slaying of a Detroit woman who had come to Alabama is worse than the brutal subway killing of a New York white youth by Negroes a few days earlier. No excuses can be found, though. Murder is foul and uncivilized whether on a New York subway train or on a desolate stretch of highway in Lowndes County, Ala. And with the attention of the Nation—indeed, of the world—riveted on Alabama at this time, it was an utterly stupid deed.

Admittedly there are low forms of human life, and this was the act of one of the lowest orders.

It will be said that the good people of Alabama deplore such primitive violence. True. Good New Yorkers abhor the city jungle with its disregard for human life.

There are good people and bad. Environment, physical and mental, can lead to the demented hatred that causes murder.

But America, a land that regards itself as blessed with freedom, cannot rest content when city streets or lonely roads are unsafe.

This is not the day of the highwayman or the cutthroat.

Someone has to answer for the slaying of Mrs. Viola Gregg Liuzzo, shot as she drove the highway between Selma and Montgomery. Arrests have been made, and the import of the crime was so great that the President of the United States announced their apprehension. The suspects are identified as Ku Klux Klansmen.

Unfortunately, the murder is a national incident and it serves little purpose to try to place it in the perspective of crime that occurs from day to day in many places.

This, in a sense, is a threat to national security. It widens the gulf in racial understanding. It hardens the attitudes of distant peoples to the South. But most of all, it drives the spike of insecurity into the heart of any American who drives from State to State. For who can feel secure when he is deeply aware that his out-of-State license plates may invite violence—perhaps death?

Leased Cars for Mailmen?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I commend the intelligent analysis of the editor of the Washington Evening Journal. I hope that every Member of the House of Representatives will give this fine editorial careful consideration:

LEASED CARS FOR MAILMEN?

The Post Office Department is genuinely interested in ways to cut down the high expense of transporting the mails. Recently a bulletin to postmasters announced a breakthrough in machinery to read addresses and ZIP code numbers and sort certain types of mail automatically. When and if such a system goes into operation we'll be happy to put a ZIP code number on every letter we write.

Another recent suggestion for cutting mail distribution costs had to do with the cars driven by rural mail carriers. At present, the carrier furnishes his own car and is reimbursed 12 cents a mile for route mileage. The suggestion was that the Department discontinue this practice and, instead, lease cars from large companies which (reportedly) would furnish them at a lower cost per mile.

Frankly, we're suspicious of this suggestion.

In the first place, either the leasing contract with the Post Office Department would be profitable, or it wouldn't. If it is profitable we see endless possibilities of graft, favoritism, kickbacks, and payoffs in the awarding of the leases. To think any such system of leases could be kept free of politics is naive.

Further, we suspect that any such leasing system would require the creating of a new postal bureau to oversee and police the system. The presumably lower price per mile would soon be swallowed up in overhead.

(We suspect, also, that the company which had made money leasing cars to businessmen and salesmen at 8 to 10 cents per mile would find leasing cars for service on rural routes a considerably different kettle of fish. It's one thing to drive a hundred miles nonstop on paved highways, and quite another to drive a hundred miles on rural roads, stopping at every mail box.)

Finally, we think the rural mail carriers would have a legitimate beef about such a system. These men are rugged individualists. If you don't think they're rugged, try doing their work. And if you don't think they're individualists, just look at the variety of vehicles they choose for their daily chore. The make and model that suits one carrier isn't likely to suit another. And that's as it should be.

Nobody takes better care of a car, or gets more miles out of it economically, than the car's owner who is paying his own car expenses. Regimentation in such fields is not likely to cut costs but to raise them in the long run.

Treasury, Post Office, and Executive Office Appropriation Bill, 1966

SPEECH
OF
HON. PAUL G. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 5, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7060) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, when this legislation was in committee the request of the Post Office Department for additional permanent employees was reduced from 20,520 to 6,625. While I realize the committee has provided for temporary employees which they feel are sufficient in number to maintain current services, the failure of the committee to provide for the necessary permanent employees will be a distinct disservice to our many areas of rapid economic expansion.

The Department's original request was the minimum request and was kept at that minimum figure in order to help with the President's economy in Government program. That 20,000 figure was the minimum figure necessary to maintain the current efficiency of the Post Office Department. If the Department were to eliminate all of the overtime now necessary, it would take twice the request they made in order to maintain adequate service to its 45 million family and 4.1 million business patrons.

Mr. Chairman, I am quite familiar with the problems that the Department faces in areas of rapid economic expansion. In my own district we have had 36 new post offices constructed in the last 11 years. Some of these have been in communities which as short a time ago as 1957 did not even exist. These post offices are making use of the latest equipment and systems for processing the mail but they also need employees.

If the Post Office Department is going to continue to meet the needs of areas of rapid economic expansion, they must have the manpower to do so. The committee action cripples the request for that manpower and the Department has attempted to be reasonable in their request.

Several of the communities in my district are so understaffed that substitute carriers and clerks have been working as much as 60 hours per week. On top of this the regular employees have been working overtime as well. The normal morning deliveries are arriving at residential homes as late as 5 p.m., and the continued growth in my area will mean added problems to the post offices in meeting the demands for adequate service.

Mr. Chairman, it would seem that if the fine record of our Post Office Department has made in the past is to be continued, additional permanent postal employees will be needed.

The Need To Improve Working Conditions for Farm Laborers

SPEECH
OF
HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, any reasonable and literate person ought to be able at this late date to read the congressional handwriting on the wall. The 88th Congress, in its wisdom, decided that time had run out on the "temporary" bracero program, and that it should expire at the end of 1964. The President, in his wisdom, signed into law that decision and thereby obligated himself and his administration to carry it out. The 89th Congress, in its wisdom, is not going to buckle under the pressures that have been generated to revive the discredited bracero program. The President is not going to buckle under those pressures, and the Secretary of Labor is not going to buckle under those pressures.

The bracero program is as dead as the dodo bird. It is time for the leadership in the farm industry to stop looking for cheap, captive sources of labor. It is time for the leadership in the farm industry to exert itself in a positive and constructive and progressive manner in order to help solve the farm labor problem. It is time to look forward to the day when the farmworker can share in the fruits of his labors. Today, for the sweat off his brow that he leaves in the rich and abundant fields and orchards which he harvests he receives for his part a pittance, a pat on the back, and a passport to nowhere. Justice, decency, and humanity demand that progress not pass him over for yet another generation.

Farmworkers under State and Federal labor laws are relegated to a second-class citizenship. Millions of Americans are protected by minimum wage, maximum hours, and child-labor laws. Millions of Americans are protected by workmen's compensation and unemployment compensation. Millions of Americans are assured decent housing for their families, good schools for their children, health and medical facilities. Not so the farmworker.

Historically, labor laws were designed to regulate and set a floor under the

working conditions of employees in industry and trade. At first these laws were limited to specific types or places of employment or to certain industries. Some of these laws have been extended to cover employment generally, but usually agricultural employment is expressly excluded. Even where no specific exclusion exists and the laws could cover farmworkers, they often are not applied.

For example, in only eight States and Puerto Rico are there laws or regulations which specifically regulate farm labor contractors and crew leaders. Only a few States, California, Colorado, Connecticut, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia, have laws setting safety standards for vehicles used in the transportation of farmworkers, and for the operation of such vehicles. Farm labor camps are regulated as to housing, location, and construction of the camp in 30 States. But in 20 States there is no such regulation. And even in the States where there are laws on this subject, the standards are very limited in most.

Only 11 States, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia provide a minimum age for employment of children on farms. This age is 14 in Connecticut, Alaska, Hawaii, Missouri, Texas, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. In four States the minimum age is 12. In one State, Utah, the minimum age is 10. Compulsory school attendance requires children to attend school, usually to age 16, in most States. But in many States the laws permit children under 16 or even under 14 to be excused from school in order to work on farms.

In only four States and Puerto Rico do workmen's compensation laws cover all farm employment. Only 17 States have any specific coverage for farmworkers at all. Only Hawaii and Puerto Rico provide any minimum wage coverage for all farmworkers. Hawaii requires a minimum of $1.25 an hour. Six States have wage payment laws and wage collections laws for farmworkers. Only Hawaii and Puerto Rico specifically cover farmworkers in their unemployment insurance laws. In one State, California, farmworkers are covered by a temporary disability law.

Federal laws supplement these deficiencies somewhat. The 88th Congress enacted more laws for the protection of farmworkers than perhaps any other Congress. The Economic Opportunity Act contains provisions for the assistance of migrant farmworkers and for low-income rural families. The Housing Act of 1964 provides for grants to States or its political subdivisions, or private nonprofit organizations, to assist in providing housing and related facilities for domestic farm labor.

Have these laws been utilized for the benefit for farmworkers? What are we doing now to implement them and to pass additional legislation in the area of minimum wages and workmen's compensation? There are the fruitful areas of work and inquiry where the time and energy of the people and the Congress could be well spent.

The farmworker is the forgotten man in the industrial revolution that has benefited almost every other class of worker. Part of the evil inherent in the bracero program was that it served to keep the farm industry in a constant state of depression, as far as the workers were concerned. Braceros were a cheap source and a captive source of labor. They stifled competition and formed a crutch on which farmers and growers became accustomed to lean. That crutch is gone. It is now time for the farmer and the grower to walk without it, to seek his labor needs in the competitive market, and to give decent wages and working conditions to their employees.

This afternoon, in the Washington Daily News, John Herling ably reviews some recent events in the struggle to upgrade conditions in the farm industry. With unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD this incisive and enlightening column by John Herling:

W.W.W.'s CRUSADE

(By John Herling)

Perhaps it is inaccurate to describe the efforts of Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz in the farm labor sector as a crusade. He himself would prefer to say that he sticks to his responsibility under the law and that he is doing only what Congress plainly intended him to do and what President Johnson would want him to do.

Maybe so. But in the administration of any law or policy, the character of the administrator—made up of gutpower plus brainpan—is often decisive, whether his regulatory function is direct or indirect.

Secretary Wirtz, accompanied by Labor Under Secretary John F. Henning, spent an intensive 4 days last week in California on the problems connected with the use of braceros—imported Mexican workers—in American agriculture. While California occupies the central place in the farm labor arch, more than 20 other States also have habituated their farm economies, to a considerable extent, to the use of imported workers from Mexico and the British West Indies.

But as of December 31, 1964, the law which permitted the importation of Mexican workers—Public Law 78—expired. To the shock of many of their employers—the growers—Mr. Wirtz had made it clear that he was not going to shut his eyes to the intent of Congress and permit the growers to keep on bringing in low-paid Mexican workers.

While field trips by Government officials are often a dime a dozen, there was a special quality about this one: Mr. Wirtz flew into the eye of the hurricane—the high-pressure center of the growers' indignant demand for cheap imported labor. His trip appears to have accomplished two things: One, the growers came to know Mr. Wirtz, and while they huffed and puffed, they did not succeed in blowing his house in. And second, within the space of 1 week the growers who were red-eyed ripe for conflict have now apparently come around to the point where, in effect, they adopt the attitude of Isaiah and L.B.J. and say, "Let us reason together."

In short, their attitude has changed because the Labor Secretary made it clear that when he said that Public Law 414 (the existing immigration law) was not going to be used as a subterfuge to do by other means what had been outlawed as of December 31, 1964, he meant it positively.

Boiled down, here is the way Secretary Wirtz finds the situation: "Much clearer now than it was at the start of this trip is that here is a basic, profound movement ahead as far as the agricultural economy of this State and some of the social implications of that change are concerned. The discussion a year ago—even 2 or 3 months ago—was in terms of superficial aspects of this situation. There was the suggestion that U.S. workers won't do stoop labor, and there were other catch phrases of one kind or another that were bandied around. What is now clear as you travel the State, talk to the growers and to the workers and to their representatives, to people of very strong conscience who are leaders in the attempt to meet this problem, to clergymen, to public officials, there is a much more basic development taking place.

"Three aspects of this development stand out: First and fundamental is the fact that Congress, by terminating Public Law 78, changed a situation in which there had previously been a fully assured, guaranteed labor supply for California agriculture. That no longer will be the case. The second change involves the fact that this previously guaranteed and assured labor supply had been provided under terms which included no competitive or bargaining power as between the employer and employees. Employment was solely on terms and conditions which could be dictated, subject only to the application of laws by the employers. From here on there will be a competitive factor in the labor situation which there has not been before. The third element, hardly appreciated or recognized in the public discussion of this matter, is that Public Law 78 had the effect of putting at least a fifth of California agriculture on the basis of its being performed by single individuals, men who lived apart from their families, and who came here alone as individuals, from Mexico.

"In the future, if the families move with the men who do California's agriculture work, there will be problems of schools, housing, churches, and of facilities of one kind or another to be met. With all of these factors taken into account, the changeover will be fundamental."

Overtime in the Post Office Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I subscribe to true economies, but oppose vigorously false economies. I do not fuss with the Appropriations Committee for curtailing unnecessary expenditures or for insisting on maximum economies. However, I do not subscribe to the theory that the Appropriations Committee is infallible in their judgment.

The Post Office Department requested sufficient funds for the Bureau of Operations to eliminate some 15,000 man-years of excess overtime. They proposed to accomplish this by the appointment of regular employees. This approach is nothing less than good management and would produce eventual economies.

Mr. Speaker, experience has proven that it is not efficient to employ excessive temporary employees or to work regular employees excessive overtime. In the first instance, it is a costly process training temporary employees and certainly because their employment is temporary they leave the post office for employment elsewhere whenever they can find permanent jobs. This vicious and costly cycle continues on and on.

In the second instance, it has long been known that employees performing hours of overtime are not as productive as during their regular hours of employment. Cost-conscious and progressive private firms found this to be true, and as a result have taken proper steps to eliminate excessive overtime in their plants. Certainly if this is true in the cases of companies operating for a profit, it is equally true in the case of the Government.

I regret that the Appropriations Committee did not provide sufficient funds to enable the Bureau of Operations in the Post Office Department to convert their temporary employees to a permanent basis.

The report states:

Additional funds will allow about 1,300 positions to be used as an experimental program to reduce the excess overtime work by postal employees.

It is my contention that the time for experimentation has long since passed. The work exists—it is being done—either by temporary employees or by the use of excess overtime. Neither course is proper.

The solution is to provide sufficient funds so that regular clerks and carriers can be employed to do the work of the Post Office Department.

Dereliction in Debate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, this Congress has been asked time and again to accept without change several legislative proposals from the executive branch of Government with the admonition that we in the Congress should not change a comma, or remove a period. The steady cry from the minority side is that "the heavy hand of the executive branch is extracting its pound of flesh." In these legislative proposals, it is demanded that each be passed without amendment. The gentlelady from Oregon, Representative EDITH GREEN, has now made this cry bipartisan.

I am pleased, Mr. Speaker, to have supported the motion of the lady from Oregon with respect to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Her amendment meant great benefits to my State of West Virginia and I am truly sorry that I was the only member of my delegation to support her. Under unanimous consent I include an editorial from the Wall Street Journal, "Dereliction in Debate," which forthrightly brings bipartisanship to the complaint that "legislation should not be debated or amended, but should be passed as is," in order that my colleagues may see the same:

DERELICTION IN DEBATE

It's tempting merely to chuckle about partisan politics when Republicans complain, as one of them did the other day, that "the Great Society has turned into the great steamroller." But when a northern liberal Democrat supports the substance of that complaint, perhaps it's time to listen.

To wit, Representative EDITH GREEN's searing commentary on both the administration's primary education bill and the tactics used to speed House approval of that measure. The lady from Oregon noted that while her fellow Democrats brag of guarding minority rights, their benevolence evidently doesn't extend to congressional minorities which question official infallibility. She observed, "It seems to me we have in the House a determined effort to silence those who are in disagreement."

The debate did seem curiously restricted for a proposal with such far-reaching implications. Also, the bill is such a Rube Goldberg contraption that, as Mrs. GREEN said, more debate was needed simply "to let the House know what is actually in the bill." The measure is so confusing that at one point even its sponsors couldn't agree on what its language allowed. Still, its backers seemed intent on passing it without change, and treated most amendments peremptorily, without record votes and often without discussion.

Such arrogance might be understandable if the amendments were merely political or trifling. Instead, many of them dealt conscientiously with the bill's fundamentals, such as the fact that while its ostensible purpose is helping the disadvantaged, its systems of allocating Federal funds heavily favors already wealthy States.

The majority even brushed aside bipartisan attempts to facilitate judicial tests of the bill's constitutionality. The proposal intentionally walks close to the constitutional line on church-state questions, and Federal courts often evade jurisdiction on this issue by finding that no one is directly enough affected to bring suit. One proposed amendment might have helped simply by encouraging judicial review; another definitely specified who would be eligible to start constitutional tests.

Since the bill fosters a multiplicity of approaches to aiding children in church schools, it has endless opportunity for chaos unless the constitutional questions are resolved quickly. Not surprisingly, the judicial review provision was backed by the National School Board Association, which represent boards covering 95 percent of the Nation's pupils. The House majority chose to avoid the whole constitutional issue.

Simply by closing its ears to serious questions, the Democratic majority achieved the victory of having its measure passed practically untouched. This bit of vanity means, among other things, that some disadvantaged children will get shortchanged, and the Nation's school boards will have to struggle with the tough questions the House was afraid to face. As with so many past Federal programs, the price for dereliction in congressional debate will be paid by those the program purports to help.

Washington Star Editorial Raises Objections to Voting Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES D. MARTIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, lest it is believed that only southerners are objecting to the unfair, discriminatory and highly dangerous voting bill sponsored by the President, I call your attention to the editorial, "Voting Discrimination," which appeared in the Washington Sunday Star, April 4, 1965.

The editorial follows:

VOTING DISCRIMINATION

Our basic objections to the administration's voting rights bill have already been stated. We think there is need for a reasonable literacy test, provided there is no discrimination in its application to would-be voters. The administration's bill, in one aspect, outlaws any and all literacy tests, and is designed to permit total illiterates to vote. The educational voting level is low enough now without enacting a Federal law to push it down even farther.

The second important aspect of this bill imposes its harsh and punitive provisions on any State which has a literacy test, and in which fewer than 50 percent of the residents over 21 are registered or actually voted in the 1964 election.

This bill contains other provisions which are reminiscent of the Reconstruction era following the Civil War. But the two which we have mentioned, taken together, offend one's sense of fairness. If enacted, in its present form, this bill would result in a legislative discrimination as bad or worse than the evil the bill is supposed to remedy.

Let's take the case of Virginia, which is brought under this bill because it requires a literacy test and, though more than 50 percent of its eligibles are registered, fewer than 50 percent voted in 1964.

What is Virginia's literacy test? As spelled out by Senator HARRY BYRD in his recent statement, any person desiring to register must be able, without assistance, to give in writing the following information: His name. The date and place of his birth. His current residence. His occupation. And, if he has voted before, the county and precinct in which he voted. That is all.

Is this a test which opens the door to such obviously discriminatory requirements as being able to interpret to the satisfaction of some ignorant registrar sections of a State constitution? Is it a test which asks too much of a person who wants to vote on the important and complicated issues which face us today? We do not think so. Furthermore, the administration concedes that this is not an unreasonable literacy test, and that there is no evidence that it has been used in Virginia to discriminate against Negroes.

If this is so, why does the bill link a reasonable and nondiscriminatory literacy test to an arbitrary formula with respect to voting or registration percentages?

One explanation is that the statistics on registration are unreliable. But this is said to be true in West Virginia, which is not affected by the bill because it has no literacy test. What nonsense.

In addition to Virginia, the States covered by the bill are Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, and Alaska. We are puzzled by the inclusion of Alaska, in which Negroes certainly are not discriminated against. There are few if any there. As to the others, we haven't enough information to pass judgment.

But it is our firm belief that this is a discriminatory bill. If its purpose is to protect Negro voting rights, it discriminates in favor of New York, which requires a rather strict literacy test but which has met the voting percentage standards. It also discriminates in the case of Texas, which did not meet the percentage-of-voting standard in 1964, but which does require a literacy test, although it is verbal in character and is called by some other name.

There have been reports that the administration's bill will be changed or modified in some unrevealed aspects. We hope this is true. We also hope that the bill, if modified,

will be made applicable to Virginia (in which we have a special interest) on the basis of facts rather than fiction. And certainly not on the basis of some arbitrary formula dreamed up by someone who hasn't the faintest idea what the facts are. Or, if he knows, doesn't care.

Revision of Copyright Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year the distinguished chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, introduced a bill which provides for a general revision of the copyright law. I introduced an identical bill, H.R. 5680, as a cosponsor of this legislation. This bill contains the first sweeping reform of our copyright laws since 1909.

The bill, which was prepared at the instigation and with the aid of the U.S. Copyright Office, would establish a single national system of statutory protection for all works, published and unpublished, including those of authors, composers, artists, book publishers, industrial designers, universities, and even widows of writers. The measure is now pending before the Judiciary's Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, Copyrights, and Revision of Laws, of which I am a member.

Recently, the Washington Post published an informative article on the subject, entitled "Some Wrongs Need Righting in the Copyright Law." It was written by Jack C. Landau and appeared in the issue of March 28, 1965. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert this article into the RECORD:

SOME WRONGS NEED RIGHTING IN THE COPYRIGHT LAW—BILL BEFORE CONGRESS WOULD STRENGTHEN OUTDATED RULES

(By Jack C. Landau, Washington Post staff writer)

A decade ago, the U.S. Copyright Office decided that major revisions were needed in our antiquated 1909 copyright law.

The primary objective was to aline the United States with European countries by giving our writers and composers more protection against piracy of their works.

It was hoped that this increased protection would result in higher royalties which, in turn, would stimulate production of artistic and scientific writings.

A coordinate goal was to resolve the tangle of legal problems that have arisen from advancements in communication media, most of which were either in their infancy or undreamed of in 1909. These include motion pictures, phonograph records, radio, commercial and educational television, photographic duplicating, and tape recordings.

Almost everyone was in favor of revisions. But, as the Register of Copyrights, Abraham Kaminstein, soon found out everyone also had a philosophical and financial ax to grind.

At the heart of the copyright problem is the traditional American division over the place of the artist and scientist in our society.

There is the theory that the artist or writer has a strong proprietary interest in the work he creates and should be able to control its use and charge for it as he would for any other piece of property.

But there is also the tradition that, in the best educational interests of the Nation, scientific, literary, and musical material should be cheap and easily available to schools, universities, and libraries.

The general rule in copyright is that there can be no reproduction of a copyrighted work without the permission of the author, or whoever bought the work, and the payment of royalties; not a sentence from a poem; not a verse from song; not a chart from a high school chemistry book.

Many exceptions to this rule have developed. Most of them favor schools, newspapers, and libraries under judicial interpretation that a line from a T. S. Eliot poem, for example, is "fair use"; or that, by statutory exemption, a school production of songs from "My Fair Lady" is "not for profit."

Copyright coverage has expanded over the years, again through judicial interpretation, from books and music to include ballets, uniquely designed clothing, the graphic arts, sculpture, and interpretations of noncopyrighted works such as Beethoven's Fifth Symphony.

The group favoring tighter laws includes writers, backed by book publishers, and composers, backed by music publishers. They are generally opposed by the giant educational establishment, librarians, historians, and newspapers.

Although the Copyright Office started discussions about law revisions with various groups more than 10 years ago, the draft bill was not presented to Congress until last July. The bill was not passed, so Kaminstein revised it slightly. The second proposal was introduced last month.

The new bill would revolutionize the theory of copyright enforcement. Under the present law, a copyright lasts for 28 years with a right to renew for 28 years and a right to sell the entire 56-year term. Any unexpired term goes into the owner's estate. And a writer, for example, may lose his copyright by distributing a book without the familiar copyright designation or some other copyright notation, in a prominent place.

Under the new bill, the term is the life of the author plus 50 years. The author can sign away his rights for only the first 35 years and the unexpired 50-year rights would go directly to his widow and children, so they would not be subject to his debts—a provision similar to many life insurance policy provisions. He would not lose his copyright by publishing a book without imprinting the copyright notation.

In addition, the present dual system of copyright enforcement is swept away in favor of one uniform system, all under the statute. At present, authors can sue under the copyright law or under the rather amorphous theory that a pirating author is engaging in "unfair competition" with a legitimate author.

Authors would be given additional protection under the controversial manufacturing clause. At present, only 1,500 copies of a book written by an American but published abroad may be imported into this country. This limitation is supported by the powerful printers' unions, which fear the cheaper publishing costs in Europe and Asia.

The new bill would raise this limit to 3,500 copies. But, more importantly, if the limit was broken, the author would not lose his copyright as he does under the present law.

The biggest financial boon in the bill would go to composers and music publishers, especially in the popular music field.

Under the present law, music may be recorded on regular or LP records with a royalty payment of 2 cents per record sold. The payments are made by the record manufacturer to the copyright owner. Jukebox operators pay no royalties under a special exemption.

Under the new bill, record companies would pay 3 cents per record or 1 cent per minute on an LP. Jukebox operators would be required to pay royalties.

The most complex problems involve the use of copyrighted textbooks, dramas, musicals, and periodicals in schools and on educational TV.

The educational system has retained its right to make fair use of copyrighted works, but the new law does little to explain fair use or not for profit.

Is it fair use to make copies of 1 chart, 10 charts or 40 charts from a chemistry textbook that may have cost the publisher $10,000 to develop? To make 10 sets of 3 pages of laboratory experiments? To photocopy a 10-page section on hydrogen?

Is it not for profit when a university charges 20,000 students $1 apiece to hear Peter, Paul, and Mary perform copyrighted hit songs—if the money goes to the university library fund? Is it not for profit when a high school group sings Oklahoma songs to finance a trip to New York or to buy new uniforms for the football team?

Educational TV receives rather novel treatment in the proposed bill. It would permit an open circuit educational TV station, such as Washington channel 26, to broadcast a reading of a chapter from the late Rachel Carson's "Silent Spring" without paying royalties if the broadcast was during school hours for children's science studies—even if thousands of housewives also tuned in. This was done by a Boston radio station.

This provision for education could be expected to cause controversy when educational TV goes into the adult education field in night broadcasts.

When the first proposed bill was introduced last July, it had a provision to permit the Government to copyright its publications if an agency head thought a copyright would be in the public interest.

This would have reversed the present law.

Federal agencies supported the proposed provision, believing that many valuable Government reports never reach universities because the Government Printing Office does not have commercially oriented distribution facilities or a budget which permits expensive printing. The book publishers, they said, would invest money in printing and distribution, but only if they could be assured of protection against pirating by obtaining an assignment of a Government copyright.

However, newspapers, schools, historians, and other scholars argued successfully that an assigned Government copyright would make it difficult to quote Government reports because time and money would have to be spent to trace down successive copyright owners. This, they argued, would dampen enthusiasm for research and would counter the American tradition that Government studies belong to the public to use free.

The provision was taken out of the latest proposed bill but the Warren Report is an example of how private publishers can attempt to copyright Government publications. The report, of course, was not and could not be copyrighted.

Various publishers added prefaces, forewords, indexes, appendixes, maps, charts, and photos and copyrighted their versions of the report as an entity.

The proposed bill is before Congress and probably will undergo changes. No one knows whether it will emerge "not with a bang but a whimper." (A line from the Hollow Men, by T. S. Eliot, copyright 1925, 1930, and 1958 by Thomas Stearns Eliot; copyright 1934, 1936, and 1963 by Harcourt, Brace & Co. from T. S. Eliot, Collected Poems, 1909 to 1962: reproduced here without permission.

A Disabling Amendment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARCH A. MOORE, JR.
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, the House very shortly will be receiving legislation from my Committee on the Judiciary with respect to a proposed amendment to the Constitution providing for succession to the Presidency and particularly dealing with the question of presidential disability. I personally consider this proposed constitutional amendment one of the real important challenges of this 89th Congress. I question the advisability of placing in the Constitution the proposed language because of its rigidity.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Wall Street Journal had a very exciting editorial which thoroughly sets forth the concern I have with respect to the proposed constitutional amendment. Under unanimous consent I place it in my remarks so that my colleagues who may not have had the opportunity to read it may have the benefit of the questions raised therein:

A DISABLING AMENDMENT

Since these columns have long urged some repair of the procedures for dealing with the succession to the Presidency, and particularly those dealing with the question of presidential disability, we wish we could commend the Bayh amendment to the Constitution which proposes to repair them.

Yet the more we reflect upon the objections raised by Senator DIRKSEN, the more we are persuaded that he is right. To adopt the Bayh amendment as it is now written, it seems to us, could be a serious mistake.

Like Senator DIRKSEN, we aren't objecting primarily to the substantive provisions of the proposed amendment, although there are some sections that strike us as dubious. What seems truly unwise is to freeze into the Constitution the details of procedure, making them difficult to alter under any circumstances, impossible to change in an emergency.

Take a look at the long and detailed Bayh amendment in an adjacent column. The first three sections are properly matters for constitutional consideration. The first and third simply restate the present law, providing for the Vice President to take over on the death or resignation of the President, and for the Vice President to act for the President whenever the President states that he is unable to perform his functions.

The second section provides that when the office of Vice President is vacant, for whatever cause, the President may nominate and both houses of Congress may confirm a new Vice President. Admittedly, the merits of this are debatable, but on the whole it strikes us as a sensible provision. In any event it is properly a constitutional question.

The fourth and fifth sections are something else. Here we find detailed procedures on how to decide when a President is unable to carry on. To put the onus of such a decision on the Vice President and the Cabinet, all of whom will have personal interests in the result, strikes us as of dubious wisdom. This question aside, however, it seems to us foolish—and possibly dangerous—to write such procedures into the Constitution where they may be altered only by a favorable vote of the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States.

It is not at all difficult to imagine an instance where these officers would be unable to agree, and where then Congress would be powerless to act. Conversely they could combine to oust a President, and Congress would be equally powerless to stay their action.

The provisions for restoring power to a temporarily disabled President are even worse. Here the amendment allows a 7-day hiatus in which the Vice President and the Cabinet may object, 7 days in which the Government might be paralyzed in a moment of great crisis.

And all this dangerous language is totally unnecessary. Article II of the original Constitution, while silent upon how the question of disability should be decided, quite plainly says "Congress may by law provide" for the case of "inability of both the President and Vice President." What can be done by legislation requires no constitutional amendment.

Nor should the one means be substituted for the other. The purpose of a constitution is to lay down principles and provide for the structure of government; in this, as the writers of the original document knew, a certain rigidity can be wise. The fundamentals of government ought not to be too readily changeable.

But a constitution cannot anticipate all the details of all the questions of the future. That is why those original draftsmen so often, and so wisely, included that phrase, "Congress may by law provide" for carrying out in an ever-changing life the details of government.

So it seems to us, as it does to Senator DIRKSEN, that we would be ill-advised to forget that distinction. To create a new office, a sort of substitute Vice President, will require a constitutional amendment. It might be useful also to reaffirm in this fashion the authority of Congress to make provision from time to time on the question of disability, so that there will be no question of the authority of the man called upon to perform the duties of the President.

But if we imagine that men can today foresee every possible eventuality and meet every possible contingency, the country may well regret it some 7 days in a distant May.

An Exception for the Kennedy Film?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK MacGREGOR
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. MACGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the USIA film, "John F. Kennedy: Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," is the subject of special legislation this session which would allow its showing to the American people. The following editorial from the March 30 Minneapolis Tribune dispassionately outlines the principal objection to this proposal:

AN EXCEPTION FOR THE KENNEDY FILM?

It may be a lost cause, given the Democrats' overwhelming majority in Congress. But until the die is irretrievably cast, reasonable voices should continue to question the special legislation proposed to allow the showing of a U.S. propaganda film in this country.

The film, "John F. Kennedy: Years of Lightning, Day of Drums," was made for foreign showing by the U.S. Information Agency. It is a highly emotional, extremely effective propaganda film.

The word "propaganda" needs to be stressed, because that sums up the purpose for which the film was made, and the role it plays. It is not a cool, objective, "warts and all" history of the late President.

Perhaps it will be argued that since John F. Kennedy is no longer personally a political power in the national arena, the film's propagandistic nature can be ignored. (Party partisans of, or opponents of, Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY might have unspoken thoughts on this score.)

But those who object to the special legislation are not concerned about the Kennedy legend itself; they are uneasy about providing still another precedent for the domestic use of government-sponsored propaganda films. An earlier exception was made to allow the domestic showing of a film recording Mrs. Kennedy's Asian journey.

The basic legislation which limited USIA's propaganda work to the foreign field was wise; the unease many feel at setting precedents for similar Government activities at home should not be shrugged aside.

The Kennedy film is a good film; it is not unique or earthshaking. There is no overwhelming reason why it has to be shown here.

The Governors Speak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial, "The Governors Speak," which appeared in the Indianapolis News of March 26, 1965, points to evidence of discontent which is felt in many quarters with the Great Society's programs. This editorial is well worth reading and well worth remembering, no matter on which side of the aisle the reader may sit.

The editorial follows:

THE GOVERNORS SPEAK

Evidence that all is not well within the ranks of the Great Society emerged from recent executive committee meetings of the Governors' conference held in Las Vegas, Nev.

By a margin of almost 2 to 1, the Nation's Governors today are Democrats, a statistic often cited as proof of increasing liberalism and an asserted groundswell of popular opinion toward welfarism and assorted Federal panaceas.

It appears, however, that the Governors themselves do not agree. In fact, they passed a resolution at their recent gathering condemning the growth of the Federal bureaucracy, and focusing particular fire on that alleged godsend from Washington, Federal aid.

The Governors pointed out that "the Federal share of total taxes collected equals 70 percent," that States and localities are pressed for revenues, and that the Great Society proposes to increase both the Federal take and the strain on local governments. The resolution states:

"The latest Federal budget lists approximately 85 local grants-in-aid activities and as a consequence these programs are beginning to exceed the level of manageability.

"The dollar value of grants-in-aid programs has increased from $3.1 billion a decade ago to approximately $10.6 billion this year, and

the continued growth of such programs makes State and local governments even more dependent upon the Federal Government.

"Such programs often force the States to send tax moneys excessively to certain areas in order to match the allocation of Federal funds."

To avoid this cycle of increasing Federal power and decreasing State vitality the Governors urge a program of tax credits, releasing revenue to the States outright without Federal interference with their use. The resolution notes politely that this step is urged by "certain economic advisers of the present administration." It might also have noted that it is the approach recommended last fall by Barry Goldwater, for which he was roundly condemned by liberal politicians and publicists.

Whoever recommends it, the idea is a good one, since it would simultaneously impose a check on Federal expansion, restore vigor to the States, and halt the advance of bureaucratic controls. Unfortunately, it is just that set of reasons which makes many planners in Washington opposed to this and all other "tax-credit" ideas. Although these spokesmen talk a great deal about "aid," their real concern is to establish Federal control, and they are hostile to any program which does not include that feature.

The alleged demands of the States for Federal assistance are often cited as reasons for Federal grant-in-aid programs. The Governors' resolution makes it clear the States do not like such programs, and do not like the dependence on Washington resulting from them. As with American farmers, discussed on this page recently, the asserted "demand" for Federal services is a fiction created by the bureaucrats themselves, to advance their program of increasing expenditure and intervention.

The Science of Oceanography

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the important new science of oceanography is coming more and more into its own each year. In the Congress, our colleague, the gentleman from California, Congressman BOB WILSON, is one of the most knowledgeable in this field. On March 10, he gave a very penetrating and thoughtful speech outlining the opportunities ahead in oceanography. He knows what is being done in this field by our Government and he has some highly constructive suggestions on how to improve what we are doing and to streamline the way we do it. He has introduced legislation which would carry out his ideas. I would like to include his recent remarks at this time:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN BOB WILSON, REPUBLICAN, OF CALIFORNIA, MEMBER, HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE, TO AIAA/USN MARINE SYSTEMS AND ASW CONFERENCE, MARCH 10, 1965

Ladies and gentlemen, needless to say, I'd rather be there enjoying San Diego's climate than here in Washington today. Being an enthusiastic chamber of commerce member I will bet 100 to 1 with the meteorologists present that the weather is better there than here.

Then, too, I would have thoroughly enjoyed welcoming each one of you personally to our dynamic growing area which has become a magnet for so many oceanographic and related scientific endeavors. It is fitting that many of you are identified with space activities, since San Diego, which developed the original Atlas booster and Mercury vehicles, has been vitally concerned with developments in outer space. And we likewise share a mutual interest in oceanography. The pioneering role of Scripps Institute of Oceanography and the expanded activities of the Naval Electronics Laboratory and other Federal agencies here become our credentials in this field. We accept with you the challenge of exploring and harnessing the power and benefits of the ocean and the unexplored lands beneath it.

It is fitting that many of the experts in the field of outer space are now turning their eyes from the distant stars to the oceans lapping at their feet. The unexplored depths of the sea have become known as inner space and to my notion that is a fitting name if for no other reason than it can help to explain the parallel problems that pertain to both areas.

In less than 10 years, man's experience has progressed in outer space from a simple grapefruit-sized satellite to actual manned space travel plus television surface contact with the Moon and the imminent closeup views of Mars.

There can be no question that progress in space has stemmed primarily from a concentration of interest by the Federal Government, which replaced a proliferation of interest both governmental and private. For my part I believe the vast potential of inner space holds so much more promise and potential than a trip to the stars that I am impatient to eliminate governmental diffusion. It is time to coordinate and channel the resources of the Federal Government into a program that will turn the plans and dreams of many of you into realities.

There is no question in my mind that the creation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration under the Eisenhower administration—October 1, 1958—is the benchmark from which progress in outer space will always be measured. I believe it is time for the formation of a similar agency concentrating in the area of inner space.

I have introduced legislation again this year, similar to my original bill of last year, which calls for the formation of a National Oceanographic Agency. Under the peculiar techniques of nomenclature this would be known as NOA, an illiteration no self-respecting seadog could object to. NOA is needed if we are to realize the dramatic potential of oceanography.

As did its sister agency, NASA, the new NOA would absorb related functions from many different agencies of the Federal Government and give them a definition of purpose and concentration of programs that would produce far more progress for every dollar invested.

As a politician, let me give you some of the political reasons why oceanography has lagged on the national scene. Most departments and agencies of Government today look to Capitol Hill for specific sponsorship of their roles and missions. Committees of Congress are given the responsibility of overseeing the activities of these departments and agencies. For example, the Defense Department looks to the Armed Services Committee for guidance and legislative championing. The Commerce Department must gain the approval and, in fact, the support of the Commerce Committees. In most cases, the committee members become expert in these specific areas of interest and in doing so become champions of that particular cause.

Yet, poor little oceanography with its program parceled out among 22 different bureaus, including 9 departments or agencies, is truly an orphan with little chance to grow to meaningful maturity. Space exploration would have suffered the same fate had not it been for the formation of NASA, plus a new committee in Congress with primary jurisdiction over NASA's activities. With a champion on the Hill, you can be sure the cause of oceanography would advance more quickly, with more meaningful results.

Now I recognize that opposition to such a concept is politically inevitable. In the first place, many of the oceanographic activities in various bureaus, agencies, and departments have their own advocates within such units and resistance to change out of fear of the unknown is inevitable and even understandable.

NASA faced the same problem during its days of incubation. The military departments, for example, loudly protested the loss of some of their more exciting projects to a new nonmilitary agency. Other boards and committees threw roadblocks in the way but reason finally prevailed and NASA became a reality with attendant results.

We can expect and, in fact, are already experiencing doubts and verbal roadblocks to the formation of NOA. Yet, I submit that those who fear the unknown prospect of giving up oceanographic activities and prerogatives within a given agency are being provincial in their outlook. Such fears are for the most part unfounded. There is no intention to remove from the Navy Department, for example, those oceanographic activities that directly relate to military needs. There is no doubt in my mind that on the contrary the Navy will find that a combined agency will accomplish more in her behalf in military developments than she could, going it alone. Many programs that are integral within existing agencies would not be carved out of that agency, at least in most instances. For example, Navy, Air Force, and even Army still continue space research, although at a reduced level, despite NASA's prime role in this area.

Unfortunately, one of the major roadblocks to the adoption of a new agency is the matter of committee jurisdiction. The committees in Congress would likely be hesitant to approve by themselves the diminution of their authority in the field of oceanography. Frankly, I expect the creation of this new Agency to be bogged down in a legislative morass unless a clear-cut directive from the White House gives the proposal the solid footing it needs.

As a matter of fact, I am convinced that action in the field of oceanography leading to the formation of a new agency hinges to a great extent on Presidential sponsorship. The new Agency would be a creature of the executive branch of the Government, therefore, the Chief Executive must be the enthusiastic sponsor of a deparmental reorganization plan involving oceanography. This does not mean the creation of a new Cabinet post, but it does mean a reshuffling of overlapping authority in this vital field if we are to have the necessary progress.

It is incredible to me that such an agency has not been in effect for years. There can be no question that the potential benefit to mankind far exceeds the probable benefit from space exploration. This is not to downgrade the exploration of outer space. I enthusiastically support research projects in this area, but the benefit to mankind in terms of material wealth harvested from the sea and the ocean floor makes Federal participation on a grand scale in this area a sound business proposition.

Perhaps this sounds like strange philosophy from a member of a political party that advocates less Federal action in most fields of human endeavor and more reliance on State and local governments. There is nothing incongruous about my position on this. In fact, it jibes very well with the

classic interpretation of constitutional rights.

Clearly, the seas around our borders are a Federal possession, a Federal responsibility, and a Federal opportunity. Even the most conservative constitutionalists can fully support an all-out federally sponsored oceanographic program. This is not to say, of course, that industry or States or communities should not be encouraged to make their contribution to progress also. It is a big ocean and Uncle Sam should be the first to say "Come on in, the water's fine."

Federal participation in oceanography is heightened by the implications of modern military science. Control of the seas has always been a classic goal of the leading nations of the world. Up to recent times, this has meant control of the sealanes for surface ocean traffic.

All of us know now that the new dimension of depth has compounded the military problem and made so-called control of the sea ever so much more difficult Competition among nations in this area has, frankly, been the greatest prod that oceanography has had in its lifetime. Much of the remarkable progress made in recent years must be laid directly at the door of the Navy and to a lesser degree the other military departments. Expenditures for deep submergence research, sonar, and ocean floor mapping have had a distinct military significance. The Honorable Robert W. Morse, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research and Development, announced to Congress yesterday that the Navy's oceanographic program has increased 9 percent in the past year, and a request for $129 million is included in the new Navy budget for 1966.

This is a healthy sum of money. Why, then, my interest in making a nonmilitary agency the chief advocate of an oceanographic program. For one reason, the orphan, oceanography has grown out of his adolescence and is ready for long pants. The military must, of course, continue to have a dominant role and interest in oceanography just as it has in space activities. We must not, however, fence off the oceans to give them the status of a battlefield for this would deny to our people the maximum beneficial use of this enormous asset.

Right now I give full credit to the Department of Defense for its recognition of the need for coordination in this field. The Inter-Agency Oceanographic Committee, originated under the experienced and capable hands of Dr. Wakelin, and sparkplugged by Comdr. Bob Abel, has achieved remarkable results in tying together a lot of loose ends and eliminating at least some duplication of effort in this field. I must give credit to Adm. Denys Knoll, Chief Oceanographer of the Navy, and his predecessor Adm. Ed Stephan, who despite their military leanings and the mission of their office, have had the good sense to recognize and foster nonmilitary potentials as they developed under their military programs.

Industry is awakening to the profit potential of oceanography and this is one of the healthiest and most encouraging signs of real maturity. When science, through its laboratory experiments and computations, develops processes and products that have a profit potential, all mankind becomes the beneficiary in one degree or another. I recognize that the interest of many defense industries is excited and spurred on by the prospect of additional Federal funds, but I am not critical of the interest. As a member of the Armed Services Committee of Congress I have seen many military-developed sinews of war become the muscles of commerce. Who can forget that the 707 or DC–8, that brought many of you to San Diego would still be in the dreams or on the drawing board of engineers and scientists had it not been for military necessity. Who can doubt that the military oceanographic programs of today will lead to a better life for future generations?

Getting back to the problems of arousing effective political interest and action in oceanography, I would like to point out to you that great interest has been shown in recent years by Members of Congress. In the 88th Congress, which concluded last December, over 50 bills were introduced to benefit the oceanographic program. Admittedly, most of them died aborning, but the fact that so many were introduced is a sign that progress is being made. If you will pardon an alliteration: With so many "political eggs" being spawned, at least a few are bound to make it back to the open sea. The efforts of Senator MAGNUSON and my colleagues, Congressmen HERBERT BONNER, of North Carolina, and ALTON LENNON, of North Carolina, HASTINGS KEITH of Massachusetts, TOM PELLY, of Washington, and especially GEORGE P. MILLER, of California, and WILLIAM MAILLIARD, of California, deserve your enthusastic appreciation and support.

If you will allow me now to move from the political into the educational arena, I would like to make an obvious point regarding the importance of increased educational activity in this field.

It is amazing how few universities offer programs leading to degrees in ocean sciences or ocean engineering. I venture to say more courses in restaurant management or stage designing are offered to our young people. There can be no doubt that more textbooks have been printed on finger painting than oceanography. This is hard to comprehend, because no field could offer young people the exciting prospects of exploration, danger, sportsmanship, recreation, and remuneration as does oceanography.

James Webb, the Administrator of NASA, has taken a bold step in advocating grants of $25 million for predoctoral training in space research. Over 185 universities are working on NASA-sponsored research projects. An estimated 3,000 graduate students will be engaged in research and advanced training in space sciences this year. What a contrast with our own field of interest.

You and I have reason to be concerned about the unrealized potential of oceanography and the importance of a concentration of effort in this field if we are to make significant progress.

In conclusion, let me tell you today that I am optimistic for increased Federal recognition of your problem and a vastly expanded Federal interest and acceptance of responsibility. I would be less than human if I did not tell you that I am envious of your prospects for the future in this exciting and rewarding endeavor. Were it not for the 2-year contract which I recently received from the electorate, I might be tempted to join you. In lieu of this, I assure you of my continuing interest and emphatic support of your chosen profession.

Who knows, if my contract is not renewed, I may be knocking at your door for a job on the ocean bottom.

Voting Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to note that the City Council of Indianapolis, Ind., has seen fit to endorse the proposals by President Lyndon Johnson aimed at guaranteeing to all citizens their constitutional right to vote. Accordingly, I place in the RECORD at this point the text of a resolution passed unanimously by the council on March 15, 1965. Signed copies, bearing the official seal of the city of Indianapolis, have been sent to President Johnson, Senator VANCE HARTKE, Senator BIRCH BAYH, and myself.

The resolution follows:

"RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

"Whereas it has come to the attention of the citizens of the city of Indianapolis that Negro American citizens, in striving to gain their rights to register and vote, in the city of Selma, Ala., have been denied the right to peaceably aassemble to petition their government for redress of grievances, and their right to register and vote, and that violence has erupted in their attempts to further said rights; and

"Whereas President Lyndon Baines Johnson has indicated to the citizens of the United States his firm resolve for Federal action to guarantee the right of Negroes or of any other citizens, who seek to redress their grievances, to peaceably assemble, and the further guarantee of all citizens' rights to register and vote in the election of public officials, and said President Lyndon B. Johnson has indicated that legislation will be proposed to Congress to guarantee said rights, promptly and effectively: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Indianapolis, Ind.*, That the Common Council of the City of Indianapolis, on behalf of the citizens of this city, does hereby support the proposals of President Johnson for prompt and effective Federal action to safeguard the lives of all persons who seek to register and vote, and to guarantee to these persons their right to register and vote, and that the common council instruct the city clerk of the city of Indianapolis to forward a copy of this resolution to President Lyndon B. Johnson, Senator R. VANCE HARTKE, Senator BIRCH BAYH, and Congressman ANDREW JACOBS, JR."

Adopted by the Common Council of the City of Indianapolis this 15th day of March 1965.

Joseph C. Wallace, President; Max E. Brydenthal, Rev. James Cummings, Albert O. Deluse, Harold J. Egenes, Thomas C. Hasbrook, Rufus C. Kuykendall, R. Thomas McGill, Daniel P. Moriarty, Members.

Attest:

ANGELINE ALLSTATT,
City Clerk.

M. MAY SEAY,
Deputy City Clerk.

And the mayor of the city of Indianapolis, Ind., joins with the common council in the above and foregoing special resolution.

JOHN J. BARTON,
Mayor.

Textiles and Two-Price Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from my hometown newspaper, the Index-Journal on April 2 is excellent and timely in every respect. This splendid editorial points out the need to eliminate forever two-price

cotton. I commend this editorial to the attention of every Member of the Congress and to the people of the country:

TEXTILES AND TWO-PRICE COTTON

Much textile history—past and future—is contained in this simple statement by William E. Reid at the recent meeting of the American Textile Manufacturers Institute:

"We have one-price cotton, and it must be retained."

He had reference to the Agricultural Act of 1964, whose intent is that "upland cotton produced in the United States shall be made available for domestic use at a price which is not in excess of the price at which such cotton is made available for export."

With these words the two-price cotton system was ended, at least until July 31, 1966. They represent victory in a great struggle going back a decade or more and reaching into the highest levels of government. Now, as Mr. Reid said, the industry seeks to retain the one-price system in some form that will allow American textile plants to buy American cotton at no more than the rest of the world must pay for it.

The complicated situation goes back to the price support programs begun in the great depression of the 1930's. It began restricting the textile industry with congressional legislation in 1939 forbidding American mills from purchasing foreign cotton except in minute quantities.

It became acute in 1956 when an export subsidy was provided to keep artificially-supported American cotton from losing its world market. This subsidy represented the difference between the American support price and the world market price. It varied some, but was set at 8½ cents a pound in 1961 and remained at that level until last year.

It was this subsidy which created what became known as the two-price system, one price for the world market and another price 8½ cents a pound higher for American mills. This means that an American textile manufacturer had to pay $42.50 more for a 500-pound bale of American cotton than his foreign competitor had to pay.

Since raw cotton accounts for better than half the cost of producing a yard of typical cotton cloth, the effect of this is obvious.

The two-price system came at a particularly bad time for the American textile industry. Modern textile plants had been built by the U.S. Government following World War II to replace those destroyed by our Armed Forces during the war in such countries as Japan and Germany. These new plants poured a great flood of textiles into the world market as the pent-up need created by the war was becoming an oversupply. Add to this the much cheaper labor available to those countries, and the situation became critical for the American industry.

It would take a book—and a big one at that—to recount the paths the American textile industry followed seeking relief. Some success was won in voluntary quota agreements with such countries as Japan, but as one country's imports leveled off those from another area such as Hong Kong started up.

The chief concern was over the two-price cotton system, however. There were four possible remedies:

1. Eliminate the price-support program.

2. Eliminate the export subsidy.

3. Place an offsetting fee to equal the 8½ cents a pound of the export subsidy on the cotton content of textile goods imported into this country.

4. Provide an equalization fee on cotton used by the American manufacturer, enabling him to purchase American cotton at what, in effect, would be the world price.

Method one and two would have meant immediate ruin to the approximately 600,000 small and often marginal farmers among the 800,000 American cotton producers. Nobody thought Congress would do either, and no serious effort was made to have this done.

A tremendous effort, lasting for years, was made to get an import fee on the cotton content of imported textile goods.

The Tariff Commission has the authority to effect this if, under section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, the Secretary of Agriculture presents evidence in support of his findings that cotton textile imports are having an adverse effect on Government cotton programs. It should be noted that the findings must be that the Government cotton program is adversely affected, not that the textile industry is being crippled.

The Secretaries of Agriculture under Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy made such reports of findings, but in both instances the Tariff Commission denied the request.

All administrative paths thus being closed, there was but one approach left—to seek congressional approval for an equalization payment to offset the export fee. The American textile industry has historically opposed such legislation, and it sought it then only as a last recourse to eliminate the intolerable two-price system as fundamental to the cold realities of the current situation.

President Kennedy, calling textile problems "serious and deeprooted," sought administrative relief. That failing, he sought legislation, commenting, "The inequity of the two-price system of cotton costs remains as a unique burden upon the American textile industry, for which a solution must be found in the near future." Johnson continued that support.

Luther Hodges, then Secretary of Commerce and a former textile executive, said "Our Government is actually destroying a basic industry essential to our economy and national defense."

Mountainous accumulations of statistics support this position.

Hearings were begun in 1962 on a one-price cotton bill, and it was passed April 8, 1964. It provides certificates for cotton held by the Commodity Credit Corporation equal to the amount of the export subsidy. The certificates can be issued anywhere along the line of handling, except to the producer, for cotton used in this country.

The law runs until July 31, 1966. New legislation will be necessary if it it so be continued, but the form it will take has not yet become clear. There is some support for a direct payment to the producer, which would eliminate subsequent subsidies and payments.

The textile industry has resented, and rightly so, the implication that it is being paid a subsidy when it buys American cotton at the same price it is sold to foreign competitors. The two-price cotton system was not of its making, but grew out of the cotton price-support program, which grew into the prohibition of purchases of foreign-grown cotton, which grew into the export subsidy.

It wants neither to be favored nor discriminated against.

The long period of uncertainty between the proposal of legislation and its enactment was a trying one for the industry, since no provision was made for an equalization fee on cotton held in the form of manufactured goods. There could be another such period if legislation to continue the one-price system, in whatever form it takes, is delayed too long.

Voting Law Could Create Problems in Apache County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1965

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, anyone who does not believe that the Johnson administration's proposed voting rights legislation poses serious corrolary problems should read the following article from the Phoenix, Ariz., Gazette of April 1, 1965.

The article follows:

VOTING LAW COULD CREATE PROBLEMS IN APACHE COUNTY

Imagine—

A government wherein officials who set rates and levy taxes are themselves exempt from taxation.

Those who have power to establish laws and regulations are immune to the laws.

A near-totalitarian government in some foreign lands? Actually, under certain conditions, it could be Apache County, Ariz., if the Voting Rights Act of 1965 becomes a law and if its provisions are applied to Apache County.

U.S. Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach has said the law will apply to Apache County because: (1) Arizona has a "test or device" as a prerequisite for voting; and (2) less than 50 percent of persons of voting age residing in the county were registered on November 1, 1964.

Apache County has an estimated population of 36,000 and about 25,000 are Indians; with the Navajo and Apache reservations and the Apache National Forest comprising almost 75 percent of the total area of the county. Therein lies the cause for concern among some Apache County residents.

County Attorney Richard Greer explained:

If all Indians of voting age were registered, regardless of whether they could read or write, and if these Indians voted in a bloc, the Indians could outvote others in the county about 2½ to 1.

Supervisor districts are located in such a manner that the Indians could elect two of three supervisors, and thus control the board. This majority could set the tax rate at any figure desired, with the knowledge that the Indians live on Federal reservations and therefore pay no State, county, school or city taxes. The tax, set by the Indian majority, would then apply only to non-Indians.

The Indians could elect a Navajo sheriff, for example, who wouldn't have jurisdiction over a single Navajo; they could elect a Navajo lawyer as county attorney, and he would have no criminal jurisdiction over the Navajos.

Greer calls this "representation without taxation." He added:

"By voting in a bloc, the Indians could control Apache County. They could set a tax rate so high as to ruin businessmen and ranchers, discourage business expansion and actually drive population away from the county."

A State official agreed with Greer, and he told the Gazette:

"This actually could kill Apache County."

Greer continued:

"Let's consider what might happen if Federal registrars come in and register Indians left and right without too close a check on even basic requirements.

"First, if there is an obvious case of vote fraud on the reservation, say someone voted twice, I couldn't prosecute the offender. The State of Arizona and its courts have no criminal jurisdiction on the reservation.

"Second, how could residence requirements ever be checked? Even many of the Navajos in the four-corners area don't know whether they live in Arizona, Utah, or New Mexico. And we couldn't go on the reservation to check without permission of tribal leaders.

"The laws must be changed to apply the same measure of laws for Indians as for non-Indians.

"I know of no one here who is opposed to the registration of Indians, or to Indians voting, but the Indians should be qualified under State law just like the residents of any other county."

It is estimated there are about 18,000 residents of voting age in Apache County, about 13,000 Indians and 5,000 non-Indians. The 1964 registration was 4,697 and it is estimated that 1,800 of this total were Indians. The 1964 presidential vote was 2,042 for Johnson and 1,849 for Goldwater.

Chief problem in registration has been the vast distances between villages on the sprawling Navajo Reservation, which takes up almost all the area north of U.S. 66 in Apache County. In places, Navajos would have to travel 80 to 129 miles in order to register.

Mrs. Virgie Heap, county recorder, has said she has not sent more deputy registrars to the reservation because of the conflict between State and Federal laws. She actually would have no authority over registrars on the reservation, but would be responsible for their actions, it was noted.

Under provisions of the Voting Rights Act, the Federal Government could send Federal registrars into Apache County to register voters. The State's literacy test could not be applied, under this Federal law, and there would be no requirement other than age and residence for registration.

A Difference in Emphasis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, John A. Penello, regional director of the National Labor Relations Board in Baltimore, recently rendered a decision which graphically illustrates the use and abuse of propaganda with racial overtones in a dispute between an employer and a union attempting to organize his employees.

Mr. Penello's decision overriding the objections of the employer was rendered on September 9, 1964, and the union was certified as the employees' representative by the National Labor Relations Board on January 8, 1965.

The following article on the matter appeared in the Washington Afro-American on February 16, 1965, and I commend it to the attention of our colleagues:

FROM THE WORKBENCH

(By Clarence Mitchell)

APPLAUSE FOR MR. PENELLO

A recent decision of the National Labor Relations Board in the laundry industry presents an interesting treatment of what happens in a labor dispute when civil rights questions arise.

Usually, civil rights problems arise because employers try to prevent their employees from joining a union by saying that this will lead to social equality. One of the earliest examples was a case in which circulars were distributed saying, "If you want a n - - - r for a boss, vote for the CIO and get him."

Another famous example was the picture of President James B. Carey, of the IUE–CIO, dancing with a beautiful lady. The lady was an African and the dancing occurred at an international affair in Europe. This picture was given front-page publicity in Mississippi for the purpose of killing an organizing drive that was in progress at the time.

USE OF DOG PHOTO PROTESTED

The laundry case involves use of racial matters by employees and their supporters. The employer charged that the union seeking to organize the workers used signs showing dogs with bared fangs, placards showing police brutality, and a fire hydrant and hose beside a fat, bald man with a club and money bag couldn't stop us and neither can hoses stop us, and neither can the boss.

The employer charged that this was a deliberate and sustained effort to exacerbate and inflame racial emotions, "thereby preventing the attainment of the high election standards which the [National Labor Relations] Board has for so long demanded."

The opinion of John A. Penello, regional director of the NLRB, was the basis for the National Board's decision. Mr. Penello's opinion contained these comments:

"There is a vital difference between the basic themes of these two campaigns. In each, the idea that unions support racial integration and equality was hammered home, yet the purpose of such emphasis was different.

"LITERATURE DESIGNED TO INFLAME

"The campaign literature distributed by the employer * * * was designed solely to inflame racial hatred and to engender a conflict between colored and white workers in a southern plant.

"The employer attempted to take advantage of the latent prejudices of his white workers by equating unionism with integrated working conditions, knowing that such conditions would be distasteful to the white workers.

"A picture of a white union leader dancing with a colored woman implied that unionism would bring in its wake social and physical race mixing."

Speaking of the laundry case, Mr. Penello pointed out that the basic theme of the literature was that colored persons had banded together to overcome their de facto inferiority in American society. The action was described as:

"Unionism, according to the theme of the campaign, is another method of concerted action which colored persons may use to better their lot in society. Thus, a distinction must be drawn between racial propaganda designed to inflame racial hatred and set the tone of a union campaign as a battle of one race against another and racial propaganda designed to encourage racial pride and concerted action."

CONSCIENCE HAS BEEN STIRRED

This case shows how deeply the national conscience has been stirred by efforts to promote civil rights. The entire opinion written by Mr. Penello shows a grasp of the subtle differences between using racial themes to promote discord and using illustrations of how other oppressed people freed themselves for the purpose of instilling courage and determination among those seeking better conditions for themselves and their fellows.

A few years ago it is entirely possible that this case would have been decided against the employees. The person making the decision would have been unable to see where there was any difference between an employer showing an interracial couple dancing and a labor union showing dogs attacking civil rights workers.

Mr. Penello is to be congratulated for his decision, but the advocates of civil rights must remember that even now there are not very many government officials like him. It may well be that more person-to-person talks will make it possible to reduce the number of themes used on signs.

It is also important to continue to stress the fact that the civil rights struggle is interracial. No one could suggest that a sign showing colored and white pickets being carried off to jail together in Mississippi was designed to inflame race hate.

How the Handicapped Are Overcoming Barriers to Employment in My Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HANSEN
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, a young constituent of mine, Miss Marybeth Meffert, a senior at Boise High School, will be in Washington the latter part of this month to attend the annual meeting of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped. Miss Meffert won this trip to Washington by taking first place in the Idaho 1965 Ability Counts Contest with her essay with the above caption.

We, in Idaho, are very proud of Marybeth and her achievement. We are also proud of the other young people who competed for the award she has won. There can be, unfortunately, just one State winner in Idaho in this contest; but the real winners are those about whom these young people wrote—the handicapped. Through Marybeth's and other essays on this topic, a wider understanding is gained about the handicapped and the very real contribution they can, and do, make to our society.

It is with great anticipation that I am looking forward to meeting Marybeth when she arrives in Washington.

Her prize-winning essay follows:

HOW THE HANDICAPPED ARE OVERCOMING BARRIERS TO EMPLOYMENT IN MY COMMUNITY

(By Marybeth Meffert, Boise High School)

Not many years ago, the handicapped were seldom seen working competitively with the able bodied. They were isolated, kept away from social contacts, and rejected by society. Employers did not know how to measure the potentials of a handicapped person, and unfortunately they often drew their own conclusions, based on ignorance and prejudice—negative ones.

The handicapped themselves deserve all the laurels for breaking through the barrier of misconceptions and the biased opinions of the ignorant. It was not easy. It took the courage and determination of individuals who refused to give up; who said, "I will," when society said, "You can't." Often through sheer will power alone, severely disabled persons proved to society that they could take their place in the community as valuable and self-reliant citizens.

Any handicapped person should be able to be employed if he is given the necessary training and proper job placement. Proper job placement is especially important when considered from the viewpoint that anyone, even an able-bodied person, is handicapped if he is placed in a job situation for which he is not equipped. A disabled person should not be considered handicapped in respect to his job if he is capable of doing the work.

Here in Idaho, Live, Inc., has placed approximately 40 handicapped persons per year on the competitive labor market since 1949. Given the chance that time, training, and proper job placement afforded, these individuals have proved themselves to be competent and resourceful.

This year, 13 blind students are attending Idaho colleges. Their textbooks are records with the labels printed in braille. These young people have amazed their fellow students and the members of the faculty with their self-sufficiency. They have also earned the admiration of their school, their community, and their State. They are young men and women who, in spite of their handicap, are learning to take their place in the world of tomorrow.

Handicapped persons are at more of a disadvantage in States such as Idaho than in areas where there is a great deal of manufacturing. Being made up mostly of rural communities, Idaho has little industry, which has often proved to be a source of employment for the handicapped. In communities such as ours an imaginative approach must often be used to find work for a disabled person.

But there are jobs, and for each of these jobs there is a handicapped person who can successfully fill the position. A blind, partially deaf man skillfully handweaves rugs, though his eyes will never see their beauty. A woman who cannot stand because of an orthopedic hip ailment sits, and her fingers fashion lovely wind chimes. A man in a wheelchair sits in the courthouse, administering driver's license tests. A rodeo rider proves to be tough competition in the calf-roping event, despite his two artificial legs. It was not easy for these people, nor is it easy for the other handicapped like them who are striving for independence though they are disabled. These individuals are living testimonies to the fact that handicapped people can lead useful, productive lives.

Once employers would not hire the disabled because it disturbed them to have a handicapped person around. Handicapped individuals who have proved their capabilities deserve the credit for changing employers' opinions. Now the nearly unanimous viewpoint of employers is: "I do not object to hiring the handicapped if they can do the work."

Employers who give the handicapped a chance to prove themselves are seldom sorry. Statistics show that the handicapped make the most reliable employees, having less absenteeism than others.[1]

Because of the fine examples set by handicapped workers, the barrier of employer prejudice is quickly melting away. In this way disabled persons are helping society to overcome its handicap—crippling prejudice and blinding misconceptions.

Yet there is more to be done. Here in Idaho there is a waiting list of handicapped people who need jobs. There are inadequate funds to meet the needs of the State in giving these people the training they need and seeing that they obtain suitable jobs. Progress has been made, but it is not enough. Obstacles have crumbled and fallen away, but there loom more barriers ahead that are yet to be overcome. Judging by the past record of the handicapped in my community, I feel sure they will remain dauntless and undefeated no matter how formidable those barriers may be.

[1] Wishik, Samuel M., M.D., "How To Help Your Handicapped Child," Public Affairs Pamphlet No. 219, p. 23.

Fourteen Lost in Transit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, contrary to reports of Washington, D.C., newspapers, California growers have been and are making extraordinary efforts to recruit farm labor—from all over the country.

They recruit and advertise in almost every State within the continental limits. Every State employment agency has been requested to refer any available worker to California. The Departments of Labor, Agriculture, and others have been trying desperately to recruit and force all governmental agencies to recruit to prove their theory "that those big city people, unemployed from factories and processing plants, and drawing regular generous unemployment compensation, will move to California to work on farms for 3 or 4 months each year during harvest seasons."

The following is an accurate account of a recent recruiting effort. The account is from the Salinas Californian newspaper, March 31, 1965. The results of this extraordinary recruitment effort are typical.

By this time, most of these recruits have probably quit the farmwork and are competing for jobs against local domestic restaurant workers and common laborers:

[From the Salinas (Calif.) Californian, Mar. 31, 1965]

FOURTEEN LOST IN TRANSIT: MIDWEST FARM RECRUITS ON JOB

Seventy-four out of 118 field workers recruited by Growers Farm Labor Association of Salinas east of the Mississippi River last week are on the job in the valley's fields today.

The men were recruited in the St. Louis, Springfield, and Joplin areas of Missouri and around Kansas City, Kans. All were unemployed when recruited. Most said that they were, or had been, farmworkers.

When the three buses bringing the men West arrived in Salinas over the weekend, 104 men were aboard. Fourteen had been lost in transit. What happened to the 30 who apparently didn't go to work after arriving in town is anyone's guess.

The new farmworkers, in groups ranging in size from 5 to 15, are currently employed by California Coastal Farms, Jack T. Baillie Co., Salinas Marketing Cooperative, Bruce Church, Inc., Harden Farms, and Merrill Farms. Most of them are thinning lettuce. Some are harvesting asparagus and cauliflower or transplanting celery. They are residing in labor camps in the Salinas and Gonzales areas.

Cost of transporting the men to Salinas and feeding them en route, according to the association, was $52.60 each. The men are expected to pay back their fares in weekly installments.

Interstate recruitment is one of the criteria set forth by the Labor Department that growers must meet in order to remain eligible for the use of foreign supplemental farmworkers under Public Law 414.

Another criterion is the payment of a minimum wage of $1.40 per hour effective April 1.

Local growers have not yet officially announced whether they'll start paying $1.40 Thursday. And Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz, who toured the valley last week, hasn't announced what disposition he has decided to make of the local request for 5,100 foreign supplemental workers through April 30.

One major lettuce grower-shipper, Bud Antle, Inc., recently announced that it is going to use an all-domestic work force and not push for workers under Public Law 414.

Jack Bias, executive vice president of the Grower-Shipper Vegetable Association and E. J. Raffetto, president of the California-Arizona Farm Labor Association, are reportedly conferring with Labor Department officials in Washington, D.C., today about the minimum wage requirement. Bias last week asked Wirtz to delay imposition of the $1.40 minimum wage.

Racing to the Moon: If We Do Not Win, Things May Be Rough for Us Here on Earth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 9, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of our outstanding success with the Ranger and Gemini programs in NASA, it is important to note with sober outlook the importance of our space program to our national security. Mr. Roscoe Drummond has aptly described the seriousness of our space effort in his Washington Post article of March 28, 1965. The essential points which Mr. Drummond makes, bear reiteration to the American public for our race to the moon is certainly not a scientific stunt but a serious step-by-step program to establish and maintain our country's preeminence and security in this new environment:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 28, 1965]

RACING TO THE MOON: IF WE DON'T WIN, THINGS MAY BE ROUGH FOR US HERE ON EARTH

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The race to the moon continues and, whether we relish it or not, the United States is in it to the end.

The outcome is not in sight, but Gemini's magnificent, two-astronaut performance, plus Ranger's precise lunar photography, show that after our tardy start we are on the way.

We are still behind the Russians, for a bad reason; we failed to grasp the worldwide psychological impact of outer space exploration.

We did not even grasp it in 1957 when the great Soviet first, Sputnik I, went into orbit. We failed to realize that at stake was the reputation of American science, the genius of American industry and the capac-

ity of our free institutions to seize and respond to the challenge.

Instead, too many in high places poohpoohed it. One of the most influential officials remarked while millions of people listened to Sputnik's signals: "How ridiculous. Nothing more than tossing a basketball into the air."

Not that nothing was being done, but for the most part it was business as usual, science as usual; nothing urgent, nothing galvanic—and the Soviets raced on. We did not get really moving until 1961 when Congress made a lunar landing in this decade a national objective.

We are catching up. We may be nearer to even in the race than we think. Our timetable is public. Theirs is secret—though we know a good deal about it.

Our handicap has been the tardy development of powerful rockets. Twice as much rocket thrust lifted Voshkod as put Gemini into space. It will be 1967 before the mighty 1.6-million-pound thrust of Saturn will be ready to put the three-man Apollo into orbit.

But the maneuverability of Gemini III was a first. It had abilities its Soviet equivalent didn't. It changed its altitude—the shape and direction of its orbit; essential to achieving a rendezvous in space.

Naturally we want to win the race to the moon. But that is not the end in itself. The essential thing is to achieve preeminence for the United States in the mastery of outer space.

It was preeminence on the seas which gave Britain its ascendancy for a hundred years. It was Allied preeminence in the air which guaranteed victory in World War II.

If we concede preeminence to the Russians on the way to other planets, we will be conceding it to them on this planet.

If we do, our problem will be survival under the worst of all conditions because mastery of outer space is an essential condition to preserving freedom on earth.

Our goal is not to deny the highways of outer space to any other nation. It is to make sure that no nation can deny those highways to us.

Internal Revenue Service Should Request Authority To Waive Interest on Underwithholding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, Internal Revenue Service Commissioner Sheldon S. Cohen is to be congratulated for the statement promising sympathetic considerationl for those taxpayers suffering hardship in paying balances of 1964 income taxes because of underwithholding last year. The announcement would seem to concur with the concept of H.R. 4659, which I introduced in February to permit taxpayers owing balances because of underwithholding to spread payments over the coming 12 months without penalty.

Mr. Cohen cannot waive interest on unpaid balances, inasmuch as Congress alone has authority in this matter. I believe, however, that a request from Mr. Cohen would stimulate the Ways and Means Committee and both Houses to enact the necessary legislation before the April 15 deadline, and I am hoping that he will choose to make a request of this nature without delay.

My view is that the Federal Government was needlessly lax in failing to give proper notice that payroll deductions might not cover total tax bills as a consequence of the change in tax rates during the 1964 calendar year. Since introducing H.R. 4659 I have been informed by a number of employees right here on Capitol Hill that they were shocked in making up their tax returns to learn that deductions had fallen far short and that they are now faced with an indebtedness of serious proportions. If our own congressional staff members were ignorant of what was taking place, how in the world should we expect people back in our home districts to be aware of the situation?

I have seen a number of advertisements by banking and lending institutions offering to make money available—at regular interest rates—for taxpayers who need to catch up on their IRS bills before April 15. While it may be gratifying to stockholders of these business houses to experience increased activity in the loan departments, there is no justifiable reason why the Federal Government should allow its own negligence to create a minor boom of this kind.

Until Mr. Cohen made is announcement, there was a very serious question in regard to those who are not in position to negotiate bank loans. His lenience has apparently solved that problem, yet there still remains the matter of whether it is in propriety for the Federal Government to charge interest on the befuddled taxpayer who through no fault of his own will be in arrears with IRS beginning April 15. Mr. Cohen's approach would seem to answer in the negative. I hope that he will support this inclination with a request for a waiver of interest, and I trust that Congress will act with all haste to preclude the inequity that is at present in making.

Retirement of Maj. Gen. James L. Snyder

SPEECH

OF

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, on March 31, 1965, Maj. Gen. James L. Snyder, the commanding general of Brooke Army Medical Center, retired from the U.S. Army after more than 32 years of service. At a retirement ceremony culminating his brilliant career, General Snyder was honored as more than 2,000 troops from units of the medical center and Fort Sam Houston passed in review.

Born at Medora, N. Dak., General Snyder was graduated from high school at Ashton, Idaho. He attended the University of Washington and received his B.S. and M.S. degrees from the University of Washington. He received his medical degree at the George Washington University School of Medicine in Washington, D.C., in 1933, and entered the Army upon completion of his internship a year later.

While previously stationed at the Army Medical Service School, Fort Sam Houston, Tex., where most Army Medical Service personnel train at some time in their careers, General Snyder served as training officer, school secretary, director of the department of tactics, techniques, and logistics, and assistant commandant. He assumed the position of commandant of the Army Medical Service School on October 1, 1959, and in December of 1961 General Snyder became the commanding general of Brooke Army Medical Center.

One of the Army Medical Service's foremost authorities in field medicine and training, General Snyder, while commanding the medical center, directed a vast and complex program which covers nearly every phase of medical education, training, patient care, and research.

General Snyder started the first Army Medical Service officer candidate school in July 1941, and subsequently assisted in the rapid expansion of schools of the technical services and the officer candidate school system of the Army service forces in 1942.

While serving with the 1st U.S. Army in England preparing for the invasion of Europe, he set up demonstrations to prove the value of his theories on the simultaneous discharge of troops and the loading of casualties into landing vessels. He landed on D-day with the 1st Army and supervised the establishment of medical units and the evacuation of the wounded through the bitter fighting of France, Belgium, and Germany.

General Snyder has taken part in special studies of problems encountered by the Army Medical Service in both arctic and tropical regions. While in Europe from 1956 to 1959, he formulated the first area medical service concept which has proven to be so effective for the U.S. Army. He has been a leading proponent of preparedness for medical care in a disaster. This includes not only disaster training within the medical service, but he has also emphasized the urgent need for this type of training in medical schools through the medical education for national defense program and through his cooperation with local civil defense organizations.

Among his many decorations for valor and distinguished service are the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star Medal and the Croix de Guerre from France.

During his outstanding career, General Snyder has compiled a record of many achievements in the field of Army medicine and practice, for which we of this Nation are deeply grateful. General Snyder's retirement is the Army's loss, but I am proud to say that it is San Antonio's gain as General and Mrs. Snyder will continue to reside there.

Education and Labor Committee Should Review the Election Machinery of Labor Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, I stated publicly that I felt that Education and Labor Committee should review the election machinery of labor unions. I did this in light of the recent revelations by the U.S. Department of Labor of election result manipulations. These final results showed that Mr. Paul Jennings had defeated James B. Carey for the post of president of the International Union of Electrical Workers. This was a complete reversal of the result announced by the trustees of that union. Mr. Carey has just sent me a copy of his resignation, for which I ask permission to include in this statement.

Despite Mr. Carey's resignation, I still am of the belief that the Education and Labor Committee should review the election machinery of all labor unions.

The copy of the resignation follows:

STATEMENT BY PRESIDENT JAMES B. CAREY OF THE INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ELECTRICAL, RADIO AND MACHINE WORKERS AFL–CIO, APRIL 6, 1965

I have devoted my whole life to organizing and advancing the welfare of the workers of the electrical manufacturing industry. For 32 years I have given them the full measure of my energies, my skills and my devotion. Over these three decades the economic security, the dignity and the happiness of the men and women of our industry has transcended all else in importance. It is a matter of deep satisfaction that during these 32 years their economic, social and political progress has transformed the industry and the lives of the workers whose toil has turned its wheels and built its prosperity.

Circumstances of history made it necessary for us to organize the electrical industry not once but twice, and also to provide the leadership that routed for once and for all Communist influence in all mass production industries. I had the incomparable privilege of being part of that organizing leadership and the leadership that insured the future of democratic unionism in the United States.

In these campaigns and achievements I was profoundly fortunate in having as my associates many of the truly outstanding men and women of the modern American labor movement, people of heroic dedication and selflessness. My associations and friendships with these leaders of democratic unionism vastly enriched my life and work as I hope I may have contributed in some degree to them and to their labors in trade unionism.

What I have given to the industrial union movement has been amply repaid in the deep satisfaction I have found in the opportunity for service to trade unionism and the men and women of our industry.

For the past 15 years I have been honored with the presidency of the International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers AFL–CIO, a labor organization that we created literally out of nothingness and built into the greatest union of electrical manufacturing workers in the world. This has been an achievement that can never be minimized or sullied, and I shall always derive the deepest satisfaction from the role I was privileged to play in founding and leading the IUE.

A point has now come in the affairs of our union, however, that requires the establishment of a new unity and a new internal solidarity to insure the IUE's continued progress. We have witnesses with sorrow the growth of internal dissention and disagreement that threaten the IUE's future. At all costs the International Union's splendid promise must not be jeopardized.

The IUE as an instrument of service for the welfare and happiness of hundreds of thousands of men and women in our industry must not be injured or diminished.

I have often declared to our international executive board and to other bodies of the IUE that I would not hold any office which I did not hold by the clear-cut will of the men and women I serve.

Because of this and because of the interim report on the IUE's presidential referendum released yesterday by the U.S. Department of Labor I have come to the painful conclusion that I can best serve our beloved union's future, its unity, and solidarity, and its capacity for advancing the interests of all electrical workers by resigning from my position as president of the IUE. The interests of the International Union and its future are far greater than any individual or group of individuals.

I was completely surprised by the results of the recount, which I had no reason to expect.

The interim report states that the investigation is not complete and that it will be continued. Numerous questions have not been answered or resolved. In view of this I believe I would be fully justified in remaining in office and await a final resolution of these questions. However, I believe that I can best serve the unity, future growth, and effectiveness of the international union by offering my resignation to a meeting of the international executive board which will convene here tomorrow.

I will want, of course, always to be of service to the men and women of our industry and to the democratic labor movement which has been and which will continue to be so encompassing a part of my life.

My most fervent hope is that the executive board will provide the far-seeing leadership that will insure the IUE's continuing independence, autonomy, integrity, and internal democracy. My heart and my soul will be constantly with these leaders and members of the IUE as they move unitedly into the future, always working for the men and women of our industry and always looking forward.

Voting Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to join my colleagues in the introduction of a voting rights bill that, if enacted, will reflect sound progress, based upon uniform principles of law, in an area of paramount importance.

As I sat in this Chamber and listened to our President speak on this subject just a few weeks ago, I sensed that the Chief Executive was echoing the sentiments previously expressed by so many of us who had already registered strong support for legislative action to insure that the basic rights guaranteed the citizens of this Nation by our Constitution were not denied. When we passed the Civil Rights Act during the last session of Congress, we were hopeful that we had devised an effective means to combat the discrimination problem. But, as subsequent events have proved, that measure was not enough; something more is needed.

Following the President's recent address to the joint session of the Congress, a reporter stopped me in the corridor to inquire as to my reaction to the message. My immediate response was that "I hope Congress will be prompt and decisive in its action." Further, I said that I would be awaiting the administration's proposed legislation, hoping that it would effectively deal with the problem which now had reached a crisis stage.

The administration's bill was filed and I, along with many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, was disappointed.

Mr. Speaker, I am not one of those individuals who say we must clear up this Southern problem. I believe that we must take action to eliminate the American problem of voting discrimination wherever it is practiced. Yes, it is a national problem and the action Congress takes should apply throughout the 50 States.

The administration's bill was drafted during a period of great tension and presented to the Congress at a time when emotions were high. At first glance, a number of people hailed the measure. I was not in that group. I applauded its stated objectives, but not its suggested methods. I could see that the proposal was deficient in several respects.

Since that time, we, on the minority side, have been working strenuously to develop a plan to correct the deficiencies in the administration's bill. What has emerged is being labeled as a constructive Republican alternative, but let me strongly emphasize that I am not seeking to affix a party label to the measure that is finally enacted into law. We are after headway, not headlines.

At this point, I would like to cite a few specifics from the bill which I have introduced.

A Federal examiner is appointed by the Civil Service Commission when the Attorney General receives 25 or more complaints from residents of a county alleging denial of the right to vote on account of race or color. The examiner immediately determines whether these persons are qualified to vote. Challenges by the State may be made to a Federal hearing officer, appointed by the Civil Service Commission, within 10 days, and the hearing officer must render his decision 7 days thereafter.

Determination by the hearing officer that 25 or more persons are denied suffrage because of race or color establishes a pattern or practice of discrimination. Immediately thereafter, the Civil Service Commission shall appoint such additional Federal examiners and hearing officers as necessary to register all other persons within the country who may be subject to discrimination.

The bill provides for an appeal of the hearing officer's decision to the local Federal Court of Appeals if made within 15

days. All persons found qualified to vote by the examiners shall be entitled to vote. Those who are challenged shall vote provisionally until the appeal is decided by the hearing officer and the court. Provisional voting will encourage a prompt determination of the appeal. The administration's bill provides exactly the same appeal procedure, except that there is no authority for provisional voting.

The bill provides that examiners shall disregard literacy test requirements for persons who possess a sixth grade education. But, Federal examiners under this bill will apply to all other persons a State's literacy test, provided it is fair and nondiscriminatory. The administration's bill requires the complete elimination of literacy tests in a few States or their subdvisions, caught in its net, no matter how reasonable the tests or how fairly applied. At the same time, the administration's bill permits other States to enact literacy tests in the future.

The bill deals with the problem of physical and economic coercion and intimidation. It permits registrants in a county in which a pattern of discrimination has been established to bypass local registrars, if they have reason to believe that they will be subjected to coercion and intimidation. In addition, our bill provides for civil and criminal penalties against those officials who engage in such coercion and intimidation. The administration's bill contains similar provisions except that the Attorney General must take affirmative action to waive the requirement that a person first appear before a local registrar.

The bill does not overturn constitutional principles by requiring States to establish their innocence. The administration's bill does do this by presuming a State or a political subdivision, covered by the bill, guilty of discrimination until it receives from a Federal court in the District of Columbia a declaratory judgment that it has not violated the 15th amendment in even one instance in the past 10 years.

The bill does not invalidate laws or ordinances of State and local governments in contravention of established constitutional principles. The administration's bill would require States and their political subdivisions, covered by the bill, to come to a Federal court for validation of their future laws and ordinances relating to voting requirements. Such is required by the administration's bill even though the laws and ordinances of the State or local community have never been found to be discriminatory.

In summary, I believe that the bill faces up squarely to the problem and offers a sensible approach to a prompt solution.

Resolution on Farm Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, in line with the discussion we held here in this House earlier this afternoon, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of a resolution which was unanimously adopted by the 18th Annual Americans for Democratic Action Convention on April 4.

It points up quite vividly the plight of our domestic farmwokers, particularly those engaged in migratory labor, and certainly strengthens our arguments against the restoration of the Mexican farm labor importation program, which the Congress terminated as of December 31, 1964.

The resolution is a follows:

RESOLUTION ON FARM LABOR

The Nation's 1.5 million farmworkers are the most poverty stricken, the most exploited and the most depressed work groups in the United States. They earn an average of less than $1,000 a year. They are employed for an average of only 140 days in the entire year. And they are specifically exempted from virtually all of the social legislation which has long protected most other Americans, including the Fair Labor Standards Act, unemployment compensation, workmen's compensation, and the National Labor Relations Act.

In addition, farmworkers are the only American work group which has been forced to compete with foreign workers for jobs in this country. Until this year, several hundred thousand docile and semicaptive laborers were imported annually mainly from Mexico and the British West Indies for temporary work in the United States on corporate farms. The importation of this cheap labor force naturally depressed the wages and limited the job opportunities of competing American farmworkers. It was a major reason for their abysmal poverty.

After a long and bitter fight, liberal organizations, including ADA, church groups, labor unions, and civic organizations succeeded in getting Congress to end the foreign farm labor importation programs. The programs officially terminated on December 31, 1964.

Unreconciled to its loss of a virtually unlimited reservoir of cheap labor, agri-business has launched a massive lobbying and publicity campaign to restore the importation programs. The growers and their allies charge that American workers "are not available," that they are "too lazy to work" and that they will not "perform stoop labor," such as picking oranges. These great proponents of free enterprise demand that the Federal Government "assure" them a sufficient labor force. At the same time, they denounce the "Government interference in business" posed by the adverse effect regulations which seek to protect U.S. workers.

The growers and their allies are currently villifying the Secretary of Labor, W. Willard Wirtz, for his refusal to violate the intent of Congress. The Secretary has courageously withstood the tremendous pressure campaign. He has demonstrated that U.S. farmworkers are available and can be recruited for work in agriculture if sufficient wages and 20th century working conditions are provided.

ADA commends the Secretary highly for his courageous stand. We continue to oppose any foreign farm labor importation whatsoever. We regard the importations as nothing less than a means of undercutting the meager wages and working conditions of the poorest of America's poor.

In addition, we believe the exemption of farmworkers from this Nation's social legislation is an injustice which should be quickly remedied. These workers were left on the outside during the enactment of the New Deal legislation only because the then-powerful farm bloc had to be placated. No economic or other justification existed then or today for the exemption of men, women, and children who need the protection of this legislation the most.

ADA therefore strongly urges:

(1) Full coverage of farmworkers under the minimum wage, maximum hours, and child labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

(2) Full protection of the farmworkers' right to organize into unions through coverage under the National Labor Relations Act.

(3) Full coverage of farmworkers under the unemployment compensation and workmen's compensation laws.

(4) Increased coverage for farmworkers under the Social Security Act.

ADA also believes that the misery to which farmworkers have so long been subjected because of their being singled out for exemption from legal protection and for exploitation has resulted in problems which require special solutions. We therefore urge that special efforts be made—and if necessary, additional legislation be enacted—to meet the education, health, housing, and other welfare problems of agricultural laborers, particularly the migrant workers. Also, we strongly urge that Congress enact legislation which will provide a permanent recruitment program to bring farmworkers to areas of labor need at the time of need. This program must include necessary safeguards for farmworkers, especially concerning wages and working conditions.

The deprivation of America's farmworkers is so huge that it poses one of the largest single challenges to the Great Society. What this Nation does to erase the harvest of shame among agricultural laborers will be one of the most important tests of the seriousness and the effectiveness of its war against poverty.

House Un-American Activities Committee Should Investigate the Ku Klux Klan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I think that our colleagues and other readers of the RECORD may be interested in a WTOP radio and television editorial presented late last week.

While I do not endorse this statement in its entirety, it is a good exposition of a reasonable viewpoint and does raise questions which I believe are of concern to many Members of this House:

[This editorial was broadcast on March 31 and April 1, 1965, over WTOP radio and television]

WTOP EDITORIAL

There are those who want a congressional agency other than the House Un-American Activities Committee to conduct the inquiry into the Ku Klux Klan. And it is true that Un-American Activities' investigations of the past were too often marred by sensationalism to give that particular group an impressive reputation.

Nevertheless, the committee has an undoubted claim on the subject of Klan activities. Because that is so, the HUAC has to be given a chance to prove what it can do in the present circumstances. And we, for one, are willing to see the committee given that chance.

Already, however, plans for the investigation are raising some difficult problems. According to Chairman EDWIN WILLIS, the com-

mittee's scrutiny will involve not only the Klan but such other organizations as the Black Muslims, the Minutemen, and the American Nazi Party.

We recall that when Congressman WELTNER, of Georgia, first proposed a probe of the Klan early in February, he was careful to say that the congressional interest should be in overt activities, not what some organization may represent in the way of ideas or ideology. What a man thinks—individually or collectively—in his own business. It is only when he begins to act on the basis of his beliefs that Congress has a legitimate interest.

So in the probe of the Ku Klux Klan, the Un-American Activities Committee must restrict itself to what the organization does, not what it stands for. The same holds true for all other groups which may be included in the investigative effort. The question here is not how repulsive some points of view may be. It is the need, as Congressman WELTNER emphasized, to make a distinction between thought and deed—which, in the case of the committee, is a very delicate but very necessary process.

This was a WTOP editorial, Jack Jurey speaking for WTOP.

Remarks by the Honorable Richard L. Roudebush, U.S. House of Representatives, Sixth Indiana District, Before the Indiana Council of Teachers of English, Saturday, April 3, 1965, at Marian College, Indianapolis, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, my very able colleague from Indiana, Congressman RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH, has led a long and active fight for the past 4 years in effort to obtain a commemorative postage stamp for the late Ernie Pyle, famed Hoosier war correspondent during World War II.

Congressman ROUDEBUSH has won wide backing and support for his campaign in behalf of an Ernie Pyle stamp.

This applause for Congressman ROUDEBUSH's efforts comes from a wide spectrum of American life, including millions of World War II veterans who recall Ernie's fine reporting.

Congressman ROUDEBUSH was recently invited by the Indiana Council of Teachers of English to present an address on the life and works of Ernie Pyle, a native of the congressional district which Congressman ROUDEBUSH represents in the 89th Congress.

His remarks concerning this great Hoosier are worthy of the attention of this entire body, and I include them in the RECORD at this point:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE RICHARD L. ROUDEBUSH, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, SIXTH INDIANA DISTRICT, BEFORE THE INDIANA COUNCIL OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH, SATURDAY, APRIL 3, 1965, AT MARIAN COLLEGE, INDIANAPOLIS, IND.

It is a genuine pleasure to be here today.

And, I wish to thank your president, Dr. James Mason, for his kind invitation to speak before the spring meeting of the Indiana Council of Teachers of English.

It was requested that I direct my remarks today to the life and work of Ernie Pyle, the famed Hoosier war correspondent who was killed during the closing days of World War II.

For nearly 4 years now, we have been seeking approval by the Post Office Department for the issuance of an Ernie Pyle commemorative stamp.

Ideally, the stamp should have been issued this month to coincide with the 20th anniversary of Ernie's tragic death on the tiny Pacific atoll of Ie Shima, located west of Okinawa.

In our campaign to obtain a commemorative stamp in honor of Ernie Pyle, we have contacted literally hundreds of civic groups, veterans organizations, and other interested persons throughout the Nation.

The support we have received has been encouraging.

More than 100 Members of Congress have written letters lending their support.

We have also gained the support of the Veterans of Foreign Wars which endorsed the stamp by formal resolution during their national convention last year in Cleveland.

Support from the journalistic field has also been most gratifying.

United Features Syndicate endorsed the stamp proposal with this comment: "During World War II it was our privilege to syndicate Ernie's column which was read religiously by families and friends of our fighting men in Europe and the Pacific. His ability to offer them a soldier's insight into the war, and the warmth with which he wrote of the ordinary foot soldier, endeared him to the Nation. Ernie was a journalist in the very best tradition, setting a high standard that reporters strive to emulate today."

The Wyoming Press Association, the Georgia Press Association—representing 225 newspapers—the Kansas Press Association, the New York Press Association, and the Maryland-Delaware press associations have all supported our efforts.

Mention should also be made of support from the American Council on Education for Journalism, the Pacific Stars and Stripes, the New York associated dailies, and Scripps-Howard newspapers.

Our campaign has also been endorsed by perhaps the most exclusive club in the United States—the Medal of Honor Society.

Chartered by Congress in 1958, the Medal of Honor Society limits its membership to persons who have received this Nation's highest military award—the Congressional Medal of Honor.

In a letter to Postmaster Grounouski, the society declared, "Ernie Pyle not only distinguished himself by writing brilliantly about the brave and noble deeds of our fighting forces overseas but added new stature to his profession by combining his unique and warm personal talents with responsible and objective reporting. In this manner his work contributed immeasurably to the morale of our troops as well as the men and women on the homefront."

In addition, we have introduced legislation (H.R. 1723) which provides for the issuance of a commemorative Ernie Pyle stamp.

As of today, the Post Office Stamp Advisory Committee, has not acted favorably on this 4-year effort in support of an Ernie Pyle stamp.

They are scheduled to meet two more times this year, and I have been told that the Ernie Pyle stamp could be on either agenda.

Thus far, I have been most restrained in my criticism of the delay in acceptance of this stamp, which incidentally, would be the first time a working newspaperman has been so honored.

I must admit, however, that I have not been exactly elated with the many times that Ernie Pyle has been overlooked.

Last winter it was discouraging, to say the least, when the Post Office Department announced it was honoring an Italian poet born 700 years ago, and a foreign political document signed 750 years ago.

And, I'm sure you have all seen the different birds and animals that adorn some of our new commemorative stamps.

I am an admirer of wildfowl, but I do believe a valid case has been made for the issuance of an Ernie Pyle commemorative stamp.

Like millions of Americans who went overseas in World War II, my interest in Ernie Pyle stems back to that period.

The life and work of this newspaperman had an enormous impact on millions of Americans.

No other journalist ever evoked such mass affection as was accorded him during his tenure as a national figure.

There was, of course, a reason for this.

He bridged a gap in the knowledge of the Great War and of the men who were waging it—a gap which was not appreciated until his reporting began to span it.

Many other war journalists were as enterprising, as brave, as impeccably accurate in their war dispatches as Ernie Pyle.

No other correspondents, however, told the story of the soldier with such insight and such moving sympathy.

And his personality so permeated his column, as it had done in peacetime with a smaller audience, that readers came to think of him not as a stranger, but as their friend—their friend Ernie.

As a GI, in Africa and Italy, I knew Ernie Pyle by reputation as a friend and a true chronicler of the war.

As a Member of Congress, for the Sixth Indiana District, I now represent the area where Ernie was born and raised in western Indiana.

Many of his friends and relatives still reside there, and these folks have been most helpful in our campaign to obtain a commemorative stamp.

Petitions requesting the Post Office Department issue a commemorative stamp, have been circulated in the small town of Dana, Ind., where Ernie was born on August 3, 1900.

"I wasn't born in a log cabin," he wrote in one of his columns, "but I did start driving a team in the fields when I was 9 years old, if that helps any."

Ernie's boyhood was not unlike that of thousands of Indiana farm boys, except that he was an only child and was left to himself a good deal.

There was no plumbing in the home where Ernie Pyle spent his boyhood. There was a backhouse, and Ernie took his baths in a washtub near the woodstove in the kitchen.

When Ernie was a child the lack of such things was not considered a deprivation by respectable Indiana farmers.

Ernie was educated at Indiana University where he majored in journalism.

He never graduated. After attending for 3½ years, he left in his senior year after his girl friend decided in favor of another man.

He was an excellent student at Indiana, became editor of the Daily Student and worked on the yearbook.

After leaving school, his first job was as a reporter on the La Porte Herald.

This was just a brief steppingstone for newspaper jobs in Washington, D.C., and New York.

While working on the Washington Daily News he met Geraldine Siebolds, of Minnesota, a Government worker in Washington, and they were married in 1926.

Fed up temporarily with the newspaper business, he drew out his savings and bought a model T roadster.

Ernie and his wife took a long trip, driving leisurely around the United States.

It was on this trip that he originated his "traveling" column.

From 1935, until the war broke out, Ernie and his wife traveled around the country, writing stories on every conceivable subject, and winning quite a reading public.

Ernie once estimated that they stayed in more than 800 hotels, crossed the Continent exactly 24 times, flew in 66 different airplanes, rode on 29 different boats, walked 200 miles, gone through 5 sets of tires, and put out about $2,500 in tips.

His war reporting carried the same kind of homey and simple quality that made his travel column so popular.

Whether writing about a terrifying air raid in London, the Normandy invasion, or a group of soldiers talking about home, Ernie captured the image of the situation that gave his millions of readers back home in the United States a true picture of the war.

His reports earned him a Pulitzer Prize in 1943.

His two books, "Here Is Your War," published in 1943, and "Brave Men," in 1944, were both best sellers, and earned a fortune.

Admired by the public, GI's and officers alike, Ernie left the European theater before V–E Day to cover the war in the Pacific.

President Roosevelt had been dead only 5 days when Ernie went ashore on the tiny Pacific atoll of Ie Shima, on April 17, 1945.

Five miles square, the tiny island was, nevertheless, the scene of one of the bitterest engagements in the Pacific.

Three Japanese airstrips were at stake, and the 77th Infantry Division's officials history of the battle records that not one Japanese soldier surrendered and did not stop killing until killed.

On April 18, Ernie rode toward the front line with a jeepload of troops looking for a new location for a command post.

A machinegunner opened fire from about one-third of a mile away, and Ernie was struck in the temple. He died instantly.

He was buried on the island, and the body was later transferred to Hawaii where it remains today, at the National Memorial Cemetery of the Pacific in Punchbowl Crater.

The entire Nation was saddened by the news of Ernie's death, and he received many posthumous honors.

It has been 20 years this month since his death, and he is still remembered by the men who fought in World War II, and millions of Americans who followed the war through his columns.

Today, as you may know, the journalism building at Indiana University is named in honor of Ernie Pyle.

I think it would be a fitting tribute to this great Hoosier to be honored by the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp, and I pledge to continue my efforts to do so.

Thank you for inviting me and God bless you.

Poor "Junior"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask to insert in today's RECORD an editorial by Al McIntosh, editor of the Rock County Star-Herald, Luverne, Minn. As usual, Al provides us with a telling analysis of one of the major problems of our times, the decline in personal responsibility and integrity.

The editorial follows:

POOR "JUNIOR"—HE THOUGHT EVERYBODY WAS ON THE "MAKE"

One day when "Junior" was 14 he noticed his father grinning all over when he came from the office.

"Got pinched for speeding but Jake down at city hall got the ticket fixed for me," he said.

When "Junior" was 15 he was with his mother in the family car when she backed into a tree. The damage would easily exceed $100.

"We'll say that somebody rammed into it when we were parked downtown," she said, "then we'll collect insurance for it because that's what insurance companies are for."

When "Junior" was 16 he listened to grandfather reminisce about the "good old days of rationing" when he made $100,000 black-marketing cars.

That same night "Uncle John" was bragging that on a good share of his business he sent no bills and took no checks. Just cash. "Why be a sucker and let those punks in Washington get it all?" he asked.

When "Junior" was 17 he listened one night to his lawyer uncle bragging about how cute he'd been in getting his client off scot free in a court case.

"It took a little high-class arm twisting on one of the witnesses," he bragged, "and by the time he got to court we had it made."

"Even if you know they're guilty you never want to plead 'em guilty because you can't make any money that way," said the uncle.

When "Junior" was 18 his family pulled every possible string to get him a paying scholarship at a coveted Ive League eastern school. They even lied about the family income to make it seem that "Junior" needed financial aid.

He didn't make the grade there but by a stroke of luck he wangled an appointment to a service academy.

"Junior" was having it a bit tough scholastically. An upperclassman sold him the answers to the calculus examination.

"Junior" was caught and expelled.

On his return home his mother went into paroxysms of hysterical weeping over the disgrace.

"How could you have done this to us?" she sobbed.

"This isn't the way we raised you."

Doctor of Humane Letters to Hon. John T. Connor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure last Saturday to accompany the Honorable John T. Connor, the Secretary of Commerce, to the campus of my alma mater, Ohio Northern University at Ada, Ohio, where he received the honorary degree of doctor of humane letters.

The Secretary's address at the Founder's Day Convocation was an excellent statement of the problems that confront us, and I include it with my remarks as follows:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF COMMERCE JOHN T. CONNOR

I am most happy to speak here at Ohio Northern at the kind invitation of President McIntosh and my good friend Dean Robert Fischelis, of your College of Pharmacy.

I have known Dean Fischelis through my own past connections with the pharmaceutical industry—connections which I have severed as a businessman but retained as a consumer. The headaches you get in government are no milder than those you get in business.

In a sense, although I am out of the drug industry, I'm still very much concerned with the health of the American people. Now it is their economic health that concerns me most urgently, rather than their physical well-being. But the two are closely related. A healthy economy requires a healthy work force, and good health is necessary for us to enjoy fully the fruits of our country's unprecedented prosperity.

So, as Secretary of Commerce, no less than as the former president of a leading pharmaceutical firm, I am interested in what is necessary to keep Americans healthy physically and economically. This is a big problem with many facets. And it is a problem that challenges each of you and this institution on the 94th anniversary of its founding.

I have mentioned the pharmaceutical industry because it is a link we share through your fine School of Pharmacy, but also because what Dean Fischelis and his faculty are doing here this weekend is symbolic of the challenge we face—whether we are in education or business or government or one of the professions.

I helped create the problem he and the Nation's pharmacists are facing. My former company spent—and is still spending—about $30 million a year to discover and develop new drugs. Other companies spend similar large sums to help create the biochemical armaments of the war on disease.

Together they have helped make American medicine the finest in the world—not only by providing the medical profession with more effective drugs, but by putting those drugs and the knowledge of their use into the hands of the physician and into the corner drugstore.

You can see the problem this rapid change creates for the pharmacist who has been out of school—even for a few years. Most of the drugs doctors are prescribing today were not on the market a decade ago. And most of the prescriptions the pharmacist will fill 5 or 10 years from now could not be written today. The drugs haven't been discovered yet.

And this is a problem that is appearing throughout our society.

There is an explosion of knowledge going on all around us. It's coming out of industrial laboratories and out of the laboratories of our colleges and universities.

And it's not merely an explosion of scientific knowledge—in the usual sense. It's much more than a rapid expansion of our understanding of the physical and biological aspects of our life. It involves the social and cultural areas as well.

The sociologist, the political scientist, the psychologist who left school a few years ago can't afford to be ignorant of what the computer, for example, is doing to his field of knowledge—any more than can the physicist or chemist. The same thing is true of the economist and the business manager.

And it's not just the computer hardware or any other advance in equipment that is responsible for the change. There are new ideas emerging in every field that are potentially revolutionary in themselves.

Our experts in the Department of Commerce, for example, are working to develop the idea of the noted Harvard University economist, Prof. Vassily Leontief, into an important tool of business and government policymaking. Computers are involved, but the important thing is the concept. And the result—called the "input-output"

tables—is deceptively simple. It boils down to a set of tables that show in quantitative terms the complex interrelationships in our national economy. It shows how much business is generated in each segment of the economy by an additional dollar's worth of output anywhere in the economic structure.

Right now we don't know just what impact the development of these input-output tables will have. But you can be reasonably sure that the next generation of economists and businessmen and government officials won't be able to do its job adequately if it doesn't understand the use of this and similar economic tools.

Keeping abreast of one's field today is truly a lifetime job. Those of you who are students here have really only begun your education. You may never come back to Ohio Northern for a special course or seminar. But increasingly more and more college graduates will find it necessary to return to the campus—for postgraduate programs. Like the seminar on contemporary pharmacy being held here this weekend, these programs will be designed to bring you up to date and to broaden and deepen your understanding of the changing environment in which you work.

Businessmen are finding it necessary to strengthen their academic groundings in management techniques. They also are finding that periodic sessions on college and university campuses are very valuable means of broadening their understanding of the social and political changes that vitally affect their business operations.

So I think it is particularly symbolic that a seminar on contemporary pharmacy should be part of this annual founder's day observance. The best way you can honor the past of this great institution is to look to its future. And this is what you are doing.

Ohio Northern was born of Henry Solomon Lehr's desire to raise the level of competence of the poorly trained public school teachers in his region. He was trying to close the gap between what had been adequate—or at least tolerable—and what would be required of teachers in a burgeoning American economy. He dealt with the realities of the present—recognizing both the shortcomings of the past and the opportunities unfolding before our country and our people.

I think we must do the same.

President Johnson has summoned the American people to the task of building a Great Society. He has enormous faith in the idealism of our people and in their ability to respond to great challenges. But there is nothing "pollyannish" about his thinking. He recognizes that Government cannot hand out a Great Society to an apathetic people. He realizes that we must do this job together over whatever period of time it may take, and that most of the work must be done through private initiative rather than through Government action.

I personally think this calls for a new alliance of the campus and the company—of the academic and business worlds—in a sustained effort to cope with the problems and exploit the opportunities before us. I think such an alliance is especially needed in the field of education, manpower development, and employment opportunities.

I say "field" rather than "fields" because these are all aspects of a single challenge. You can look at it from different viewpoints. You can talk about the need to develop our manpower resources to meet the demands of an increasingly sophisticated economy. You can talk about the right of the individual to a job and an opportunity to earn his own livelihood. You can talk about his obligation to develop marketable skills, or about the obligation of government, business, and the schools to give him an opportunity to develop his productive—and human—potential.

But these are all part of the same ball of string. And you know the answer to the question: Where do you start to unravel a ball of string? You start anywhere.

The same thing is true of this problem of education, human development, and economic growth. You start where you are—whether you are in business, in a classroom, or in a position of public or community influence.

As a businessman and now as head of a Government agency charged with promoting economic development, I have been very much concerned with this problem of matching our manpower supply to the changing demands of an increasingly technical and rapidly changing economy.

The shifts on both sides are dramatic—on both sides of this supply and demand relationship. Not only is there continuing change in the kinds of jobs required, there is a big change occurring—as a result of the postwar baby boom—in the labor force available for these jobs.

The most dramatic change in job opportunities, of course, has been the decline in farmworkers—from 37.5 percent of all American workers in 1900 to only 5 percent in 1964.

The proportion of factory blue-collar workers, however, has risen only slightly. But there have been substantial changes within this group. The demand for unskilled workers has dropped sharply from 12.5 percent to 5 percent. The demand for skilled workers has risen from 10.5 to 14 percent, and the demand for semiskilled workers even more—from 12.8 to 20 percent of all workers.

The big growth has been in white-collar workers—from less than one in five workers in 1900 to nearly half the work force in 1964. The demand for professional, technical, and similar workers has nearly tripled. The demand for managers and officials has risen 50 percent. And the percentage in clerical and kindred jobs has increased fivefold since the turn of the century.

Today it is virtualy impossible to get a job in a factory without a high school diploma, and it is even more difficult to get an office job without this minimum educational qualification. At a higher level, there is a great unsatisfied demand for top quality, highly educated people in virtually every field. In the Commerce Department, we are particularly concerned with the lack of advanced-degree people capable of doing engineering research and development—people who can bridge the gap between the basic scientific discovery and the production line.

On the other side of the picture, the labor force is growing faster than in the previous postwar period, and the composition of the labor force is shifting toward youth and inexperience.

Because of the baby boom after World War II, we had half a million more young people entering the labor force last year than the annual average of the previous 5 years. Between 1957 and 1962, the total labor force grew at an average rate of less than 800,000 a year. From 1962 to 1964, it grew by 1.2 million a year. And for the rest of this decade, the growth is expected to be about 1.5 million a year. This means we must create some 9 million new jobs—1.5 million a year—just to take care of the growth in the labor force through 1970.

And that doesn't include doing anything about the 4 million currently unemployed, or about the additional workers that would move into the active labor force if the prospect of finding jobs improved significantly.

Another major change in the labor force is the above-average growth in nonwhite—mainly Negro—participation. Although nonwhites make up only slightly more than one-tenth of the current labor force, they will account for roughly one-fifth of the growth in the labor force during the remainder of the decade.

This constitutes a major challenge for both education and business. These young Negro men and women must be equipped in our schools and colleges to fill the higher skilled jobs that will be opening during the rest of the 1960's and beyond. But they must know that the jobs—which formerly were closed to them—will be there and will be open to them when they are prepared to take them. This will require a close cooperation of business and our institutions of higher learning to identify and meet the special educational needs of these young people—including the urgent need to strengthen their motivation to obtain higher education.

Today the unemployment rate among Negroes in the labor force is about 10 percent—double the rate for the population as a whole. For teenagers it is triple the general rate, and for Negro teenagers, I understand, it runs on the order of 25 percent.

I am concerned about the manpower development problem from the business point of view. But, as a businessman, nothing gave me greater satisfaction than the knowledge that I was helping to create jobs for my fellow citizens.

I think most businessmen feel this way. And I think businessmen are ready to accept the challenge to work intimately with the educational institutions and governmental bodies in their areas to help create job opportunities for every pair of willing hands.

In providing an adequate education for every American, there is a role for each of us to play. There is a local community responsibility. The State has a major responsibility. Our churches and our private educational institutions have a big opportunity. And the Federal Government has an important supplemental role to play.

I think the President's education program deserves full business support. I am not worried about Federal aid supplanting local support or local control in education. The job we face in education is so big that we need all the help we can get. And, if education is among the most important business of our society—and I think it is—we need not be afraid of the American people losing interest in it at the local and community level.

At the same time, I think business has a special obligation to support institutions such as this. Variety in educational opportunity is an important support and safeguard of a democratic society. But it must also be quality education. And business corporations, as well as individual businessmen, who have the means, should make support of private colleges and universities one of their continuing obligations.

President Johnson pointed out recently that this is the richest and most powerful country that ever existed, and that the might of past empires was little compared with ours.

"But," he said, "I do not want to be the President who built empires, or sought grandeur, or extended dominion. I want to be the President who educated young people to the wonders of their world—the President who fed the hungry—and helped the poor to find their own way—and enriched the simple, daily lives of every family. And I want to be the President who helped to end hatred among his fellow men, and war among the brothers of this earth."

I think this is what we all want. I think we want to be part of the generation that helped make these things possible for all our fellow men, and for all the world.

The campus and the corporation represent two of our most important means of furthering this ambition for America and mankind. I think they must work together in mutual support and with common purpose to achieve our goals. I am confident that they can work together for the benefit of an enlightened and capable people in a free and prosperous society.

Thank you.

Blowin' in the Wind: A Progress Report on Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct the attention of the House to a noteworthy public service by RKO General Broadcasting. RKO, which has its headquarters in my district, has produced an exceptional radio program on brotherhood and civil rights called "Blowin' in the Wind: A Progress Report on Brotherhood." The program describes the course of brotherhood in this country through music, historical references and the words of our Presidents.

RKO, which is a national group of 7 radio and 5 television stations, has made this program available, without cost, to more than 2,000 stations in this country. It was carried by nine stations in the South.

The program originally was produced for Brotherhood Week in February. At that time it was broadcast by the seven RKO stations. In addition to supplying the program to American stations, RKO also sponsored a worldwide distribution through—to name just a few of the outlets—Radio Free Europe, the Voice of America, the British Broadcasting Corporation, and the Armed Forces Radio Network.

The program was largely the work of Martin Weldon, director of public affairs for RKO, who wrote and produced the show. Weldon has received a letter of commendation from Eric F. Goldman, special consultant to the President, for his "vigorous and skillful work in behalf of American ideals."

Also involved with the production of the program were RKO President Hathaway Watson, Executive Vice President Sam S. Slate, and Jerome Bess and Folksinger Oscar Brand, who narrated the program.

Under unanimous consent, I submit an abstract of the program script for inclusion in the RECORD:

BLOWIN' IN THE WIND: A PROGRESS REPORT ON BROTHERHOOD

(Special 45-minute radio program for Brotherhood Week, February 21–28)

Mr. OSCAR BRAND. On January 20, 1965, the 36th President of the United States took the oath of office. He spoke about 1,500 words. These were 36 of them.

Tape excerpt from Johnson's inaugural address: "Justice requires us to remember when any citizen denies his fellow, saying 'His color is not mine,' or 'His beliefs are strange and different'—in that moment he betrays America, though his forebears created this Nation."

Mr. BRAND. This is Oscar Brand. This program is called "Blowin' in the Wind: A Progress Report on Brotherhood."

RKO General Broadcasting produces this program for its seven radio stations in honor of Brotherhood Week, the week of February 21, as set aside by the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

We do this in the hope that someday every week will be Brotherhood Week, and every day, not officially set aside by anyone or any organization, but in our hearts.

The program is essentially musical, the fourth in our series, "Musical Americana," music tracing a chapter of the American story.

And we call the program "Blowin' in the Wind: A Progress Report on Brotherhood" because we seem to have made some progress—slow and painful, to be sure—but progress just the same. While the song "Blowin' in the Wind" says that the answer to the question "How long must we wait for full brotherhood" is blowin' in the wind—and the winds of the future are always unpredictable.

Up with instrumental, "Blowin' in the Wind," segue to vocal "Blowin' in the Wind," sung by the Johnny Mann Singers:

"The answer, my friend, is blowin' in the wind,
The answer is blowin' in the wind."

Mr. BRAND. It's a thick, tight circle—poverty, envy, hate, resentment, guilt—and no place in the circle for brotherhood to break in.

Yes, it can make a man especially bitter if he loses his job, or can't get one, because of certain things which have nothing to do with his abilities, because of factors beyond his control, like the color of his skin, or his race, or his religion, or where he comes from. There was a time when the people who came here from Ireland ran up against this.

Quite a few years later, there was one man of Irish descent who not only applied for a job, but got it. And this is what he said, to the whole world, the day he started work, which was January 20, 1961.

Voice of John F. Kennedy, from inauguration speech: "My fellow citizens of the world, ask not what America will do for you, but what together we can do for the freedom of man."

Mr. BRAND. But brotherhood seemed far away—as faint and sad as a lost dream of love—when John F. Kennedy was shot down, for many of us the most sorrowful experience of our lives. Was it hate that pulled the trigger? Was it a mind diseased by frustration? We may never know. But strangely, in the national feeling of revulsion, the influence of hate groups diminished. Hope could stir again.

The house we live in. This house called the United States is just that. A collection of sovereign States, each of which gave up a good slice of its sovereignty to the Federal Union. And it wasn't a simple matter—getting the States together.

Recording of "We Shall Overcome," sung by Joan Baez:

"We shall overcome, we shall overcome,
We shall overcome someday.
Oh, oh, deep in my heart I do believe
That we shall overcome someday.

"We'll walk hand in hand, we'll walk hand in hand,
We'll walk hand in hand someday.
Oh, oh, deep in my heart I do believe
That we shall overcome someday.

"We are not afraid, we are not afraid,
We are not afraid today.
Oh, oh, deep in my heart I do believe
That we shall overcome someday.

"We shall overcome, we shall overcome,
We shall overcome someday.
Oh, oh, deep in my heart I do believe
That we shall overcome someday."

Mr. BRAND. Many of those who sing this song—hands clasped and swaying—must recall that a President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, once looked forward to a world for them—and for everyone else—founded on four freedoms.

Voice of Roosevelt enunciating the four freedoms: "The first is freedom of speech and expression everywhere in the world. The second is freedom of every person to worship God in his own way everywhere in the world. The third is freedom from want everywhere in the world. The fourth is freedom from fear anywhere in the world."

Mr. BRAND. Of course, if we had all that, we'd have full brotherhood now. But things take time. It seems to be taking especially long to achieve freedom from want everywhere in the world. And when times are hard for a man, it's difficult for him to feel brotherly toward anyone, including himself.

Ira Hayes was an Indian—how better to begin this story? An Indian, a Marine, a war hero, a legend. But even a war hero and a legend can be a casualty—in the struggle that never ends.

Who knows why men act unbrotherly toward one another? Maybe it's because we all come into this world naked and alone, and that's a pretty unimportant way to feel, and later on, when we get the chance, it makes us feel a lot more important to be able to put someone else down just on the color of his skin or where he comes from.

The histories call it the New World the settlers came to from Europe—but it was really the same old world of suspicion and fear, as each new group of arrivals tried to find a place, as some of those who had arrived before them resisted. One by one, year by year, the ones who had arrived first felt threatened by the new ones coming in and tried to keep what they had. Using all the methods of resistance: denial of jobs, knives, guns, all the way down to ridiculing different religions and strange accents.

There were so many accents: Spanish, French, English, Dutch, Swedish, German, Scottish, Irish, Polish, Greek, Czech, Rumanian, Russian, Italian, Chinese, Japanese, Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban—and while the procession of new arrivals continued, there were always the Negroes—refused even the status and opportunities of new settlers because they were not free. Many say they are still not free. This is their anthem, their prayer—not a battle cry, a prayer, that the doors be opened.

In the early days there was rivalry and bitter distrust among them.

The pendulum swings, back and forth. Racial ridicule, political revenge, and social snobbery have never really been very funny to the victim. Sometimes these differences have been used by voteseeking politicians. One such period in our history saw the American farmers united against the rest of America. But the pendulum does swing—and sometimes forward. In our own time, a Broadway musical comedy recognized a crucial, and a hopeful, fact: we are not born with hate in our hearts, children grow up to hate only if grownups teach them to.

Also in the time many of us remember personally, a man named Hitler taught his people to hate, taught them so well that they helped him put to death millions of Jews, Poles, Russians, Englishmen—even Germans. But Hitler never reckoned that the rest of the free world—stung by the need to defend itself, furious at his threat to all its principles—would bury its differences, and fight together and work together. Indians and Frenchmen, Negroes and whites, Englishmen, Greeks, Canadians and Australians, Catholics, Protestants, and Jews. Few of them said they were fighting for brotherhood, but most of them knew or felt, that unless they won the battle, all would be lost—freedom of religion, any chance for brotherhood, life itself.

Perhaps the most ironic thing about the war was the fact that one of the major architects of the victory was himself of German descent, a man named Eisenhower. He later became President, and at one time

he said—he might have been looking backward at Germany, or he might have been looking forward for America, or he might have been doing both—at one time he said:

Voice of Dwight D. Eisenhower: "A people that values its privileges above its principles soon loses both."

Mr. BRAND. All our Presidents remind us from time to time about our principles, because they all see this as part of their job. Our job—our first job—is to listen. It's possible that we don't listen well anymore, because so many of the words sound the same, and we take so many things for granted. Maybe our big need is to start listening again, because the words have always been there, in our songs, in our Constitution, in our Bible, in the words of our Presidents. Inauguration Day—January 20, 1949. The words of Harry S. Truman.

Voice of Harry S. Truman: "We believe that all men have a right to equal justice under law and equal opportunity to share in the common good. We believe that all men have a right to freedom of thought and expression. We believe that all men are created equal because they are created in the image of God."

Mr. BRAND. Where do we stand now? Back where we started? I don't think so. I think we're ahead. There are signs and portents. There are signs and portents that more of us are becoming less insecure, less greedy, less ignorant, less fearful, less ready to hate, less guilt ridden. Signs and portents. A civil rights law. An antipoverty program. A dream of a Great Society. A United Nations. A week devoted to thinking about brotherhood, which could any one of these days break out into a habit. Signs and portents—but nobody really knows which way the wind will blow, how really close we're getting to brotherhood. Nobody really knows. Except possibly you.

Report on March to Montgomery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES D. MARTIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD I would like to include the following editorial from the Greensboro Watchman, published at Greensboro, Ala. It deals with the march from Selma to Montgomery:

THE YEAR 1965 AND THE CAMP MEETINGS OF THE 1820'S: A PARALLEL IN FRENZY

We are surprised that some of our learned church historians have not drawn the parallel between the civil rights demonstrations of the 1960's in Alabama and the camp meetings, or bush-arbor meetings, of the 1820's in the Appalachian and nearby regions.

Both have religious overtones; indeed, they have been held ostensibly for religious purposes—but that does not hide their deeper and less palatable meaning. In the camp meeting days, the frontier people gathered for hundreds of miles around, coming in buggies, in wagons, on horseback, and afoot, for gatherings that often lasted as long as 2 weeks. There was endless open-air preaching, and some of the assaults on the devil were violent and earth shaking. The listeners often became frenzied—shouting and screaming, mumbling in unknown tongues and even lapsing into unconsciousness. Others became so violent that they stripped the very bark from saplings. Alcohol always lurked in the background, and then there was the usual sexual orgy—with a crop of new babies, not always wanted, arriving 9 months later to populate the frontier. Some of these frontier leaders were great preachers, who fed those who were religiously hungry. Others were mere frauds, flexing their vocal chords against the Devil, and at the same time seeing to it that the Devil had his own way. Those congregated at the camp meetings were starved for companionship, for social contact, and for sex.

The civil rights demonstrations, in which the northern preachers have tried to seize control from the emotional Negroes, resembles the old-fashioned camp meeting more than the sponsors would like to admit. The preachers show the same zeal as those of the camp meeting days—some of their preachings genuine and authentic, but far more for the mere purpose of arousing the passions. There has been lusty singing and marching and shouting, and lurking in the shadows, there again has been the strong stimulus of alcohol, making some of the more timid mighty brave and daring. And there has been the usual outburst of sex, with Negro preachers and white blonde girls bedding down for the night under the same blanket, and vice versa, until things got so bad that, in the final days, there was segregation after all. The women were kept in separate tents from the men on the road to Montgomery.

Alabama, of course, is the Devil of the 1960's—and these crusaders have obviously made some headway against him. But they haven't conquered nor, in fact, do we believe they want to conquer. They want to keep something to shout about, to sing about, to march about, to lie about. These poor creatures want to keep something which offers them adventure; which brings something different into their starving urban lives; which gives them an excuse to vent their passions, and to let off their steam precisely as the camp meeting gave those others a century and a quarter ago. We speak our own sentiments alone, and not those of the average Alabama observer, when we say that we actually feel sorry for them; they are so utterly hopeless; their lives have so little meaning that we pity them.

The Lake Erie Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, in an editorial published on April 1, 1965, the Buffalo, N.Y., Courier-Express made an eloquent appeal for strong action to halt and abate pollution in Lake Erie.

Pollution of this lake is a very serious problem that has far-reaching implications. I would like to bring the editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

ENDING LAKES POLLUTION VITAL TASK

What are the prospects for the Great Lakes, accustomed to be described as the world's largest and most valuable source of fresh water? Bad, according to Senator STEPHEN M. YOUNG, Democrat, of Ohio, unless something drastic is done to conquer the rising tide of pollution.

Senator YOUNG quoted expert predictions that Lake Erie and perhaps the other Great Lakes would be "dead within a decade or two" from pollution. Into Lake Erie alone, the Senator said, each day 3 million tons of debris and filth are dumped, making it probably the largest body of seriously contaminated fresh water in the world. And what is happening in Lake Erie, he told the Senate, is typical of what is happening in the other Great Lakes where cities bordering them and their tributaries discharge sewage into the water. The lakes, he warned, are rapidly becoming one continuous cesspool.

It is an extremely ugly picture and in all likelihood it will get worse before anything can be done to make it better. However, this is reason to welcome a word of optimism from James B. Coulter, Chief of Water Projects of the Public Health Service Division of Water Supply and Pollution Control. His opinion is that pollution can be controlled, that Lake Erie could be restored to health in 10 years. He said the project would require the cooperation of Federal, State, and local governments.

And it's no insignificant project, either. It would include these steps: Cleaning up the tributaries which carry sewage and industrial wastes into lake waters, maintaining water quality at present levels by reducing the amount of nitrogen and phosphorus entering the water, stepping up sewage treatment up to one-half above present costs, dredging the bottom sediment and harvesting crops of algae and aquatic growths.

Coulter said the salvage of Lake Erie "depends on what people want and how much they are willing to pay for it." In this situation there isn't much choice. It's a cinch things can't be allowed to go on as they are. We can't afford to let such a vital national asset as the Great Lakes go down the drain. We can't afford not to take the steps necessary to restore them and maintain them as they ought to be. We think the imperative nature of the task is gaining impressive recognition. The cost will be heavy, but it is unthinkable that the money will not be forthcoming and put to effective and beneficial work.

The Proposed World Trade Center for Lower Manhattan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the current proposal for the building of a world trade center in lower Manhattan in New York City has many disadvantages which have been overlooked or ignored.

Some of the objections are contained in the following editorial which was broadcast by WCBS in New York on November 24–25, 1964, and which I commend to the attention of our colleagues:

WCBS CRITICAL OF WORLD TRADE CENTER PROPOSED FOR LOWER MANHATTAN

The Port of New York Authority's proposal to condemn 13 square blocks of lower Manhattan for a world trade center demands critical reappraisal.

The tendency has been to swallow whole the catalogue of benefits the metropolitan area could expect to derive from the scheme. But not much publicity has been given the other side of the story. In our judgment, the disadvantages are considerable. They outweigh positive aspects, and should be examined with candor.

The trade center scheme rests on the assumption that the port's economic health depends on efficiency, and efficiency depends on how physically close to one another you can bring firms and agencies engaged in world trade. Yet the port authority consistently glosses over evidence that, first of all, export-import activity is already highly centralized below wall street: secondly, trade center space has been set aside for government agencies having nothing to do with international commerce: and thirdly, bulldozing a few hundred small retail stores now on the site would contribute little to a meaningful concept of economic health.

Further misgivings arise when you consider the tax picture as it affects New York City. The port authority enjoys tax exempt status. On the proposed trade center, however, it has agreed to pay the city three or four million dollars voluntarily—in lieu of taxes. But this is small potatoes compared with the tax yield the city could expect were private interests, not a public agency, to construct the $350 million project. Striking 13 blocks of real estate permanently from city tax rolls hardly qualifies, in our opinion, as enlightened municipal self-interest.

For the Wagner administration to sacrifice jobs, businesses and future tax revenue to the trade center plan would run counter to accepted practices of good government. The trade center's so-called public purpose is open to serious question. Nothing would better indicate the city's willingness to act in the public's true interest than bold opposition to the trade center plan in its current form, and on the site now proposed for it.

We Must Not Destroy the McCarran-Walter Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, a concerted effort is being made to destroy the McCarran-Walter Act as it relates to admission of immigrants, and make admissible hundreds of thousands of additional immigrants each year. I am convinced this would be contrary to the public interest. The Secretary of State has admitted that we already have one of the most generous immigration policies in the world, though he favors a few changes.

This effort to destroy our quota system and open the floodgates for new categories of admissions should be defeated. I expressed my views on this subject in testimony given to the House Subcommittee on Immigration of the Committee on the Judiciary, of which the distinguished member from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is chairman. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include that statement:

STATEMENT OF O. C. FISHER BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION, HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman, I desire to record my opposition to H.R. 2580. This measure would destroy our time-tested traditional national origins system of admitting immigrants from European countries. It would transfer from the Congress to the Executive the responsibility of determining how many immigrants would be admitted each year. It would give to a politically appointed commission power to decide who would be admitted and from what country they would come. This would create a bonanza for immigration lawyers and influence peddlers, and would not be in the public interest.

Unfortunately, the real purposes of this proposal are obscured in political motivations, emotionalism, claims of racial discrimination, alleged foreign policy embarrassments, and a contention that we are desperately in need of the skills of those who would be admitted under the new policy that is proposed.

Now, what are the real purposes of this bill? One man described it as a numbers game, and I think that is a fairly accurate description. The real purpose is to increase the number of people who can be admitted to this country each year. We might as well be frank about it.

The alleged discriminaion is, of course, ridiculous. Since admissions from various European countries is now based upon the ratio of people from those nations who were here in 1920, it would be just as sensible to contend that the Italians, the Russians, the French, or others discriminated against this country because more of them did not choose to emigrate here prior to 1920. In other words, discrimination has no place in this discussion.

Likewise, the claim that the State Department runs into embarrassing situations because all nations are not treated alike, is, in my judgment, flimsy and very farfetched. Other nations, in their wisdom, impose certain restrictions on admission of immigrants, and so do we. That is their business, and we have our business to look after.

The same is true of trade policies. Some of our people did not like the Common Market when it was announced some years ago. Diplomats representing the member nations that comprised the Common Market could have reported to their respective governments that they were embarrassed by claims of discrimination from some of their foreign counterparts. But who would contend that those countries were for that reason under any obligation to rescind their trade restrictions which were imposed to serve their own self-interest?

The matter of immigration policy, as with trade policy, is purely a domestic issue, and has always been treated as such by all countries.

It could, of course, be contended that we discriminate against the English, the French, the Italians, and all quota countries because we admit people from the Western Hemisphere without any quota restrictions at all. In a manner of speaking, that is true. But that is a part of our policy, the making of which comes under the head of our own business. The fact, for example, that we admit an Argentinean without regard to any quota does not mean that we consider that South American as a better person than an Englishman who can be admitted only under a strict quota.

I mention this to illustrate how ridiculous is the discrimination contention. It simply has no place in this discussion.

The real question to be resolved is: Do we need more immigrants? We now admit about 300,000 a year. Frankly, I think that is too many, under present conditions. We already have 196 million people in this country. The U.S. Census Bureau estimates that at the present rate of growth we will have 372 million by the turn of the century. By the year 2000 it is estimated world population will approximate 6 billion, and that at the present growth rate it will pass 25 billion by 2070.

It is imperative that we consider our normal population growth, and the population explosion around the world, in the fashioning of immigration policies for the admission of more people to this country.

Mr. Chairman, I am constrained to question the good faith of those who insist this legislation is needed in order to be able to admit more skilled people. Again, I am convinced that is an excuse, not a reason. I simply do not believe very many people are sincerely concerned about supplying more trained and skilled people for our labor market. I have not heard that appeal coming from prospective employers. On the contrary, it comes from the politicians and organized selfish-interest pressure groups as an excuse to justify their desire to have our restrictions broken down so more people can be admitted. Besides, our present law contains the same preferential treatment for skilled people as is proposed in H.R. 2580. Yet I understand that only 2,500 immigrants were admitted because of special skills last year.

NEW IMMIGRANTS SWELL RELIEF ROLLS

Another reason we do not need to increase the number of immigrants is because of the burden they become to so many localities in terms of unemployment, housing, education, crime, subversive activities, and assimilation problems in some instances.

It must be assumed that most of our new immigrants are good people and deserving. But despite the screening, the records are replete with instances of bad characters who, though relatively few in number, manage to get in despite all precautions.

We are told there are 35 million in this country who are poverty-stricken or are in that general category. We have scores of welfare programs, local, State, and Federal, the costs of which have increased astronomically in recent years. Yet, sponsors of this legislation want to admit more, a good many of whom would undoubtedly be added to relief rolls or would otherwise become burdensome. In other words, we have our hands full trying to handle our own problems with our 5 million unemployed and others who are in need of retraining, rehabilitation, and other types of help.

Now, what will the proposed increase amount to? Sponsors estimate it will be about 60,000 a year, bringing the total to about 360,000. If that is true, then why not put an overall ceiling of 360,000 on the total number who can be admitted in any one year, and write it into the law? I daresay sponsors would not stand for that.

The fact is that the increase will probably be substantially more than that if the bill is passed. There is simply no way of estimating the number of refugees, Asiatics, Africans, and others who would be admissible under the terms of H.R. 2580, because there is no way of determining in advance how many of the eligibles will choose to seek admission and how many of the applications will be granted. Estimates of the total increase run as high as 1 million a year. Perhaps that figure is a bit extravagant, but I will not be surprised if more than a half million come in each year under the Celler bill, if enacted.

In addition, we must assume that pressures for increases in the nonquota category will occur in the years ahead. Rate of population growth in Latin America is the highest in the world, and there is much poverty. It is estimated that the already overpopulated area of Latin America will double during the next 20 years. So we must brace ourselves for stepped-up pressures to admit more of those people.

The big increase under the Celler proposal would come primarily from Africa, Asia, and some from southern Europe.

Mr. Chairman, the far-reaching effect of this legislation is simply too important to be decided, or even influenced, on the basis of politics or emotionalism. We are playing for

keeps. Once this bill is enacted, the die is cast.

We already have a good immigration law. It has stood the test of time. The McCarran-Walter Act, which reenacted the provisions now under attack, was passed over a Presidential veto on June 26, 1952, by a vote of 278 to 112 in the House and 57 to 26 in the Senate. I am convinced the vast majority of Americans want it retained. I recently submitted a questionnaire to every voter in my district, and included the immigration issue. The responses, which have been tabulated, revealed that 78 percent of my constituents are opposed to the proposed changes. There is a lot more grassroot opposition to this bill than the sponsors realize.

Mr. Chairman, in considering this legislation let us think in terms of what is best for America and its future. Are we to become the dumping ground for the surplus populations of other countries?

Above everything, let us keep control of immigration in the Congress where it belongs. Someone wisely suggested that it would be better to have a mathematician select who comes here, under a formula, than to have a politician do it, without any formula at all. With that I agree.

I respectfully urge the committee to reject this bill.

Safeguards Against the Delinquency of Youth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an inspirational and eloquent address by the beloved 91-year-old President David O. McKay of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints at the opening of the church's 135th annual conference in Salt Lake City, Utah, last Sunday morning.

President McKay has developed those recognized safeguards necessary to combat the delinquency of youth—the home, the church, the school, and the moral atmosphere of the leaders of the Nation, town, and community. He has shown the necessary environment to which every child is entitled and pointed out many of the areas where the adults of this Nation are failing in their responsibilities.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, this significant spiritual sermon deserves the thoughtful consideration of every parent, every churchman, every educator, and every public official in our Nation. This can only serve to emphasize earlier concern voiced in these matters by the President of the United States in his message on crime.

President McKay's address follows:

SAFEGUARDS AGAINST THE DELINQUENCY OF YOUTH

(Address delivered by President David O. McKay at the 135th annual conference of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, held in the Salt Lake Tabernacle, Sunday, Apr. 4, 1965)

My brethren and sisters, and friends of the television and radio audience, as I approach this solemn duty, I sense fully the need of your united support, and particularly the sustaining and guiding influence of the spirit of the Lord.

"I charge thee", wrote Paul to Timothy, "before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ * * * teach the word; be instant in season, out of season; reprove, rebuke, exhort with all long-suffering" (II Timothy 4: 1–2).

In the same letter he prophetically declared "that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, * * * lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God: Having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof" (II Timothy 3: 1–2, 4–5).

It is in the spirit of Paul's charge and prophecy that I approach the subject of safeguards against delinquency of youth. In naming these safeguards, I have nothing new to offer. You have heard them mentioned frequently, but I think, as with the gospel principles, it is fitting that we be active in season and out of season, that we reprove, rebuke, exhort, admonish, with all long-suffering as we contemplate the rising crime wave, and bring home to each of use, if possible, the realization that greater diligence is needed.

Few will question the fact that we are living in perilous times; that many people have lost their moorings and are being "tossed to and fro with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive" (Ephesians 4: 14).

Among the glaring evils of our day are two which seem to be most detrimental, and which must be curbed if we would preserve true Christian ideals. These are: First, an increasing tendency to dishonor the marriage vow; and, second, the mounting juvenile delinquency. Careful research would undoubtedly disclose a close relationship between these two unwholesome social conditions.

As evidence of the first, we need only to glance at the number of divorces in the country at large. Recent statistics disclose that one out of every four marriages are separated by the ever-grinding divorce mill.

But it is the ever-increasing crime wave that I desire to call attention to this morning. Children are being corrupted by it; youth are caught in its whirlpool, and are being contaminated overwhelmingly by it.

J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, who is probably our Nation's leading authority on crime, made the following alarming report at a dinner held in his honor in Chicago, Ill., on November 24, 1964:

"To every man and every nation there comes a time when decisions must be made about grave problems. Further delay in seeking solutions can bring disaster. That time has come for the United States.

"The moment has arrived when we must face realistically the startling fact that since 1958 crime in this country has increased five times faster than our population growth. Serious crimes—murder, forcible rape, robbery, burglary, aggravated assault, automobile theft—have mounted steadily since the end of World War II. In 1951, these crimes for the first time topped the 1 million mark, and more than 2.25 million serious crimes were reported during 1963.

"Even more ominous is the fact that this terrifying spiral in crime has come about through a growing wave of youthful criminality across the Nation. Last year for the 15th consecutive year, crimes involving our young people increased over the previous year. For all serious crimes committed in the United States in 1963, youthful offenders were responsible for 72 percent of the total arrests for these crimes. The cost of our crime has now reached the staggering sum of $27 billion a year.

"What a grim and unhappy commentary on the moral climate of this great Nation. The moral strength of our Nation has decreased alarmingly. We must return to the teachings of God if we are to cure this sickness. These shocking statistics, together with the public's apparent indifference to them, are indicative of the false morality we are tolerating today. It is a false code which is based on the worship of things of man's own creation. It is as imperfect and feeble as man himself. However, captivating to the senses, this type of moral climate cannot give the support nor the strength which is so vital to our national survival. This breakdown in our moral standards can only render us impotent as a people and as a nation."

In calling attention to these conditions, I would not have you think that our young people generally do not merit our confidence. It is the few, not the many, of whom we now speak.

When, a few years ago, a little 4-year-old lad wandered into the Badlands of North Dakota, the whole countryside was aroused and organized for the rescue. They gave no thought, however, to the hundreds of 4-year-olds who were safe in their mothers' keeping. A train wreck or an airplane disaster shocks us to attention, awakens sympathy and a demand for more safeguards, while to the hundreds of trains and airplanes carrying millions to safety, we give scarcely a passing thought.

So while we solicitously call attention to the tragedies in the stream of human life, let us not be unmindful of the much greater group who move steadily and successfully along, avoiding the sandbars and rapids of sinful indulgence and spiritual decay, whose noble lives confirm and increase confidence in the growing generation. As we seek the lost sheep, let us be appreciative of the "ninety and nine" that are safe in the fold.

But no matter how firm our confidence is in the majority of the young, we must not close our eyes to the fact that the number of delinquents and youthful criminals is ominously increasing. In the interest of the moral atmosphere of our communities, the welfare of the State, the perpetuity of our democratic form of Government, we must search for the causes of this upswing in crime, and, if possible, remove them and apply the proper remedies.

One important cause of the increase in child delinquency is a let down in home ideals. A growing desire for economic independence, or a too eager willingness to improve financial circumstances, has influenced too many of our mothers to neglect the greatest of all responsibilities—the rearing of a family. Director Hoover makes the definite statement that "In the background of these youth offenders lies the story of shocking neglect. Boys and girls are being deprived of the care and guidance necessary to the proper foundation of their characters. Their lawlessness had its roots in every instance in broken homes where mothers and fathers, because of their neglect, misunderstanding, or irresponsibility had failed in their primary obligations. More often than not, God was unknown, or, more important, was unwelcome in their homes.

"On the other hand, in nearly every instance the youthful offender would have been a strong, upright citizen had he been given a chance. If his pent-up energies and desires had been directed along wholesome channels; if his problems—the problems that made him a problem child—had been solved by patient and attentive parents, he would have proved to be an influence for good in his community."

You may think me extreme, but I am going to say that a married woman who refuses to assume the responsibilities of motherhood, or who, having children, neglects them for pleasure or social prestige, is recreant to the highest calling and privilege of womankind. The father, who because of business or political or social responsibilities, fails to share with his wife the responsibilities of rearing

his sons and daughters, is untrue to his marital obligations, is a negative element in what might and should be a joyous home atmosphere, and is a possible contrbutor to discord and delinquency.

There are three fundamental things to which every child is entitled: (1) a respected name, (2) a sense of security, (3) opportunities for development.

The family gives to the child his name and standing in the community. A child wants his family to be as good as those of his friends. He wants to be able to point with pride to his father, and to feel an inspiration always as he thinks of his mother. It it a mother's duty so to live that her children will associate with her everything that is beautiful, sweet, and pure. In the words of former President of the United States, Herbert Hoover: "After we have determined every scientific fact, after we have erected every public safeguard, after we have constructed every edifice for education or training or hospitalization or play, yet all these things are but a tithe of the physical, moral, and spiritual gifts which motherhood gives and home confers. None of these things carry that affection, that devotion of soul, which is the great endowment from mothers."

And the father should so live that the child, emulating his example, will be a good citizen, and, in the church, a true Latter-day Saint.

A child has a right to feel that in his home he has a place of refuge, a place of protection from the dangers and evils of the outside world. Family unity and integrity are necessary to supply this need.

The home is the best place in the world to teach the highest ideal in the social and political life of man; namely, perfect liberty of action so long as you do not trespass upon the rights and privileges of another.

The great need of the American home today is more religion. Parents should make it obvious both by their actions and their conversation that they are seriously interested in the fruits of true religion. Example of parents should emphasize the need of honesty in our dealings with our family, our neighbors, and all with whom we come in contact; of kindness to our employees, of fair play to our employers, or good measure to our customers.

The Lord places the responsibility directly where it belongs, wherein He says that it is the duty of parents to teach their children the principles of the Gospel and to walk uprightly before the Lord, and if they do not so teach, the sin be upon the heads of the parents.

Next to the home as a safeguard to delinquency, the church should be a dominant force. The other day I was pleased to note a recent Gallup poll published in a late edition of the New York Herald Tribune, which revealed that in 1964 at least 45 percent of the entire adult population of the Nation attended church in one typical week, and that although the percentage dropped 4 points since the peak year of 1958, it is still so high that it completely eclipses the 5 percent and 7 percent in some of the other leading countries. It is interesting that although men are reputedly not very religious, 40 percent of the entire male adult population of the United States attends church each Sunday. Forty-nine percent of the women attend regularly. This means that 49,500,000 adult men and women attend church services in the United States. But what of the other 55 percent of men and women who do not attend church, and what of the children who come from the homes of these men and women? Their indifference toward church should tend only to spur us to more earnest and diligent activity.

Where there is an indifference toward Christian churches, we shall have to place next to the home, not the church, but the public school as the most influential factor in lessening delinquency.

I believe with all my heart that the most paramount objective of the public school system from kindergarten to the university should be character building and the evolving of true, loyal citizens of the Republic. The teaching of the three "R's," of the arts and sciences, even the delving into research work, should be but a means to the development of true manhood and noble womanhood.

True education is awakening a love for truth, a just sense of duty, opening the eyes of the soul to the great purpose and end of life. It is not teaching the individual to love the good for personal sake; it is to teach him to love the good for the sake of the good itself; to be virtuous in action because he is so in heart; to love and serve God supremely, not from fear, but from delight in His perfect character.

Upon the teacher rests much of the responsibility of lifting society to this high level. Ralph Waldo Emerson, reputedly the wisest American, said, "Character is higher than intellect. A great soul will be fit to live as well as to think."

Another safeguard against delinquency of youth is the moral atmosphere of the leaders of the Nation, town, and community. This is determined by the ideals and actions of adults, and particularly of civic officers and those who are entrusted to enforce the law.

If we are sincere in our desire to reduce the delinquency among youth, let us look to ourselves as members of the community and as leaders and officials in civic circles. A Nation that has conquered great material difficulties, and harnessed the physical powers, must have some more effective means of combatting the cynicism of its youth—the cynicism born of widely flaunted dishonesty of those in high places, insincerity of leadership, and gaudy pageantry of crime.

Yes, we are living in perilous times, but let us hope that they may be to the present generation as the fiery furnace that consumes the dross but purifies the gold.

A clean man is a national asset. A pure woman is the incarnation of true national glory. A citizen who loves justice and hates evil is better than a battleship. The strength of any community consists of and exists in the men who are pure, clean, upright, and straightforward, ready for the right and sensitive to every approach of evil. Let such ideals be the standard of citizenship.

Let us here and now express gratitude for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, with its priesthood quorums and auixiliary organizations especially organized to combat the evils of crime and juvenile delinquency. It was established by divine revelation of God the Father and His Son Jesus Christ. Its glorious mission is to proclaim the birth of the restored gospel, to uplift society that people may mingle more amicably one with another; to create in our communities a wholesome environment in which our children may find strength to resist temptation, and encouragement to strive for cultural and spiritual attainment; to make ineffective the influence of designing men who would make profit out of their fellows, who are fallen so low as to be slaves to their appetites and passions—and who would fill their purses through the weaknesses of addicts of gambling, drunkenness, and nicotine. The gospel is a rational philosophy that teaches men how to attain happiness in this life, and exaltation in the life to come.

God help us to discharge our responsibilities to our youth by making an environment in home, in school, in church, and in our communities that will be uplifting, wholesome, faith inspiring, I pray in the name of Jesus Christ. Amen.

Foreign Aid at the Grassroots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, Mr. J. Orrin Shipe, managing director of CUNA International, Inc., testified last month before the Foreign Affairs Committee of this House.

The Humphrey amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 made it the policy of the U.S. Government to use cooperatives, credit unions, and savings and loan associations to implement the self-help objectives of our economic assistance programs.

While revolts, palace intrigue, and civil unrest in the developing nations have made the headlines, CUNA has been quietly working at the grassroots level to improve the lot of the people in these countries. As Mr. Shipe states, over 800 credit unions have been chartered in Latin America and 600 more are awaiting their charter. The young credit unions have established a solid record of fiscal stability and reform. The results have been encouraging enough to warrant expansion of CUNA's efforts to Africa, Asia, and the South Pacific.

Mr. Speaker, I include the text of and appendix to Mr. Shipe's testimony for the CUNA International, Inc., so that the Members of the House may better understand this important link in the chain of reform binding the people of the United States to the aspirations of the peoples of the world:

STATEMENT OF J. ORRIN SHIPE, MANAGING DIRECTOR, CUNA INTERNATIONAL, INC. (FORMERLY CREDIT UNION NATIONAL ASSOCIATION), TO COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, less than a year ago I reported to you that technicians directed by CUNA International, Inc. (formerly Credit Union National Association), under a contract with the Agency for International Development had organized 600 credit unions in Latin America.

Today, I am happy to report that this number is now 800, with 600 more awaiting chartering authority. There are now about 420,000 credit union members in Latin America. Most of these members earn no more than $100 per year, and most have never saved before.

Savings of these members have now reached $16.5 million. Loans outstanding are now $22 million. Since 1962, Latin American credit unions have loaned $45 million. All these figures represent phenomenal growth.

But it is not by statistics alone that the success of the CUNA–AID program should be judged. We are finding that credit unions expand their members' horizons. Credit unions serve as training centers in the process of government; they afford members their first experience in democracy. The members readily accept the cardinal rule of credit unions: one member, one vote.

Probably most important from our point of view, and from the standpoint of U.S. foreign policy, the credit union has turned out to be an important vehicle to provide the

Latin American poor with a new self-reliance, a new self-respect, a new initiative.

A fine example is the community credit union in Iquitos, Peru. Iquitos is an isolated town in the jungle not far from the headwaters of the Amazon River. Organized in the poorest section of Iquitos, the credit union now is the largest in Peru. It has more than 3,500 members who have saved about $1 million. In Peru, this is a remarkable achievement. But most significantly, the credit union has proven to be a springboard for community action programs. It is now financing a low-cost housing project for its members.

All over Latin America, credit unions are leading people to appreciate their own power. Once a successful credit union gets underway, it serves as the foundation for other developmental projects. The members move forward with confidence, bolstered by their success with the credit union.

This improvement in motivation does not come about automatically. Our technicians have operated educational programs for 4,000 Latin Americans in over 120 seminars.

I should like to point out that CUNA has contracted both with AID and with the Peace Corps. There is a particularly strong development program underway in Eucador under Peace Corps auspices. In addition, CUNA itself has for some years undertaken development work on its own before the involvement of the U.S. Government. This involvement has simply accelerated our expansion activities.

In order to supply the committee with more detailed information, I am filing an appendix to this statement. The appendix contains information on all our programs: CUNA–AID, CUNA-Peace Corps, and CUNA alone.

You will note that our activities are not limited to Latin America. Our work in Africa is just beginning. We have made a good start in Korea. Plans are being formulated for programs in India and Pakistan. We are committed to moving ahead.

APPENDIX TO STATEMENT OF J. ORRIN SHIPE

The Humphrey amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 made it the policy of the U.S. Government to use cooperatives, credit unions, and savings and loan associations to help implement the self-help objectives of our foreign aid program. Their use, it was felt, would add a new people-to-people dimension to U.S. Government efforts to assist developing countries.

To implement this new program, the International Cooperative Development Service was set up in the Office of Material Resources in AID/Washington, and authorized to enter into a series of global openend contracts with U.S. cooperative organizations qualified to help establish cooperatives abroad. To date seven contracts are in force, one with the Credit Union National Association (CUNA), of Madison, Wis., and six other national cooperative organizations.

CREDIT UNIONS AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

A credit union is a cooperative association organized to promote thrift among its members and to accumulate a fund from these savings to make needed loans to members for useful purposes at reasonable interest rates.

It also has been described as a uniting of the efforts and knowledge of a group of people who have a common bond and share a common need for accumulating savings, providing a source of credit and developing or fostering among themselves cooperative action. Credit unions are a means by which people get together and work together toward the solution of one of the chief problems affecting developing communities, the satisfaction of basic human needs through self-help.

In uniting efforts toward the solution of their problems through credit unions, each individual in the group participates in the activity which causes the group to improve or develop.

A credit union can be started in any group: people working for the same employer; people who live in the small community; people who are members of the same church, labor union, or fraternal order. Membership is open to everyone in the group. Basically, every credit union is a group of friends and acquaintances who want to help each other. The only purpose of a credit union is service—not charity or profit.

CREDIT UNIONS—A MEANS OF SAVINGS

Communities in Latin America are assuming responsibility for the management of local affairs. They have to manage their limited capital assets to increase production and to develop and improve their standard of living and way of life.

The pattern of development in Latin American and other less-developed countries has had the effect of providing the larger share of proceeds from industry or agriculture, whether in profits or emoluments to the main towns. The remaining proceeds have been spread among the indigenous population at a low per capita income rate. Millions of people are continually in servitude during most of their lives and in many cases pay interest several times the amount of the principal. Reputable organizations providing natives with credit for personal or productive use are practically nonexistent; in most instances, they are limited to the usurer.

The internal mobilization of capital has to be accomplished first by using these small sums on a broad base, and the best, indeed, the only way in which this is economically feasible is through a credit union, where the self-help aspect eliminates the administrative cost of the operation.

Credit unions throughout the world have always maintained truly self-help programs. This feature of credit union development is most important, especially in developing countries where people in these countries often look outside of themselves and their communities for the solution of their problems:

Even in the cooperative movement itself at times due to a lack of this self-help feature, development has taken place without this effective financial contribution or active participation in management from the people within the local community.

CREDIT UNIONS—BASIC FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Credit unions are set up and operated for and by groups of interested people who have some established interests with each other or some existing common bond. They are legally chartered by government, and are usually supervised by the chartering agency, but are otherwise fully owned and controlled by their members under the one-member one-vote process. Day-to-day operations are carried on by a board of directors, and a credit and supervisory committee operating under delegated authority from members and according to accepted bylaws and operating policies.

Credit unions offer numerous benefits and services to members varying from group to group. Basic standard benefits include:

1. Encouraging, motivating, and providing a ready facility to help members practice thrift by systematically saving—even very small amounts of their incomes.

2. Providing low-cost loans.

3. Providing finance and budget counseling.

4. Planning expenditures, keeping out of heavy debt involvement to high-rate lenders.

5. Frequently providing services such as insurance coverages for loans and insurance to match member savings, and insurance protection against losses which may arise in its financial operations.

6. Education of members and training of officers in finance management through the democratic process.

The key to credit union success with low-income people is perhaps the feeling of group solidarity growing out of group action, and the confidence developing in these finance institutions that are member owned and controlled. Credit unions exist—to some degree—in some 75 countries of the world and are increasing steadily.

CUNA INTERNATIONAL, INC.

CUNA was organized in 1934 as an association of credit unions in the United States. In 1940, Canada was admitted and in 1946 membership was expanded to include credit unions in the Western Hemisphere. Since 1957, all credit unions through the free world are eligible for the services which CUNA International provides.

CUNA International, the credit unions' own international confederation, serves and coordinates this worldwide program. AID is using credit union technicians provided by CUNA to help implement the Humphrey amendment in its cooperative development programs; and helping credit union people extend this worldwide thrift service to the people of developing countries to which CUNA is fully committed.

CUNA's specific goals are to promote the organization of new credit unions; perfect credit union laws in the States, provinces, and countries in which credit unions operate; improve methods and techniques of credit union operations, and coordinate and direct the efforts of all credit unions in their drive to give the people throughout the world an opportunity to economic, social and educational advancement through self-help.

CUNA, through its World Extension Department, has been engaged for more than a decade in channeling assistance for the development of credit unions in many developing countries. This assistance by the people in credit unions did not begin with the creation of the World Extension Department of CUNA in 1954. It was the outgrowth of a desire to insure that assistance as was customarily given by credit union members to less developed countries for this purpose be better deployed and also extended. Prior to this time, many United States and Canadian provincial leagues had been assisting credit union development in the Caribbean and in South America.

Within the limits of its resources, CUNA has tried to answer the great number of requests for assistance it is receiving at its Madison headquarters. It is with such assistance to local leaders by guidance and training that a sound and stable credit union development is taking place in the Caribbean Islands of Jamaica, Trinidad, the West Indies, and the Netherlands Antilles; in the Latin American countries of Mexico, Venezuela, Ecuador, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia Peru, Panama, Guatemala, El Salvador, Honduras, Costa Rica, Nicaragua, and in the Pacific in the Fiji Islands, Samoa and Korea; and in Tanzania, Kenya, Ghana, and Nigeria in Africa.

In 1961, following on the Humphrey amendment, the Alliance for Progress decided to include assistance to the South American countries participating in the program for the development of credit unions, cooperatives, and savings and loan associations. Following this, a contract was signed with the Credit Union National Association to develop credit unions.

Under the leadership of CUNA technicians, credit unions have increased in Latin America from 432 in September 1962, to over 1,200 by December 1964, with over 600 additional groups awaiting charters; members increased from 124,000 to 420,000; savings of members from $4.2 million to $16.5 million, and loans

outstanding to members from $4 million to $18 million. Loans are made for some 25 different purposes covering personal or consumer loans, farm production loans, self-help housing loans, and loans to start small business enterprises.

Growth approximated or exceeded 100 percent in each of these 2 years. Considering that most members earn $100 per annum or less, this overall growth is phenomenal. The new program is saving low income credit union members of Latin America an estimated $3 million or more annually by way of interest charges, and is raising $40 or more in new capital for each $1 of technical assistance cost. In addition, it is establishing a new and completely self-sustaining and self-perpetuating program for the low income people of Latin America.

Some of the reasons for credit union success are:

1. It is a simple type cooperative.

2. It deals with only one commodity—money.

3. It creates no new problems; it is set up only to solve problems already existent.

4. It is less vulnerable to competition because it is self-contained and operates in the closed circuit of its own members.

5. Other enterprises need capital with which to start operations, but the credit union, in the process of developing capital, is carrying on one of the two main functions of the society—savings.

6. The credit union can be scaled down to meet the needs of the lowliest people, as well as meet the needs of the most demanding, and it can be brought within the grasp of all people.

The extent of this unsatisfied need among less developed peoples of the world has been clearly shown by the part that CUNA, with its limited resources, has played in the launching of credit unions in some 70 countries and territories as shown hereunder:

United States	22,000
Canada	4,700
Africa:	
Basutoland	3
Ethiopia	3
Ghana	20
Kenya	3
Malawi	2
Mauritius	1
Nigeria Republic	19
Sierre Leone	4
Southern Rhodesia	2
Tanzania	40
Uganda	8
Zambia	2
Asia:	
Hong Kong	3
Korea	71
Pakistan	13
Thailand	75
Vietnam	20
Latin America:	
British Honduras	44
Costa Rica	34
El Salvador	46
Guatemala	8
Honduras	37
Mexico	535
Nicaragua	1
Panama	42
Argentina	3
Bolivia	73
Brazil	80
British Guiana	17
Chile	112
Colombia	211
Ecuador	104
Paraguay	2
Peru	396
Surinam	15
Uruguay	3
Venezuela	75
Australasia:	
Capital Territory	5
New Guinea-Papua-Solomon	14
New South Wales	186
Queensland	14
South Australia	4
Tasmania	9
Victoria	86
Western Australia	7
Caribbean Islands:	
Anguilla	2
Antigua	7
Barbados	17
Cayman Islands	1
Dominica	20
Dominican Republic	28
Grenada	16
Haiti	29
Jamaica	127
Montserrat	6
Netherland Antilles	56
St. Kitts	4
St. Lucia	5
St. Vincent	8
Trinidad-Tobago	133
Pacific Islands:	
Fiji	284
New Zealand	8
Philippines	671
Tonga	1
Western Samoa	20

The assets of these credit unions amount to approximately:

[In thousands]

U.S. territories and possessions	$9,100,000
Canada	2,150,000
Africa	875
Asia	10,000
Australasia	19,000
Caribbean islands	9,500
Pacific islands	4,800
Latin America	16,500

The strength of the credit union movement is not its monetary assets, important as they are. Its greatest value is its contribution to the growth and development of its members, its practical demonstration of democracy at work, its development of leaders from among its membership, its demonstration of private enterprise as a means for attaining social, economic, and political freedom.

CUNA has played a dynamic role in these developments.

Cooperation between AID and CUNA has resulted in the extension and acceleration of credit unions in the developing countries Since the first agreement in 1962—the agreement to develop credit union systems in Latin America—AID has broadened the scope of the partnership—in January 1963—to include all other regional areas.

As I mentioned in my covering statement to this appendix, the development work carried on by CUNA International takes three forms: The CUNA–AID program, the CUNA-Peace Corps program, and the work of CUNA alone. The figures in the tables above give a good indication of the progress of each of these programs.

For example, the CUNA–AID contracts have been limited up to now to work in a dozen countries of Latin America: Venezuela, Brazil, Peru, Colombia, Bolivia, Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Costa Rica, Panama, Nicaragua, and El Salvador. Additional credit union programs can be started in a country under the CUNA–AID program on the basis of a task order worked out by the local AID mission.

Feasibility surveys have been mounted in Ethiopia, Sudan, Nigeria, Tunisia, and Sierra Leone. The average cost per country of a credit union organizing program is $50,000. On the basis of present performance, each technical assistance dollar expended in Latin America has generated over $40 in new capital through credit union savings.

Activities with the Peace Corps have been confined to Ecuador, where an intensive organizing program has gotten underway.

The remaining credit union development listed in the above tables is due to the CUNA world extension program operating alone and independent of any government support.

Strong areas of credit union development outside of Latin America include Australia, Jamaica, Netherlands Antilles, Trinidad-Tobago, Fiji, and the Philippines. We are proud of the support of credit union leagues in the United States and Canada which has made this development possible. Out of this development have come many heartening examples of what credit unions are accomplishing.

A peasant woman in Arequipa, Peru, near the Chilean border, exercised her credit union membership rights by borrowing the equivalent of $22—not a significant sum—but nevertheless, an amount of money sufficient to enable her to buy three used beds for her nine children, the first time any member of the family had slept off the ground.

In Peru, the poor people in the isolated jungle town of Iquitos, not far from the headwaters of the Amazon River, have shown how a credit union can influence an entire community's growth. Organized in the poorest section of the town, the credit union is now the largest in Peru. It has more than 3,500 members, deposits approximate $1 million, and has started financing low-cost housing projects among its members.

From September 1962, to December 1964, savings held by Latin American credit unions have increased at a phenomenal rate: from $4.2 to $16.5 million, in excess of a threefold increase.

There are other examples of opportunities opened by credit unions: a loan permitting a young lawyer to pay for his license to practice; a newly licensed dentist to buy his equipment; a mechanic to open his own tire recapping shop.

Credit unions also expand people's knowledge. They act as training centers, teaching people with limited training a basic understanding of the truth about their country's development, and having them participate in this development in a democratic manner. For the first time, in most cases, they practice the basic principles of democracy.

Credit unions are also bringing people and their communities out of isolation. Through uniting their savings into significant sums, they are being brought into the mainstream of their country's economic life, and are becoming an integral part of their country's development.

This remarkable progress is directly attributable to the education and training programs, programs designed not only to instill technical competence, but also to develop local leadership.

CUNA has provided this type of training to more than 4,000 volunteers in over 120 seminars throughout Latin America.

Among local communities, it is in the awakening of the recognition of this need, capacity, and ability to help themselves that the credit union has made its best contribution to development. Only those who have seen the self-reliance, self-respect, and initiative which a credit union engenders can fully appreciate the extent to which this is true. Credit unions, simple as they may seem, have tapped the greatest national resources of many countries through their success in bringing about this awareness by their self-help cooperative program. Where

this recognition is awakened, there will be a great willingness to participate fully and freely in development ventures. Without this recognition, all other efforts are likely to fail in the long run.

Polish American Newspaperman John Switalski Recalls Turkish Atrocities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, an article by Mr. John Switalski which appeared in the Polish American, March 30, was reproduced in the Hairenik Weekly, a journal of the Armenian Revolutionary Federation of North America, Thursday, April 1.

In view of its tremendous historic importance, the nationwide observance of the sufferings of the Armenian people 50 years ago is most noteworthy, and numerous publications are reviewing this great tragedy of the Armenian people.

The article is of special interest since in a very timely fashion it places the anniversary of the Turkish genocide against the Armenians in a very broad perspective.

With leave granted I place the article in the RECORD at this point:

POLISH AMERICAN NEWSPAPERMAN JOHN SWITALSKI RECALLS TURKISH ATROCITIES

(By John Switalski)

We are nearing the 50th anniversary of the first monstrous act of genocide in the 20th century. In April of 1915 the rulers of Turkey saw fit to wipe out the Armenian nation, the oppressed ancient inhabitants of Asia Minor and the Caucasus. One-half of the Armenian people were savagely massacred or driven to starvation and death in the Syrian Desert. The remainder had to abandon ancestral homes and flee into exile.

The Turkish atrocities excited indignation throughout the Allied countries during World War I and, after the defeat of the Central Powers, an attempt was made to restore an independent Armenia. The Armenians who returned to their Caucasian heartland, however, had to resume fighting both the Turks and the Russian Bolsheviks. President Woodrow Wilson asked Congress to establish an American mandate in Armenia to help the gallant nation maintain its existence. Isolationist-minded Congressmen succeeded in frustrating Wilson's intentions.

So Armenia once more was partitioned between Turkey and Russia. The Bolsheviks, of course, set up an "Armenian Soviet Republic," Red heads of which immediately began a new massacre of the Armenian national patriots who had fought for their country's freedom.

So tyrannous was the Communist rule of Armenia that the people rose in 1921 and drove out their oppressors. This was the first time any nation ever overthrew a Communist regime without outside help. A few months later, however, the Russian Red Army restored rule to the Armenian Communist Quislings.

Two years later this oldest Christian nation got its Yalta: the Lausanne Treaty. The Allies made a feeble attempt to bargain for an independent Armenia but when the Turkish representative threatened to walk out the Armenian case was shelved.

The Allies' betrayal of Armenia to a defeated power was bad enough, but the failure to punish Ottoman Turkey for the genocide was not only reprehensible but nurtured the terrible genocide of World War II. Hitler was to say, "The world forgot about the Armenians," and then proceeded to liquidate 6 million—mostly Polish—civilians.

(Ironically, it was a pre-Hitlerian German court that acquitted Soghomon Tehlirian, the Armenian hero who assassinated in Berlin Talaat Pasha, the Turkish interior minister who directed the Armenian massacres in 1915.)

Today the struggle for an Armenian identity continues in Soviet-occupied Caucasus, where another very ancient nation, Georgia, attempted an uprising in 1956. It is hard to understand why the U.S. Government does not remind the world of these captive nations each time the Kremlin denounces the United States for trying to keep southeast Asian countries free.

Besides the semicolonial satellites (Poland, Hungary, etc.) imperialist Russia maintains outright colonies in both of these countries, White Ruthenia (Byelorussia), Ukraine, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. And that's not all. In central Asia the vast country of Turkestan remains partitioned between Soviet Russia and Red China while new African states are born almost weekly.

The Poles, Lithuanians, Ukrainians, Slovaks, and Armenians all have cousins in the United States to remind the West of their enslavement. But the Kazakhs, Kirgiz, Uzbek, Tadjik, and Uighur peoples of Turkistan have no spokesmen in the West. Not even their Moslem coreligionists the leaders of the Arab States, have the traditional Islamic courage to lift their voices in the United Nations on behalf of their enslaved brethren. Not even at a time when they are giving arms and propaganda support to the non-Moslem, Communist-led Congolese terrorists. They are closer to Hitler and Stalin in ideology and character than to Feisal, Jinnah, and Hatta. Hence there are no spontaneous Arab demonstrations to protest Sukarno's imprisonment of Hatta.

For geopolitical reasons, Russia's rule over central Asia is less oppressive than is Red China's (compare Austria's rule in Galicia with Russian and Prussian of the Poles). Therefore, Communist China's effort to deprive the Kazakh, Kirgiz, and Uighur peoples of their language and culture has caused tens of thousands of these Tartar peoples to flee into the Soviet Union from Sinkiang (Chinese-held eastern Turkistan). But the Russians also have forced the Kazakh, Kirgiz, Tadjik, and Uzbek Soviet republics to substitute the Cyrillic alphabet for the Arabic formerly used. Russification continues.

The Tibetans, too, lack blood relatives in the West to write to Congressmen reminding them of Red China's imperialism. Few Tibetan exiles have reached the West and while India has granted asylum to their leader, the Dalai Lama, he is not permitted to make any pleas for the freedom of his unhappy country. How Gandhi must turn in his grave.

What an eloquent speech U.S. Ambassador Adlai Stevenson could make were he to remind the U.N. of Russo-Chinese Communist colonialism in central Asia.

District of Columbia Crime

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, prevention of crime is everyone's business. This is so in the District of Columbia just as it is in New York.

In connection with this I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial broadcast during the week of March 21, 1965, by WMAL here in Washington:

DISTRICT CRIME

The failure of some District residents to give full support to the Metropolitan Police Department has helped increase the city's crime rate. Others remain indifferent to the crime problem. Almost no one wants to get involved by volunteering as a witness or notifying police of a crime.

Two recent cases point up the problem. In both cases policemen needed help in making arrests and asked bystanders to call the precinct for reinforcements. In both cases the people refused. In one case onlookers laughed at the officers who were struggling with the suspect. In the other incident bystanders kicked and jeered the arresting officer.

Unless there is a change in attitude, the city's crime rate will continue to spiral upward. Crime prevention is everyone's business. The President's Commission on Crime can help direct efforts to reduce crime, but it will need the full cooperation of every citizen.

Mexican Tomato Imports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I draw the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives to the following article by the Council of California Growers, which appeared in their March 22, 1965, issue of Insight:

LOS ANGELES.—Approximately 80 percent of the fresh tomatoes handled in the Los Angeles fruit and vegetable wholesale markets in January were grown in Mexico. In the San Francisco-Oakland markets Mexican tomatoes represented roughly 30 percent of the total.

This is a 30-percent increase over the same month 5 years ago in the Los Angeles markets and helps explain the sharp decrease in the acreage of winter tomatoes grown in the Coachella and Imperial Valleys, says the Council of California Growers.

"California growers of fresh tomatoes and other winter vegetables are finding it increasingly difficult to compete against Mexican growers with lower labor and tax costs," it was pointed out by O. W. Fillerup, executive vice president of the council.

"In Mexico," said Fillerup, "the average farmworker receives the equivalent of about $1.56 per day. In California, the Mexican bracero earned an average of about $1.39 per hour on piece rates during 1963.

"During the current controversy over the farm labor shortage, agriculture's critics continue to say that the problem can be solved simply by increasing wages. California growers, already paying the highest wages in the United States, did increase their pay scales since the end of the bracero program, but still they haven't been able to attract enough domestic workers to fill the bracero gap in such crops as citrus.

"The big question is: How much more can California growers increase wages without pricing themselves out of the markets?

"Mexico and other States of the United States with lower labor costs have the potential to supply our domestic markets if California growers are forced out of competition. Mexico, for example, has doubled her irrigated acreage in the past 12 years, from 6 million to 12 million acres, most on the west coast within easy access to our markets."

The council obtained its figures on Mexican products sold in the Los Angeles and San Francisco-Oakland markets from the Agricultural Marketing Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

In the Nation: The GOP Substitute Voting Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column by Mr. Arthur Krock which appeared in the April 6, 1965, edition of the New York Times.

THE GOP SUBSTITUTE VOTING BILL
(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON.—The substitute for the Katzenbach-Dirksen voting rights bill that was offered to Congress today by the House Republican leadership vitally serves the public interest in a number of ways.

It is a great improvement over the measure which President Johnson urged Congress to rush through virtually intact. For example, it is national in scope instead of discriminatory among areas where, by the administration's own formula for determining that Negro voting rights have been denied, this denial is a fixed practice. The improvement is accomplished by placing the burden of proof of nondiscrimination on a county-by-county instead of a State-by-State basis.

PROVISIONS OUTLINED

The House Republican bill preserves the common right of all States, granted by article I of the Constitution to require literacy tests if these are administered without violation of the 15th amendment's ban on racial discrimination. But these tests would not be required of applicants with at least a sixth-grade education, whereas the Katzenbach-Dirksen bill would open the ballot to many illiterates by abolishing all literacy tests in some, but not all, of the States which fall within its presumption that, since less than 50 percent of Negro voting eligibles voted in the presidential election of 1964, there exists a fixed pattern of racial discrimination.

AVENUES OF APPEAL

The proposed substitute also opens more direct channels of appeal, to the judicial and executive branches of the Federal Government, for qualified Negro voters with complaints of racial discrimination. And by rejecting the arbitrary formula of the Dirksen-Katzenbach measure that is based on a State's voting statistics of November 1964, but applicable only to certain of the States reached by the formula, the House Republican bill would not penalize communities innocent of fixed discrimination with those guilty of it.

The substitute will not satisfy those who hold that the 15th amendment cannot constitutionally limit the grant of article I to the States to prescribe voting qualifications, if these do not violate the ban of the amendment on their use for racially discriminatory purposes. In this opinion, only by another constitutional amendment can Congress be empowered to require a State—New York, for illustration—to accept a sixth- instead of an eighth-grade certificate as a qualification for voting. But these objectors have no visible prospect of inducing the congressional leaders of either major party, or a congressional majority, to legislate their view of the limitation of the 15th amendment on article I. And few, if any, lawyers or political observers believe it would stand a chance of affirmation by the current Supreme Court.

BILL'S CONSTITUTIONALITY

In point is a remark attributed to a highly placed Government lawyer by a visiting member of the profession, in response to the question whether the official was confident the administration bill is constitutional: "I'd rather you asked me if I am confident the Supreme Court will so declare it."

This confidence conceivably might have been justified, even if the test before the Supreme Court had been of the original Katzenbach-Dirksen text. But meanwhile the authors have modified provisions which could have strained the constitutional concepts of justices most inclined to resolve doubts of legality in legislation whose purpose they ardently approve. These modifications, however, left untouched inequitable and hamhanded provisions which (except for New York's requirement of literacy in English), are the target of the House Republican substitute.

Some of these defects are accidental in measures such as the Katzenbach-Dirksen bill, drafted under the pressure of partisan and personal competition for popular credit as well as the pressure generated by the President's demand for quick action. But the textual consequences in this instance demonstrate once again the services to the public interest of time for analysis of drastic programs by a congressional minority which fulfills the function of a constructive opposition.

A PUBLIC SERVICE

By assuming the role of coauthor of the President's bill, and supporting Mr. Johnson's foreshortened timetable, Senate Minority Leader DIRKSEN abdicated these important public services to the House Republican leadership. It has now performed them.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Appendix

Tribute to Dr. Raymond L. Smith, President, Michigan Technological University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND F. CLEVENGER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, April 9, 1965, I shall have the opportunity to join with other Michigan citizens to pay tribute to Dr. Raymond L. Smith, president of Michigan Technological University, at Houghton, Mich., in the Upper Peninsula.

Those of us who will be present for Dr. Smith's inauguration as the seventh president of Michigan Tech, are well aware of the contributions he has made to education in general, to Michigan Technological University, and to the State of Michigan as a dedicated educator. In connection with his inauguration, I take this opportunity to place in the RECORD Dr. Smith's biography which has appeared in Michigan publications:

BIOGRAPHY OF DR. RAYMOND L. SMITH

In the spring of 1939 a skinny kid from the Maine backwoods stepped off the boat at Seward, Alaska. He had just turned 22 years of age and his only possessions were $50 in cash, a few clothes and a few tools. He had come to seek his fortune.

The youth's plans at that point were a bit nebulous, but the one thing he had not considered was enrolling in a university. On January 1 he became the president of one.

Last week Dr. Raymond L. Smith sat in his office and pondered his recent appointment as the eighth chief executive of Michigan Technological University. The road to this post is studded with enough quirks of fate and ironies to make it almost too incredible for even the standard Horatio Alger story.

That road started many years ago back in Vanceboro, Maine, where Dr. Smith was born. Despite some economic hard times he recalls a relatively happy childhood doing all the things any kid would do that was raised in the woods.

The new president's first jobs were in the lumber camps of the area, and by the time he was 18 he was a veteran of several big river drives from the logging camps to the mills. During the early depression years he worked in restaurants and picked up other odd jobs.

"We spent a lot of time riding the rods and in open boxcars," Dr. Smith says. "We'd hear about a job somewhere and hop the next freight to get there." His steadiest work during the 1930's was from 1935 to 1938 when he served as a psychiatric aid at the Institute of Living, then called the Hartford Retreat, a mental institution in Hartford, Conn.

A few years earlier the young Smith had obtained a private pilot's license, and by 1938 he and some friends had saved enough money to purchase an old Great Lakes biplane. While the dickering was going on, another friend approached him with glowing tales about the land of opportunity in Alaska.

The day the airplane deal was closed, Dr. Smith backed out of it and withdrew his share of the money. That same day the airplane crashed on its first flight by its new owners, and the next day Smith left for Alaska.

First he went to Seattle, and spent his last money for some tools and steerage ticket to Seward.

"Imagine our disappointment," Dr. Smith recalls, "when we eventually made our way to Fairbanks, and instead of finding work, we found breadlines.

"At that time," he says, "the Alaska Steamship Lines provided the only transportation to and from Alaska. We were warned if you ended up on relief, you would be shipped out of Alaska and never sold another ticket to return, and we didn't want that."

Then somebody tipped them there was a little college outside of town a few miles—the University of Alaska—and they might find odd jobs there. The first person they ran into on the campus was a shabbily dressed man in overalls, who tried to interest the two boys in enrolling in college.

"He said maybe if we'd go see the president, or somebody with authority, we might get a job, and going to school wouldn't cost much," Dr. Smith explains, but we had no intention of going to college.

Then the man, whom they thought was the janitor, told them he had a rundown cabin in the nearby woods, and they would be welcome to stay there if they wanted to fix it up. They agreed immediately, and spent the remainder of the summer renovating the cabin and laying in a supply of firewood.

"Later we went to see the college president," Dr. Smith said, "and, believe it or not, it turned out to be the man in the overalls—Dr. Charles E. Bunnell, the first president of the University of Alaska. He was a great man, and probably had more influence on my later life than any other person."

Dr. Bunnell not only gave the boys part-time jobs, but talked them into enrolling in college as well.

Dr. Smith earned his degree in mining engineering with an option in metallurgy in 1943. As a member of the Enlisted Reserve Corps he was soon called to active duty in the Army. Because of his metallurgical option he was sent to Aberdeen Proving Grounds, Md., for basic training and cadre school, and he became an instructor in instrument repair.

It was during his Army service that the then Corporal Smith met Beatrice Bennett, of Hartford. After 6 months they were married. "We named our first son Bennett (but they call him "Biff" so I wouldn't forget Bea's maiden name."

After the war he returned to Alaska to teach at the University of Alaska for 3 years.

In 1949 the Smiths went to the University of Pennsylvania where he was a research associate and did graduate work. He obtained his M.S. degree in metallurgical engineering there in 1951 and his Ph. D. degree in the same field in 1953.

After earning his doctoral degree, Dr. Smith joined the research branch of the Franklin Institute in Philadelphia, which has one of the largest nonprofit research laboratories in the Nation. He began as a senior research metallurgist and by 1958 had been made technical director of the laboratories.

This latter position entailed not only the technical direction of the laboratories proper, but helping to maintain financial support from government and industry and supervising a large staff of varied scientists, engineers, and technicians.

In 1959 he joined the Michigan Tech faculty as professor and head of the department of metallurgical engineering, and a year later took on the additional duties as coordinator of research.

He has served on most of the major faculty and administrative committees of the university and most recently has been an active member of the long-range planning committee. A program formulated by this committee was formally adopted by the board of control last October.

The program, designed to accommodate a 9,000 enrollment by 1975, has two principal objectives: improve the university as a center of engineering and science and meeting the growing demand for college education of all kinds.

Included in the program are plans to expand all areas of the university's operation, particularly graduate enrollment, research and service through the division of continuing education, establishing a liberal arts degree program on the Houghton campus in 1965 and establishing 4-year degree programs on the Sault Ste. Marie campus in 1965.

Under Dr. Smith's direction, Tech's Department of Metallurgical Engineering has become one of the largest and most respected in the Nation. It has also become the most active academic department on the campus in research, obtaining governmental and industrial research contracts totaling about half a million dollars during the past 5 years.

For several years Dr. Smith has been engaged in research involving ultra-high-purity iron, and has produced through a tedious laboratory process some of the purest iron in the world.

Dr. Smith holds membership in many professional societies and has held numerous key offices on a national level in such organizations as the American Institute of Mining, Metallurgical, and Petroleum Engineers (AIME).

Dr. Smith celebrated his 48th birthday last January 25, but both his actions and appearance belie his age. His hair is becoming increasingly touched with gray, but his 5-foot, 10-inch frame is draped with a compact 155 pounds—scarcely 10 pounds more than he weighed when he stepped off the boat in Alaska that day so long ago.

He is an avid outdoorsman, an accomplished trick water skier and likes both participant and spectator sports, particularly ice hockey. His favorite activities are hunting and fishing and he likes to ski and golf when time permits, but he has a particular fondness for the water.

For the past 4 years the Smiths and their two sons, Biff, a 17-year-old high school senior, and Martin, a 6-year-old first-grader, have lived in a comfortable lakeside house on Chassell Bay, about 10 miles south of the Tech campus.

The new university president, called "Ray" by most of his friends and Tech colleagues, is a personable easygoing type. He can be roused to anger on occasion, but his ire subsides quickly, and he is not the type to be

vindictive or hold a grudge. By regularly taking home sheaves of paper he crowds several days work into any 24-hour period, and has been known to work aboard one of his light boats in search of reprieve from the jangling telephone.

The papers, technical journals, and other paraphernalia that litter the desks and tables in his office look like they've been left there by a howling nor'easter. Usually, however, he can locate at a moment's notice whatever memo or scrap of paper that is needed to answer the particular question about the particular project he is concentrating on at the moment.

Reaction on the Tech campus to his appointment has been almost 100 percent favorable despite the ever-present difficulty of trying to please all of the people all of the time. As one campus wag summed it up, "there will probably be one or two people on the faculty who aren't happy with the board of control's decision, and if they are against it, is only shows what a good decision it was."

Appalachia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the historic Appalachian regional development bill, which I cosponsored, is now law. This act will not in itself eliminate poverty in the Appalachian region, but it will provide opportunities for countless impoverished human beings to help themselves to a better life.

One of the best expositions of the need for this legislation, and the accomplishments that can be expected now that it is law, was published in the March issue of the National Limestone Institute's publication, Limestone. I ask unanimous consent that this informative article, by Edmund W. Woodbury, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APPALACHIA 1965–71

(By Edmund W. Woodbury, former legislative assistant to Congressman PAUL FINDLEY, Republican, of Illinois; Congressman JAMES C. CLEVELAND, Republican, of New Hampshire, and currently assistant to the president of NLI)

Does passage of the Appalachia bill herald a broad new policy of the Federal Government?

Passage by Congress of the $1,092,400,000 Appalachian regional development bill seems likely to herald a broad new policy of the Federal Government of attempting to attack regional economic and social problems on a vast scale with a wide range of programs coordinated under one planning authority. Key feature of the legislation is an accelerated 5-year roadbuilding program totaling $840 million in Federal funds for 2,350 miles of development highways and 1,000 miles of local access roads. The remaining $252.4 million will support a series of measures designed to combat the geographical causes of poverty in the Appalachian Mountain region of our country. Federal aid would be given for reclamation of public lands destroyed by strip mining, stepped-up vocational education, construction and temporary maintenance of health facilities, research on water resource control and development, construction of sewage treatment plants, loans for timber development organizations, and increased availability of funds for State and community participation in Federal grant-in-aid programs. In addition there would be long-term contracts for up to 10 years, with landowners and operators, for soil stabilization, erosion and sediment control, reclamation through land-use changes and other conservation measures to develop soil, water, woodland, wildlife, and recreation resources.

Serving only as a planning, research, and coordinating function in the execution of the program, the Appalachian Regional Commission will be made up of a Federal member appointed by the President and the Governor and his representative from each of the 11 States included by the act. The Federal member would serve as cochairman with another cochairman elected by the State representatives.

The multiprogram campaign against economic causes of poverty in Appalachia will be expensive. Total Federal contributions up to July 1, 1971, when the program is scheduled to terminate will amount to an estimated $2 billion. Lesser State shares of the cost of the Appalachian regional development program will swell the total cost to a figure over $3 billion—for direct aid to 360 counties in the Appalachian area. The July 1971 cutoff date indicates, however, that the program will not be a continuing or recurring expense item in the Federal budget but should end on or near a certain date with no further additional costs to taxpayers all across the country.

NOTABLE LEGISLATION

Never before has the Federal Government pumped so much funds into highway construction of direct benefit to only one area. The available share of Federal aid to State contributions for primary and secondary road building is the highest ever granted. A perhaps revealing sign for the course and extent of future Federal participation in highway programs. Road building and improvement in the Appalachian area is scheduled for a multifold increase.

Unlike present highway planning and construction, roads will not be built according to needs determined by existing or projected traffic counts but the needs for encouraging and creating traffic in areas where there is now little or no travel. These new highways are intended to open up areas to commerce. The new highways planned for are, therefore, called development highways and when completed would be added to the States' primary systems.

At the very time the Appalachia bill was enacted into law, other areas of the country were seriously being considered for aid from similar legislation. There is strong interest in Congress to establish regional development plans for the northern Great Lakes area of norther Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota; the Ozark region of southern Missouri, southern Illinois, Arkansas, eastern Texas, and eastern Oklahoma; and northern New England including Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont. Other regions are also beginning to take a new look at their problems and possible solutions. The administration through its Budget Bureau has already stated that it "intends to propose very shortly, as part of the extension and improvement of the area redevelopment program, measures to encourage and assist regional planning for redevelopment of distressed areas."

Senator PAT MCNAMARA, of Michigan, chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee, has already introduced S. 812 which would authorize the President to create other regional commissions to set up plans for different sections of the country. Senators Moss, of Utah, and MONTOYA, of New Mexico, have introduced S. 1033 which would set up a regional planning commission for Utah, Arizona, New Mexico, and Colorado. S. 662, introduced by Senators MCGOVERN, of South Dakota, METCALF, of Montana, BURDICK, of North Dakota, and MCGEE, of Wyoming, would create a regional commission for North and South Dakota and portions of the States of Montana and Wyoming lying east of the Rockies. Similar legislation has been introduced in the House. Another area often also mentioned for a regional planning commission is the Deep South.

WHAT IS APPALACHIA?

Appalachia has been formally defined by Congress as a 360-county mountainous area in the 11 States of Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Virginia, Ohio, Tennessee, Kentucky, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama. If approved by the Appalachian Regional Development Commission and the Governor of New York, an additional group of southern counties in the State of New York may be added.

The area of 15.3 million persons to be covered under the act stretches from Pennsylvania in the northeast to Georgia and Alabama in the southwest. Statistics show that this mountainous 11-State region in the eastern United States has not only failed to share in the economic growth experienced by other sections of the country over the past 20 years but has actually declined in wealth in its critical industries.

APPALACHIA'S PROBLEMS

Appalachia, blessed with natural beauty and abundant rainfall while being largely isolated from population centers of the country, has been a victim of the sharp decline of her two major industries: coal mining and agriculture. On many a face in Appalachia can be seen the miserable despair of hopeless poverty.

Appalachia produces about two-thirds of our Nation's bituminous and all of its anthracite coal, but in the years between 1951 and 1961 production of coal in the area fell 32 percent and because of the automation of coal mines, employment of miners dropped 66 percent. At one time in the State of West Virginia 115,000 miners were employed; today there are about 35,000. Moreover, years of strip mining have laid barren to erosion thousands of acres of Appalachian land and polluted by acids an estimated 4,000 miles of rivers and streams. Over 2 million inhabitants have left the area in the last decade.

What farms that do remain in the area are usually small, hilly, and increasingly unsuited for competing in modern, mechanized agriculture. But these farms are still suited for limited grazing if proper steps are taken to build up the soil depleted by years of neglect. Covering three-fifths of Appalachia, timber is an abundant resource that has been poorly managed, but cut under proper procedures, could be a profitable crop. An estimated 70 percent of this timber is possessed by persons owning 50 acres or less.

Due to its mountains Appalachia suffers from poor communications and inadequate transportation facilities that have deterred the entry of other industries into the area to create economic development to take the place of coal and agriculture. Many areas are not conveniently interconnected by highways. Usually built many years ago, what roads that do exist are frequently torturous and even unsafe to travel because of inadequate width, steep grades, sharp curves, and the deterioration caused by age and neglect. Because of the northeast to southwest direction of the Appalachian Mountains, and the general absence of passes, the region has always posed a barrier to east-west and north-south travel. Much of the area has therefore remained outside the mainstreams of communication, and has consequently

been bypassed in economic growth and development. The construction of an adequate highway system for the area is therefore a necessity.

Lack of economic development has created an unfavorable tax base which hinders self-improvement and the opportunity to break the vicious circle of poverty and decay—despite heartening State and local efforts. The area has had significant but limited success in pulling itself up by its bootstraps.

But the potential of the Appalachian area is great. Besides rich mineral and timber resources, the area has great scenic beauty which would attract many more visitors from other parts of the country if roads were better in quality, more convenient, and easier to drive.

BROAD EFFECTS OF THE LEGISLATION

The likely effect of enactment of the Applachia bill will be to stimulate the economy of the whole Appalachian region. Retail sales and construction will be boosted. There should be economic development, a decrease in unemployment, and greater tax revenues. Sales of gasoline, autos, and tractors should rise. There is a strong chance that there will be a rebirth of the hardwood lumber industry and higher farm production, chiefly in livestock. New industries should be attracted to the area, and there will be a higher rate of population growth—creating more consumer demand and spending. Expanded research work will be done at colleges and universities in the area which will beneficially encourage more and better faculty members. Education in general will improve, and the rate of school dropouts—unusually high in Appalachia—will be reduced. There should likewise be a decrease in the exodus of younger people leaving the area. Health problems—particularly malnutrition—will diminish.

But the principal but hard to measure effect of the legislation will be to make Appalachia a somewhat happier place in which to live. Personal hope may be given to the younger generation of Appalachians who choose not to move on to other areas of the country but to remain in the land where they were born.

CONTENT OF THE LEGISLATION ROADBUILDING

Roadbuilding is the recipient of the greatest share of funds to be spent under the $1,092,400,000 Appalachian program. Over a 5-year period $840 million will be spent by the Federal Government for the construction and improvement of 2,350 miles of development highways and 1,000 miles of local access roads in addition to the existing Federal highway expenditures for the area. The total projected State share of the costs of highway and road construction over the 5-year program is estimated to be $360 million for a combined State-Federal expenditure of $1.2 billion. As pointed out earlier, the Appalachian program will terminate in 1971 and if past highway programs are indicative, perhaps additional Federal funds will be required to complete the highway undertaking. The average yearly Federal contributions will be $168 million although most of the funds will actually be spent during the later years of the program.

The Federal share of the costs would range from 50 to 70 percent, depending upon the decision of the Secretary of Commerce based on the recommendations of the Appalachian Regional Commission. The potential Federal share would therefore be susbtantially higher than the present 50-percent assistance given to ABC highways but lower than the 90-percent aid under the interstate program. It is certain that almost all the new highway work will qualify for the 70-percent rate. Local access roads would be authorized for specific residential, recreational, educational, or industrial purposes.

Costs of highway construction in Appalachia will be high. Two-lane highway construction east-west through mountains of West Virginia and Kentucky is estimated to cost $1 million per mile while highway costs through flat terrain will range roughly between $300,000 and $500,000 per mile. The average cost of local access roads is estimated to be $50,000 per mile although in South Carolina and Alabama, the estimated cost dips to $24,000 per mile. Costs will be roughly divided $790 million for the 2,350 miles of development highways and $50 million for the local access roads.

After first consulting with the local State highway departmnets, the Appalachian Regional Commission will make recommendations on the general routing and location of the highways and local access roads and on their construction priority to the Secretary of Commerce who will then either approve or modify these plans. Each new development highway will be added to the Federal aid primary system and continued maintenance will be required of the States involved. Local access roads will not join any Federal aid system.

Language in the bill specifies that States may give "special preference" to the use in road construction of mineral resources native to the Applalachian region. This would include limestone. The Secretary of Commerce can require that coal derivatives be used in highway construction to the maximum extent possible up to 10 percent of the road work authorized.

LAND CONSERVATION

Land stabilization, conservation, and erosion control for Appalachia will receive $17 million over a 2-year period. Individuals or groups of individuals will be paid up to 80 percent of the cost of conservation practices which will improve and develop their soil, water, woodland, wildlife, and recreation resources. Eligibility for such assistance would be limited to 50 acres. In carrying out this phase of the legislation, the Secretary of Agriculture will use the services of the ASCS committeemen, the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the Soil Conservation Service.

This section of the legislation was significantly changed from the original version of the bill introduced in the last Congress. The original bill would have granted farmowners $17 million solely for pasture improvement on 25, as opposed to 50, acres of their land. The possible Federal share of the grants was also 80 percent. This section was killed in the Senate, and this year it was redrawn to cover broadly all land conservation practices and was not limited only to pasture improvement. Despite attempts by some legislators to knock out even this broadened land improvement feature, the section was kept in the bill. The number of acres eligible for rehabilitation and improvement per landowner or farmer, as pointed out, is 50 rather than last year's 25 acres. For each of the 2 years of authorization, $8.5 million will be spent. By 1971 an estimated 3.3 million acres could be improved.

The effect of this new section on the use of limestone compared to the original pasture improvement version is to diminish the potential expenditures for aglime. Nevertheless, within the Appalachian States participating in the land and soil improvement program, an increased market for aglime is created because of its high utility in reclaiming and improving the often depleted soil common to Appalachia.

EVALUATION OF THE LEGISLATION

The Appalachian regional development bill has not been uncontroversial. Criticism has been directed at its large cost, its socialized medicine, its concept of what constitutes poverty, and its preferential special benefits for only one section of the country to the "discrimination" of other areas in need. The idea of having an Appalachian Regional Commission has been sharply attacked as the "first of a series of such regional octopuses which, if not stopped, will extend their tentacles into every part of the Nation to thwart freedom of State and local action and to make it subservient to the wishes of the Federal Government."

Some members on the House and Senate Public Works Committee flatly opposed the bill when it was considered last year. In the Appalachian area, however, the concept of regional devlopment received wide bipartisan support.

This year some minority members on the House Public Works Committee introduced their own measure. Instead of merely being directed at Appalachia, it would attack poverty areas all across the country.

While it differed in details, scope, and administration from the majority bill, the significant point was that even those formerly opposed to the Appalachia bill now admitted that some Federal action was needed to combat regional poverty. In other words—impressively showing an awareness and concern of social and economic crisis and despair, both parties now firmly recognize the need of regional Federal aid to areas that are depressed beyond the point that it is reasonable to assume that State and local efforts will be successful in overcoming a depressed area's economic crisis and despair.

However, the minority bill, by omitting a regional planning commission of any sort to coordinate regional development programs to alleviate poverty, evidenced a potential weakness (for programs other than the highway construction). It could seriously suffer from a lack of coordination and integration of programs for developmental highways, vocational education, health facilities, timber development organizations, mining area restoration, water resource surveys, and sewage treatment works. Ironically, it is almost certain that the program would have been not only more costly—not necessarily a flaw, but more importantly, it would probably have been inefficient.

This criticism does not mean that the majority bill was perfect. The boundaries of Appalachia as established in the bill were in some instances rather dubiously drawn. While it is unquestionably important to have the whole Appalachian area interconnected by development highways, it appears implausible that 76 counties out of 360 in Appalachia that are not even eligible at the present time for Area Redevelopment Administration and Accelerated Public Works funds should be included in features of the legislation other than highway construction—such as the specially beefed-up Federal grant-in-aid programs. In South Carolina, for instance, all six included counties cannot show sufficient economic need to qualify for even ARA assistance; only one qualifies for APW aid. And South Carolina like Alabama has so far requested none of the highway funds (excepting local access roads).

But considering its flaws, the value of the approved Appalachia bill can be summed up as both a social and economic shot-in-the-arm. There is no question that Americans owe compassion to their fellow Americans, and that although perhaps some unfortunate persons are poor through their own laziness and indifference, many, many more are poor through circumstances that they cannot themselves control. It is to the poor, beaten down by circumstance and geography, that the Appalachia bill addresses itself to, and remarkably well. It effectively complements other Federal and State antipoverty programs.

The original Appalachia report drafted in 1963–64 (by a Commission established by President Kennedy at the urging of Appalachian State Governors) indicated not only a keen awareness and investigation of the problems and needs of Appalachia, but moreover, was creditably marked by an absence of sentimental, vague thinking. Progress of the report into bill form and hearings from

July 1964 to February 1965 clearly showed a tempering of an idea by give and take from both supporters and critics into a realistic, fair, and promising final piece of legislation.

It is noteworthy that Republican Governor William Scranton of Pennsylvania made some of the most effective suggestions that were later incorporated into the law as finally written—namely, reclamation of lands destroyed by strip mining, control of underground mine fires, and the elimination of the Appalachian Development Corporation, a public-private hybrid that, as originally proposed, had grave possibilities of turning into a wheeling-dealing financial nightmare.

In plain dollars and cents the bill makes sense. Over a 10-year period substantial savings can possibly be made in the $5 billion of Federal relief money that Appalachia would normally have consumed without passage of the bill since the number of persons receiving relief in Appalachia is proportionately 45 percent above the rest of the Nation. If Appalachia were on an economic level comparable to the rest of the United States, an estimated $5.2 billion more would be earned in the area thus making a substantial addition to the U.S. gross national product.

CHARACTER OF PROGRESS IMPORTANT

In seeking to measure poverty, the figure of a minimum income of $3,000 per family is often considered as a dividing point between poverty and well-being. This figure, as the Appalachian study report too briefly notes, is unrealistic because when a family's living expenses, nonmonetary income, and property are taken into account, the $3,000 statistic is often either too low or too high. Consequently, the Appalachian Regional Commission must not become obsessed with the objective of attaining the $3,000 income level for Appalachia, but rather, the objective of helping to make Appalachia a worthwhile and decent place to live and work in.

Poverty in Appalachia will not be eliminated by the legislation just passed. In fact, it is highly doubtful that Government can ever by itself eliminate poverty. Opportunity is provided, however, for human beings to step out of poverty, and it is only this simple but profound opportunity that most impoverished citizens in Appalachia seek.

The initial success of the revolutionary Appalachian regional development bill will depend, first, on adequate planning and wise supervision and, second, on the establishment of priorities for concentration of efforts. First attention should be given to sections within Appalachia in greatest need.

Hopefully, the Appalachian development will be an orderly development. Sensible development of tourism, for example, should be made without the more objectionable forms of commercialism. An acute need must be met for more Federal, State, and local parks, historic areas, recreational areas, and scenic parkways.

Desirably, local officials and citizens will enthusiastically put their shoulders to the wheel to clean up their towns and to encourage strong community action for good. Many opportunities for service will exist for responsible voluntary organizations and local enterprises.

And, great effort must be made to insure that the natural beauty and charm of the area be preserved if it is to remain attractive for both local citizens and millions of new visitors.

The progress of Appalachia will be watched with great interest by the American public.

Letter to the President of the United States From the President of the United Mine Workers of America Protesting the Latest Increase in Residual Oil Importation Authorized by the Secretary of the Interior

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, as the Representative of the Fifth Congressional District of West Virginia, which is the Nation's second largest coal-producing congressional district, I am deeply concerned over the proposed increase of 75,000 barrels of imported foreign residual fuel oil per day. It is my understanding that this proposed increase will eliminate by direct competition a potential market of 6,700,000 tons of coal presently produced.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I cite the following letter addressed to the President of the United States by Mr. W. A. "Tony" Boyle, president of the United Mine Workers of America, in which he very clearly outlines the seriousness of this additional unfair competition from a growing flood of residual fuel oil imports. I thoroughly and completely agree with the position so explicitly presented by Mr. Boyle.

The letter follows:

APRIL 2, 1965.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The United Mine Workers of America deplores the increase in residual oil import quotas for the quota year 1965–66. The administration has dealt a cruel blow to the hopes of the people of Appalachia for a better life. The proposed increase of 75,000 barrels of residual oil per day further undermines the economic health of the coal industry, an industry which is absolutely essential for Appalachian rehabitation.

We have on many occasions called attention to the connection between coal jobs and Appalachian prosperity. We have also pointed to the disastrous impact upon coal jobs brought about by excessive and unwarranted residual oil imports.

You must know, Mr. President, that the continued importation of residual fuel oil threatens the elimination of a coal payroll in Appalachia in excess of $1 billion. It further strikes hard at the jobs of several hundred thousand persons and at the sustenance which goes to the people who depend upon such jobs.

You have evinced an interest in the problems of the Appalachian region. That is why it is totally incomprehensible to us that the level of oil imports has been allowed to increase to a staggering 755,000 barrels per day for the coming quota year.

A proposal has been made by various components of the coal complex to expand job opportunities in Appalachia, if a reasonable quota level on residual oil imports were established. This proposal did not look for a complete abolition of residual oil imports. It did request, and we believe justly so, that an equitable plan be worked out on residual imports for an extended period of time, so that the coal industry could plan ahead.

If this proposal had been adopted, if you had removed the ever-present threat of residual fuel oil which hangs over the head of the coal industry, a tremendous investment would have been made by the coal complex in Appalachia. The net result of this investment would have been more jobs for coal miners in Appalachia, more income for the region, a strong and more competitive coal industry, as well as a definite added value to the national welfare. Instead, your administration has embarked on the opposite course. We are shocked that this decision has been reached. We are fearful of the ultimate consequences of the present course of action. We cannot see any real hope for the Appalachian coal industry so long as it must face unfair competition from a growing flood of residual fuel oil.

Therefore, we request that you reaffirm the necessity for a continuation of residual oil import controls. Further, it is our hope that these controls will be strengthened and made meaningful in terms of the protection of American jobs and the income of American citizens.

We understand that a request has been made for a personal conference with you on this matter. We hope that this can be arranged soon, so that we may plan our future course with confidence that we will have the support and protection of your administration as we face the challenges of the future.

Sincerely yours,

W. A. BOYLE.

Hoover Attacks Critics of Crime Rise Figures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, as a continuing testimonial of my respect for the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its distinguished Director, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate an article published recently in the Washington Evening Star. This article, written by Miriam Ottenberg, a staff writer for the Star, eloquently describes Mr. Hoover's FBI methods in reporting crime statistics. It is difficult to comprehend the motivation of those who would bend crime reporting to suit supposed sociological purposes, instead of pursuing what should be the universal goal of all good citizens, the detection and elimination of crime and its causes. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOOVER ATTACKS CRITICS OF CRIME RISE FIGURES

(By Miriam Ottenberg)

Attacks by some newspapers and sociologists on the FBI's crime statistics were condemned by FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover last night as a deliberate attempt to minimize the Nation's crime problem.

He spoke out after various sociologists and criminlogists were quoted as saying things aren't as bad as they look—or wouldn't be if the FBI changed its methods of compiling crime figures.

One sociologist admitted to a reporter why critics are suddenly challenging the FBI's long-accepted crime figures.

For the past decade, he explained, an increasing number of offenders have been put on probation or sent to psychiatric clinics rather than to jail or released early on parole. And the FBI's index of serious crime has risen 58 percent since 1958. The rate of crime repeaters has also climbed.

Fearing that some people may make a connection between more crime and more experimental methods of dealing with criminals, these sociologists have solved the problem by attacking the crime statistics.

The sociologists are also embarrassed because the latest FBI crime figures clearly demonstrate that poverty and deprivation are no longer the sole answer for crime.

Crime, according to these figures, is on the rise in the suburbs and the known perpetrators are juveniles from middle-class homes. All this time, the sociologists have insisted that the way to get rid of crime is to clear out the slums.

Without going into why some people are trying to play a numbers game with crime figures, Hoover declared: "There is a deliberate attempt in some circles to minimize our national crime problem."

"In doing this, some well-known valid factors are used which help to explain the increasing volume of crime, along with much inaccurate and unreliable conjecture and opinion," he continued.

"The high volume of crime nationally is a fact which cannot be rationalized away."

Actually, FBI statisticians analyzing the latest crime figures find that your chances of becoming the victim of a serious crime are increasing six times faster than the population is growing.

Unless something is done to reverse the trend, FBI crime reporting experts agree, the Nation faces another 78 percent increase in serious crime over the next decade.

Against the background of a Presidential request to Congress for assistance to local law enforcement agencies in curbing spiraling crime rates, the theorists, still maintain their arguments against the FBI's crime figures.

They argue, for instance, that babies and old people shouldn't be counted in figuring crime rates since they don't commit crimes.

Actually, the crime rate doesn't measure the number of criminals but the number of victims. Babies are as likely to become murder victims as their elder sisters and older people are frequent targets for purse snatchers and yoke robbers.

Some sociologists have been quoted as saying that the FBI should alter its crime statistics somehow to take into consideration the disproportionate increase in the 15- to 24-age group, the "war babies" now responsible for 70 percent of the serious crime.

An FBI spokesman said that the FBI for many years has been acutely aware of this age group. Arrests of these young people has been increasing almost twice as fast as their population growth.

The main reason why the FBI estimates a 78-percent crime increase over the next decade is due to an expected population rise of 10 million in the crime-prone 15- to 24-age group.

The FBI experts, however, reject the theory that just because there are more young people there automatically is more crime. Theoretically, they argue, crime should be going down as educational opportunities and living standards go up.

VENEREAL RATE JUMPS

The FBI's youth crime figures are paralleled by HEW figures showing that in the past decade, the syphilis rate in the 15-to-19 age group has doubled and the illegitimacy rate for girls under 20 has increased by 47 percent.

FBI experts consider this symptomatic of family instability and breakdown, like its own youth crime figures.

Across the Nation, in the suburbs as well as in the cities, more and more juveniles under 18 are becoming involved in serious crime.

In the past decade, arrests of persons under 18 for nontraffic offenses has increased by 123 percent, almost triple the population increase in the 10 to 17 age group.

The suburbs are being hit even harder than the city folk by the juvenile marauders. Suburban communities report a higher proportion of juvenile arrests for such crimes as burglary, larceny, and auto theft than the cities do.

In the big cities, 48 percent of those arrested for serious crime are under 18, compared with 51 percent in suburbia. A preliminary survey has indicated that only a small percentage of these juveniles are going from the center of town out to the suburbs to do their stealing. Most of these young thieves actually live in the suburbs.

Nowhere is juvenile crime more prominent and the efforts to minimize it more insistent than in auto theft. Some sociologists argue that if most auto theft were written off as "joy riding," the published rate of serious crime would go down. The FBI calls that "defining away crime."

JOYRIDE AUTO THEFTS

The International Association of Chiefs of Police Advisory Committee to the FBI on crime reporting has rejected on three occasions various proposals to eliminate "joyride" auto theft.

FBI statisticians agree for these reasons: A nationwide survey showed that in the vast majority of auto thefts, the police don't know the reason for the theft when they finally recover the car. Furthermore, a car is often a man's most valuable asset. Its loss, even temporarily, is serious and frequently, when the car is located, there are signs of deliberate damage.

FBI and police also point out that most serious crimes are accomplished in stolen cars. They don't regard a high-speed chase after an armed robbery as any childish prank.

"It is incongruous to argue that our young people should have a license to borrow a citizen's automobile with its average value of $1,018, increasing the cost of police services, causing insurance rates to jump, and frequently resulting in serious injury," an FBI official said, "Too often, and we've got the cases to prove it, the so-called joy ride is the beginning of a career of crime."

Amateur statisticians have argued there are more car thefts because of more cars. Not true, says the FBI. During the past decade, auto thefts increased by 92 percent, while auto registrations increased by 42 percent.

The other method of defining away crime proposed by some sociologists is to raise the larceny minimum from $50 to $100 or more on the theory that the cost of living has gone up.

The FBI takes the position that whether the thief steals a $10 camera or a $300 one from your car, the criminal act is the same. Also the value of the property stolen is relative to the victim's circumstances. To a newsboy, the loss of his bicycle hurts as much as the loss of a diamond pendant to a wealthy woman.

FBI experts also point out that statistically the crime rate won't be affected if the cutoff figure goes to $100. All forms of larceny are going up. Since 1958, larcenies without regard to value and larcenies over $50 showed the same 47 percent increase.

A final claim that the FBI's crime figures are distorted comes from those who say police reporting of crime has improved, so more crimes are reported. The FBI says that's nonsense, since the improved reporting of 1 police department or even 10 of them could hardly affect nationwide trends.

The fact is, says the FBI, that the number of offenses reported doesn't even cover all the serious crimes that actually occur. Out of fear, shame, embarrassment, or a reluctance to get involved, some people don't ever tell police that they have been victimized.

So crime is still being underreported, not overreported.

U.S. crime trends, 1958–64

	Percent
Property crime, up	62
Crime index, up	58
Violent crime, up	40
Population, up	10

These trends, based on FBI figures, show how crime has outstripped population since 1958. That year was chosen because thereafter FBI reports dropped statutory rape, larcenies under $50 and manslaughter from the crime index. The index now includes murder, forcible rape, robbery, aggravated assault, burglary, larceny over $50 and auto theft.

Who Points a Finger?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOWARD H. CALLAWAY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, in light of the recent and heated controversy over the events taking place in Alabama, I call to the attention of my colleagues the question posed by the following editorial from the Columbus, Ga., Enquirer:

WHO POINTS A FINGER?

What's needed by the vociferous supporters of tolerance and brotherhood in this country is a little more tolerance and brotherhood of their own.

Prejudice seeps from their angry and vengeful slanders on Alabama.

Do they call for love and understanding to solve the problems which they view? No, they call for troops and boycotts. They cry for the Government to close down bases that provide money and jobs for white and Negroes alike. They call for efforts to crush Alabama's economy even further into the ground so that the wicked white southerners will be given their just deserts.

Mark well how these defenders of Negro rights preach their cause. Their manner bears a striking resemblance to the Negro's worst oppressors.

Those who were justly aroused by the trooper attack on Negro marchers Sunday leave the gnawing impression that they would relish the sight of U.S. troops giving the same treatment to a white segregationist mob.

Yet, is not violence all of the same cloth? Can any of us—white or Negro, southerner or northerner—point a pious finger at in-

tolerance and violence, and say, "mend your ways, and follow my example."

What example do the visiting ministers in Selma wish for the 95 percent of Selma's honest and good people to follow? New York's example? Philadelphia's? Chicago's?

How long would a band of crusading segregationists be safe on the sidewalks of Harlem? What kind of welcome would meet a marching band of Alabama citizens who were intent on marching through Harlem and into Brooklyn, and maybe on to the New York City Hall to protest the firing of School Superintendent Gross?

Malcolm X was present in Selma a few weeks ago and emerged unscathed to keep his appointment with death in a Harlem revival hall. Shall we condemn all of Harlem's residents because he was gunned down there? We should not, any more than we should blame all Alabamians for the attack on Reverend Reeb.

Tolerance and understanding are two-way virtues, and there is not enough present on either side of the tense racial question.

The troubles of other sections are no excuse for Alabama's—or the South's—difficulties in racial relations. But they do seem to provide an honest basis for arguing that emissaries from Selma might well return with the visiting ministers to their own communities and do a little praying over their problems.

Supporters of last year's civil rights bill argued that its passage would take the race issue out of the streets and put it in the courts. We were dubious, and noted the example of States such as New York and Illinois which have stringent civil rights laws and still have demonstrations and protests.

But we hoped that the supporters were right and that the bill's provisions would allow a more peaceful approach to civil rights problems.

Unfortunately, that has not been the case, and the fuse is hotter today than ever.

As we have stated numerous times, the Negro deserves the same right to register and vote as a white man does. That is beyound debate. But there are legal remedies upon legal remedies available if the Negro meets unreasonable resistance.

These legal remedies may be slow but they are the price of maintaining an orderly society, which is the only kind worth having.

The ministers in Selma should speak a knd word for Governor Wallace. And they should advise in favor of lawful recourses.

That would be the real test of their tolerance and brotherhood.

A Resolution To Declare Election Day a National Holiday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have reintroduced a resolution to declare election day a national holiday.

In my opinion, there is no reason why election day should not be a national holiday. Even when the election being held on the first Tuesday after the first Monday of November is a State or municipal election, the day itself is still a day of democratic decisionmaking characterizing the American way.

I believe that this 1 day a year when the American public makes its great political decisions ought to be a legal holiday. I urge the Congress to make it such.

Danville, Va., Commemoration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday the city of Danville, Va., in my congressional district, began a commemoration of the stirring scenes which took place there a century ago when the community became the last seat of the Confederate Government.

The program began with a reenactment of the arrival in the city of President Jefferson Davis and his Cabinet. Later, before a large crowd assembled in front of the Danville Public Library, Dr. James I. Robertson, Jr., a native of Danville, prominent historian and at present executive director of the U.S. Civil War Centennial Commission, delivered an address in which he gave an impressive review of the part played in the war by Danville, with special emphasis on the closing scenes.

Because of the important history thus brought to the forefront, covering the point in our history when the great war that forged us into a powerful Nation was drawing to a close, I should like to insert this address in the RECORD so that it can be widely read. I am sure the information it provides will be especially valuable to schoolchildren, as well as to people of all ages who care to look back into our past.

The address follows:

One hundred years ago today was a Monday, and it was hot and chaotic in Danville. The once-quiet little city on the banks of the Dan was in the throes of military activity such as it had never known before. Squads of gray-clad soldiers marched through the dusty streets; occasionally a troop of cavalry clattered past; on those avenues not already jammed with wagons, ambulances, and accumulated equipment, sweating horses strained to pull cannon and caissons up to commanding heights.

Across the river soldiers and townspeople worked side by side constructing a network of trenches to guard the northern approaches to Danville. A half-mile west of the city, where a wagon-rut trail branched off from the Salibury Road and snaked its way toward Yanceyville, trees had been felled and deep earthworks dug to accommodate a battery of artillery. Mount Vernon Methodist Church and Memorial Hospital now mark the spot where a brigade of shipless sailors, under daredevil Adm. Raphael Semmes, manned cannon that pointed silently toward the river.

A few hundred yards east of this strategic intersection, ragged Confederate soldiers guarded the home and distinguished guests of Major and Mrs. William T. Sutherlin. But at the same time these southern troops cast apprehensive glances northward at the bluffs across Dan River. A mighty Union Army was moving toward Danville from somewhere in that direction.

The serenity so long a characteristic of Danville had suddenly given way to confusion as soldiers and civilians alike were caught in a frenzied whirlpool of self-preservation. The small town that had heretofore thrived on semi-isolation abruptly found itself mushroomed into the capital of an embryonic nation.

For the past 4 years, and in spite of its relative remoteness, Danville had felt the convulsions of Civil War. Many of its sons had fought—and no small number had died—in the 18th and 57th Virginia Infantry Regiments and in Harry Wooding's Danville Battery of Artillery. Early in the war the city had become one of the major Confederate supply depots; but warehouses bulging with military material were of little relief to townspeople who suffered from a lack of food and medicines. In 1862 the first of several military hospitals was established in the city. Soldiers North and South who survived the archaic medical practices of that day never forgot the kindnesses of such volunteer nurses as Annie Eliza Johns and the town's Episcopal rector, the Reverend George W. Dame.

Danville had had welcomed guests earlier in the war. The secessionist Governor of Virginia, John Letcher, paid a visit to the city in January 1864, and was given as royal a banquet as scanty foodstuffs would permit. A month earlier Gen. John Hunt Morgan, the famed Kentucky cavalry leader, stopped briefly in Danville with his family—and sadly extended his stay in order to bury his infant son in Grove Street Cemetery.

The city also had unwelcomed guests. In the autumn of 1864 Confederate officials in Richmond had ordered six tobacco warehouses converted into prisons for captured Federal soldiers; and for the past 9 months townspeople had seen more than 5,000 of the enemy packed into filthy compounds where one Confederate official termed the conditions "truly horrible." Indeed they were. By April 1865, more than 1,300 prisoners had died of starvation, exposure, and disease—and lay buried south of town in a country cemetery chosen more from necessity than from preference.

The fullest impact of war, however, was yet to come. Danville's week of destiny actually began late Sunday afternoon, April 2, 1865, when the clicking telegraph key of the Richmond & Danville Railroad announced the somber news that the Confederate government was abandoning Richmond and entraining that night for Danville. This news caught Danville's citizens totally by surprise, but they recovered quickly and began making hasty preparations to receive a host of visiting dignitaries. The first of many trains from Richmond rolled into Danville in midmorning on Monday, April 3. Throughout that day, wrote Trainmaster J. H. Averell, "other trains soon followed. There were women and children in boxcars, many without baggage, few with anything to eat. It was a sad scene, but the doors of Danville houses were wide open, and an old Virginia welcome met the refugees, and they were soon housed as comfortably as possible."

A large delegation of city fathers met the first train, for on board was the leading southerner of that day: Jefferson Davis, president of the Confederate States of America. Those Danvillians who beheld Davis for the first time were shocked at his appearance, for the cares of war were etched deep in his countenance. He was then 56, tall, slim, and hollow-cheeked. His hair and beard were snow-white; he was now blind in one eye. His favorite son had died of scarlet fever 2 years before, and his wife was even then fleeing southward for safety. Small wonder that Davis' shoulders sagged noticeably from the heavy load he bore. He was ill and weary; yet nothing had dimmed his hopes and dreams for southern independence.

So fervently did Davis still espouse the Confederate cause that Danvillians marveled openly at his energy during those 8 days he was in the city.

Davis accepted the invitation to be a house guest at the country home of Major Sutherlin. But he was there only to sleep, eat and rest. When not in the temporary government offices on Wilson Street, he was superintending improvements on Danville's fortifications, formulating a grand design for the union at Danville of the armies of Lee and Joseph E. Johnston, attending to a mass of correspondence, meeting with a variety of officials, and exuding a confidence shared by few of his colleagues.

Major Sutherlin recalled: "During the period that he spent at my house, he never at any time within my hearing expressed any concern for himself, but his whole heart and soul seemed to be absorbed in his feeling for the people of the South. I believe he would have cheerfully laid down his life if it would have saved them from defeat."

In an effort to bolster morale, Davis on Tuesday, May 4, issued a proclamation to the South—but one which only the people of Danville ever saw. His plea for renewed strength in the war reassured some, but engendered little hope among the mass of people. Nevertheless, Danvillians extended every courtsey to the aging statesman. Scores beat a path to the Sutherlin home in order to pay their respects; dinner invitations were countless; and on those few occasions when Davis broke away from governmental work to take a relaxing ride in Major Sutherlin's carriage, he was greeted all along the way by cheers of affection. In later years Davis would write: "Nothing could have exceeded the kindness and hospitality of the patriotic citizens (of Danville). They cordially gave us an 'Old Virginia welcome' and with one heart contributed in every practicable manner to cheer and aid us in the work in which we were engaged."

And then, on Monday morning, April 10—after days of uncertainty and apprehension, came news of catastrophe: Lee's army had stopped retreating at a hamlet called Appomattox; Virginia was lost.

That night Davis packed his few personal belongings and prepared to leave the city. In a letter to Danville Mayor J. M. Walker, Davis thanked him for many favors and added: "The shadows of misfortune which were on us when I came have become darker, and I trust you will accord me now, as then, your good wishes and confidence in the zeal and singleness of heart with which I have sought to discharge the high trust which the people of the Confederate States conferred upon me."

Near 9:30 that night guards around the Sutherlin home snapped to attention as out of the door, with heavy steps, came their President. The Sutherlins accompanied him to the front gate, where a cavalry escort waited behind the carriage. The tall, sad man with an aristocratic air bowed to Mrs. Sutherlin, shook her husband's hand, and spoke words of thanks in an unmistakable Mississippi accent. He mounted the carriage and nodded to the driver. The procession started downhill into the city. The carriage's chief passenger, limp from fatigue and sorrow, bounced conspicuously as wheels struck rocks and pits.

Even as the party made its way down Jefferson Street (the city's western limits), plainly audible was the sound of shouting, gunfire, and breaking glass as mobs indiscriminately looted the city's shops. Halfway down the street the horses began to prance nervously; the stench of disease and death emanating from the Army hospital at Jefferson and Wilson Streets was almost unbearable. The procession moved rapidly past the grim brick building and turned into Wilson Street. There, government workers, methodically burning records in the front yard of the Benedict home, paused in their labors to gaze silently at the man in the open carriage.

Soon the party passed a tobacco warehouse in which lay part of the living debris of some 700 Federal soldiers still confined in the prisons. Most of these men were prostrate from starvation and illness. Again the cavalrymen escorting the President had difficulty in restraining horses who sensed the presence of death.

On reaching the Piedmont Railroad depot near the river, the party encountered a new obstacle: a mob of frightened people who shouted, shoved, and fought to get aboard an already overloaded train awaiting its main passenger. It was obvious that Lee's surrender and the probability of Federal troops being in the city shortly had given rise to uncontrollable panic.

Only after several anxious moments was the man with snowy beard and hair able to get from his carriage onto the steps of the last of 12 railroad cars. The moment he entered the coach, soldiers mounted the car platforms and used bayonets to hold back the frenzied mob. Suddenly, with a belch of steam and smoke, the train started southward. The cars disappeared slowly around a bend, but not before the engine's shrill whistle echoed through the valley of the Dan and announced in woeful tones that Jefferson Davis and the Confederacy he represented were journeying into history.

In the panic and disorder that followed Davis' departure, it was not to be wondered, wrote one eyewitness, that the whole social structure of the town was thrown into a state of almost helpless disorganization. Unreasoning terror and dismay had taken full possession of the community, and discipline had given place to utter and aimless confusion. Recognized authority there was none, and all attempts at preserving any semblance of methodical government were disregarded.

For 16 days Danville was the victim of lawlessness. Anarchy ran rampart until, on April 27, 1865, the lead elements of the veteran VI Corps of the Federal Army of the Potomac marched up Main Street. Eight thousand Union troops placed a noose of military occupation around the city. Martial law would prevail for the next 8 weeks—but that is another story with which we will concern ourselves at another time.

Utilizing the historical perspective of 100 years, several conclusions might be made of Danville's participation in the Civil War. The city was never the scene of a big battle, and its contributions to the Confederate cause were no more or less than the sacrifices of other sections of the South. The affairs that transpired here during the 8 days that Danville was the last capital of the Confederacy did not—as they could not—alter appreciably either the length or eventual outcome of that war. But to Virginians in general, and Danvillians in particular, this city's role in that tragic holocaust of a century ago should have deep significance.

Here the futility of the southern cause was painfully demonstrated.

Here manifestations of southern deficience and northern determination merged into a pool of American heritage that has remained our most prize possession.

For the loved ones of those men in gray who died in the defense of southside Virginia—as well as for the loved ones of those men in blue who perished in the prisons and hospitals of this city. Danville holds a magnitude of grief, an import of sorrow, that transcends the 6,221 engagements of that Civil War. Heartache is not measured by the size of the heartbreaker. For countless mothers, wives, and sweethearts, Danville was the shattering end of the Civil War, the site of the crashing down of the curtain over their hopes and anxieties. Here—for both those who gave and those who grieved therefrom—Danville became as solemn and as eternal as Chancellorsville and Gettysburg.

That is why we remember Danville in the 1860's; that is why its hills are hallowed; that is why the flowing waters of the Dan are symbolic of a nation's tears.

Many centuries ago, an eastern potentate ordered his soldiers to search every corner of the kingdom and to find him the three wisest men in existence. When at last the three most learned sages stood before the King, he told them: "I must be the wisest ruler of all. Therefore, I command you to draw up for me one statement, one sentence, that will apply to all of life and all of the universe."

The three wise men spent weeks in deep meditation. Finally, they presented to the King one statement that seemed irrefutable. That statement was: "And this, too, shall pass away."

On the surface, this motto might appear to apply to everything known to man. But it is not so. It fails to have applicability to certain intangibles that outlive the ages—the intangibles of man's legacies from the past, his never-ending quest for freedom, his inherent struggle for liberty. Such ideals cannot pass away, for they are the basic emotions placed in each of us by our Creator. So long as we continue to believe that we are truly made in the image of God, freedom and liberty are everlasting.

These were the same ideals for which northerners and southerners struggled near here a century ago. The heart-rending events at Danville, and even the awesome Civil War of which they were a part, were but passing moments in the ever-moving stream of history. Weighed against all the events of humanity stretching over thousands of years, those 4 years and that one war might seem relatively insignificant. So might they be save for the motivations behind them.

The northerner in blue and the southerner in gray who suffered and died in Danville were fighting for American ideals as each envisioned them. One was seeking a revision of an old independence; the other hoped to obtain a new independence. Yet both were in essence struggling for freedom, liberty, love of country, and the desire to make tomorrow a little better for the children than today was for the parents. Both were fighting, and both were willing to die, for what each considered the betterment of himself and his neighbor.

It was inevitable that one would triumph and the other would fail. But from the heroism of the victor and the valor of the vanquished was fused a new nation that grew, prospered, and remains today the sole hope of the world.

Therefore, we Americans of North and South can take increased devotion from the sacrifices of a century ago at Danville: for from small seeds of human tragedy planted here ultimately blossomed the stately forest of national unity. The hatreds of yesteryear that exploded and ran part of their jagged course on the hills overlooking the Dan eventually matured into the brotherhood that has safely carried our Nation through four subsequent wars. Since 1865, the common patriotism exhibited by northerner and southerner alike has been inexorable testimony that the wounds of the Civil War were not too deep for healing, that our Nation and the ideals which it exemplifies, live in burning majesty.

The Civil War was the accelerator, not the deterrent, of that transformation.

The universal turmoils of today are such that evangelical Americans cry out: "Lord God of Hosts, be with us yet; lest we forget." But with a prideful cognizance of our heritage, and with renewed confidence in the future, we can surely refute the three wise men of old. We can point with reassurance to modern America—to the devotion that

has made it, to the determination that sustains it—and we can, as we must, proclaim to the overcast skies: "No. By the grace of God, this too shall not pass away."

Pocono Record, Stroudsburg, Pa., Fully Supports Tocks Island National Recreation Area on the Delaware River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRED B. ROONEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege during this session of the 89th Congress to join my distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON], in the introduction of legislation which would authorize the creation of a national recreation area on the Delaware River near Stroudsburg, Pa.

Known as Tocks Island National Recreation Area, the proposed 46,000-acre site would be located on both the Pennsylvania and New Jersey sides of the Delaware and would be centered around the great, new 37-mile-long lake which would be created by Tocks Island Dam. The dam was authorized by the Congress in 1962 and planning is already well underway on it.

Hearings have been conducted on the recreation area, both during the 88th Congress and, last month, in this Congress by the gentlemen of the Subcommittee on National Parks of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I know that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] joins me in an expression of deep gratitude to the distinguished chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], and the highly regarded chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. RIVERS, for the painstakingly fair manner in which hearings have been conducted. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR], of course, is the ranking minority member of the committee, and his skillful leadership in pressing for action on TINRA is evident.

This past week, the Pocono Record, one of the leading newspapers in my congressional district, ran an editorial endorsing Tocks Island National Recreation Area. Aside from the fact that the editorial, itself, is superbly written and well reasoned, the comment is notable in that it represents a strong reaffirmation of this newspaper's long standing belief in the need for such a recreation area.

The Pocono Record has been directly concerned with the Delaware River Basin and its needs for the past 20 years. Mr. Horace G. Heller, the Record's general manager and a personal friend of my revered predecessor, Representative Francis E. Walter, has been among the leaders in Pennsylvania in the fight to preserve our great natural resources and increase our State's economic growth.

I am pleased to call the attention of this body to the editorial statement in support of Tocks Island National Recreation Area which appeared in the Tuesday, March 30, edition of the Pocono Record.

The text follows:

RECORD BACKS TOCKS

The Pocono Record stands unequivocally behind the creation of the Tocks Island Dam and the Tocks Island National Recreation Area.

And for the most good for the most people, it favors control of the recreation area by the National Park Service.

Feasibility reports, starting 30 years ago with Incodel (Interstate Commission on the Delaware River Basin), have shown that the dam is needed.

The cramped, teeming millions of megalopolis show that the recreation area is needed.

While there are several major benefits to be derived from the dam and recreation area, there are also a host of relatively minor benefits.

The two most important uses of the dam will be for a huge source of drinkable water for many miles surrounding the dam, and for flood control.

The cities of New York and Philadelphia, and the communities between these cities and the dam, have an ever-increasing thirst and need for water. We have the same thirst and will share in this water conservation basin.

The Delaware River Basin Commission has started wheels in motion which will result in interstate cooperation for distribution of the water on an equitable basis.

Monroe County residents need not be reminded of the effects of floods—Tocks Island Dam and its smaller satellite dams will help to prevent a repetition of August 18, 1955.

Of course, the major use of the 46,000 acres to be set aside around the lake will be recreation.

An anticipated 7 million people per year will use the area for camping, sports, and vacations. Probably most of these are people who haven't the time or the finances to wander to the great parks of the West.

Those who have the resources to head west will probably do so anyway. But what about the millions upon millions who also need a respite from the choking swelter of the city?

Other benefits from the dam, as shown by feasibility reports, include salinity control in the Delaware River below Trenton. By maintaining a constant level of water in the Delaware during most seasons of the year, salt water can be kept back from this fresh water port.

Pollution control is also important. A constant level dispels the danger of low water brackishness—with concurrent fish loss and stagnant water.

Hydroelectric power is an important by-product of the dam. New sources of power must be sought and utilized where possible with the rapidly increasing needs of the adjacent areas.

Two results of the creation of the recreation area will be the preservation of the Upper Delaware River Basin for public use and natural beauty, and an economic boost for an area included in Appalachia.

The arguments against the dam and TINRA pale—not into insignificance, but into questions for the people and their legislators to work out while creating this remarkable project.

These questions include adequate planning and zoning at the smallest and largest governmental level; interim tax payments by either the State or Federal Government to taxing bodies which will lose land to TINRA; adequate compact wording to insure enough water for future growth in this area.

Also, the best possible relocation programs for persons living within the boundaries of TINRA, and allowances so that the Tocks Island regional advisory council has true advisory powers to governmental agencies dealing with the area.

Keeping these questions in mind, the Pocono Record steps squarely behind the program.

A Federal System of Education?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I had the good fortunate to read a splendid article which was written by Mr. Clinton H. Pearson of Nashville, Tenn., which appeared in the April issue of the New Age magazine, a publication of the Scottish Rite Freemasons. This organization has an outstanding record of support for our country's public school system. In his statement, Mr. Pearson warns of the many dangers of transferring a community's educational responsibility to the Federal Government.

These remarks are of timely interest since the Federal aid to education bill is still before the Congress for consideration. I commend Mr. Pearson's message to the attention of my colleagues and under unanimous consent I insert the article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

A FEDERAL SYSTEM OF EDUCATION?

(By Clinton H. Pearson, Jr.)

The population of the United States is rapidly expanding. There is an interest in the education of the young and the enlightenment of all the people. This education responsibility is that of the public schools, our primary source of education and development. This gives rise to a question of the quality of our present system and its related schools. A simple solution to some education problems is consolidation. However, this involves the transferring of a locality's fundamental responsibility to a centralized authority. In essence this change involves the submission of a locality's basic power to a centralized control. Because of this primary element, a Federal system would be invading and taking away the people's power. On account of this resulting factor, a Federal system should "not" be developed in the United States.

A Federal system of education would involve and control "curriculum, instruction, supervision, and support." In substance the youths' minds would be subject to a directly controlled influence either through the teachers and instruction or indirectly through the outside direction of subjects and methods of instruction to be utilized. A Federal system through its control over individuals would therefore control the Nation's stature.

The greatness of a nation may be manifested in many ways—its purposes, its courage, its moral responsibility, its cultural and scientific eminence, the tenor of its daily life. But ultimately the source of its greatness is in the individuals who constitute the living substance of the nation.

This governmental control has another aspect which must be considered. A Federal system of education would be a step toward a socialistic form of government.

Our free, democratic way of life is in direct contrast with the government control of a slavelike communistic state. The institution of a Federal system of education would be a reversal from our arduously acquired ideals of freedom to the stern, tyrannical experiences of the past.

A Federal system of education would require governmental control of the previously mentioned factors of curriculum, instruction, supervision, and support. However, one main fallacy of the suggested arrangement is the lack of any check by the people. They would have no jurisdiction of the curriculum, the methods of instruction, the efficiency of supervision, or the necessary amount of support.

The vast amount of material for the construction of a curriculum and subsequent information would require orientation and production. This data would ultimately be: A curriculum fashioned to promote the goals of the State passed to the schools from the hands of political authority. However, a free concept would place curriculum under a control of free people [where] the subject matter is a response to the force of public opinion.

In close relation with the curriculum is the instructional process. The manner and methods of presentation would have a definite affect upon the way in which a subject is perceived and learned. A Federal system would result in a continuous educational program for instructors in learning the controlled, planned methods for teaching the conformed subject matter. There would be no academic freedom and the end result would be regimentation of the whole population.

One apparent and very probable issue to occur in this vast system of supervision is political influence. Governmental control will result in political influences and presures. The ideal of a political immunity could not exist in either administrative or teaching positions. The development of bureaucracy would result in the rise of incompetence and inefficiency.

The greatest concern of the present population is the support section of this system. The salaries of both teaching and supervisory personnel with the variation of expenses should be determined primarily by the cost of living for a specific locality. Taking this fact into consideration, setting a proper standard for the support of a vast Federal organization becomes an impossible task. The expense of a Federal system will result in an increase in the now excessive burden of taxation. No economy will or can result from the adoption of a Federal system of education.

The United States is a world symbol of the free, independent ideal. Concerning their past efforts and freedoms acquired through them, Americans "may point with pride to those that are now their heritage, lifting high their heads among the world's peoples, as their country unfurls high its flag among nations." If America wishes to retain this freedom, the facts reinforce the belief that a federal system should "not" be developed in the United States.

Uninsured District Motorists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which was broadcast during the week of March 28, 1965, by WMAL here in Washington.

My bill, H.R. 634, would provide protection against the thousands of uninsured motorists in the District of Columbia. I am also the sponsor of the administration's home rule bill, H.R. 4644. If Washington had home rule the Congress would not have to be bothered with the kind of legislation called for in this editorial.

The editorial follows:

UNINSURED DISTRICT MOTORISTS

District residents suffer unnecessary financial losses every day the city goes without adequate uninsured motorist protection. There are more than 265,000 cars registered in the District. More than 35,000 of these are uninsured and represent a hazard to every citizen. The Commissioners must direct local efforts to have Congress correct this situation.

Last year a measure drafted by the Commissioners died when Congress adjourned. A new measure to establish an unsatisfied judgment fund to pay for damages caused by uninsured District motorists has been sent to Congress. But merely sending a bill to Congress is not enough. The Commissioners and citizens' groups must exert pressure for enactment. After all these years, the District deserves adequate protection against irresponsible uninsured motorists.

Small Bank and Small Town in Wisconsin Show How in Cooperation With the Small Business Administration They Have Created 4 Industries Employing 400 People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, each day I have received half dozen letters from people in small towns asking why the Government does not establish some business in their town to create jobs. If the Federal Government were to build a plant in every small town in our Nation, we would go into bankruptcy overnight.

The people and the banks of the small towns must do the job themselves and the sooner the people of our small towns awaken to this fact, the better it is going to be for their communities.

The job of obtaining industries and creating jobs can be done if the people in the little towns will cooperate and if the banks in their little towns will cooperate and enlist the services of the Small Business Administration.

My good friend Walter Jensen, president of the First Bank of Grantsburg, of Grantsburg, Wis., has furnished me with a résumé of what they have done in their town. There is no reason under the sun why every town in our Nation cannot do the same thing if they just have the will to do it, and if they are determined that their community will not die. I doubt whether there is anyplace in America where a small-town bank has done so much for the attracting of industry as has this little bank in northwestern Wisconsin.

I am putting the accomplishments of this little town and this little bank in the pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for all Americans to see what can be done if there is the will to do it among the people in a community.

Grantsburg is a village of 900 people in Burnett County. The Congress of the United States salutes Grantsburg, Burnett County; Walter Jensen, the First Bank of Grantsburg, and the Small Business Administration for a job well done and an inspiration to the people of our great Nation.

We have analyzed the results of financing industrial development in our area the past 9 years and we thought some facts and figures may be of interest to other small banks, our congressmen, State officials and other engaged in trying to build industry for their community.

We find that most industries need long-term financing for the purchase of machinery, land, and buildings and they also need a considerable amount of short-term credit on a seasonal basis for the production of goods and the carrying of inventory. We are happy to state that excellent help and advice along with a participation in industrial loans has been furnished us by the Small Business Administration. We are also glad that we have had much help from our correspondent banks in furnishing overline financing of inventory and accounts receivable. In all instances our bank has participated in both the long-term financing as well as the short-term financing. We would like to give some facts and figures on three companies all of whom have been assisted by SBA and by correspondent bank financing.

Company No. 1: This company needed long-term financing for the purchase of additional production machinery and vehicles to increase production and to cut the cost of production. The company secured an SBA-bank loan the early part of 1956 for $30,000 and such loan was increased to $70,000 in the early part of 1959 at which time the original loan had been paid down to $15,767 so the total investment by the SBA and bank in long-term finances amounted to $84,232. In the early part of 1956 the company had 32 men working, with gross income that year of $260,545 and a total payroll of $86,974. The following year after additional machinery and equipment was added, sales jumped to $406,798, employment increased to 40 men and a payroll of $95,251. During 1964, this same company had a gross volume of business of $1,209,705 with a total payroll of $349,000 and during the period of 1956 through 1964 the company paid State and Federal income taxes of $176,886. At the present time, the company has 111 employees with a payroll of over $370,000. The bank-SBA long-term loan has now been paid in full.

Company No. 2: This company obtained a bank-SBA long-term loan of $40,000 in the early part of 1957 which was later increased to $66,000 in 1960 and again increased to $95,000 in 1962. Actual total loans after deducting pay-

ments during the period amounted to $130,342. In early 1957, the company employed 28 persons and had gross income of $241,811 with a payroll of $81,189. The company has shown a growth each year since 1957 and in 1964 it had gross sales of $757,000 with a payroll of $269,000 and a total of 86 employees. During the period from 1957 through 1964, the company paid Federal and State income taxes of $74,678.

Company No. 3: In the latter part of 1958 this company was in dire need of additional machinery, equipment, and working capital. A bank-SBA long-term loan was completed for $160,000 and in 1962 such loan was increased to $200,000 and in 1963 an additional loan of $35,000 was granted for the purpose of adding to their plant building and modernizing their heating plant. After deducting interim payments on the real estate-chattel mortgage loan granted by the bank and SBA, total loans to this company is $344,591. In 1959 the company had gross sales of $611,109 with a total payroll of $285,304. At that time they employed 98 people. The company has showed continuous growth and has now more than doubled the sales since 1959. In 1964 total sales were in excess of $1,300,000 and at the present time production is on an annual basis of $1,750,000. Total payroll in 1964 was $663,000 and the company employed 160 people. Since the first SBA loan was made the company has paid Federal and State income taxes of $126,000.

Summarizing the results of three loans made in cooperation with the Small Business Administration and with help on short-term financing by our correspondent banks, the results would be as follows: Total employment increase from 158 to 357 persons, gross payroll has jumped from $453,367 to $1,281,518, gross sales has increased from $1,113,000 to $3,367,000. During the period covered above, the three companies received bank-SBA long-term loans of $559,165 and during the same period have paid Federal and State income taxes of $377,600.

The above figures do not tell the whole story. The 357 employees also pay income tax to the State and Federal Governments and they create buying power which is beneficial to small town businessmen and to the bank. In the above analysis we have not taken into consideration fringe benefits paid to employees by these companies.

Company No. 4: Figures and facts relating to this company are not included in the above figures. We just completed a new $76,500 bank—ARA–SBA participation loan for the purpose of purchasing the plant occupied by the company and for constructing additional manufacturing spaces. Also included are funds for the purchase of modern machinery to step up production. In this case the bank has handled all the financing for the company for the carrying of seasonal variations in inventory and now they are set up with long-term financing on buildings and machinery and the bank will continue to finance seasonal inventory loans. The company started with 5 employees and will now employ 40 to 50 people.

In all fairness to these industries, we must give them credit for sound management and for creating wealth locally that is beneficial to local governments as well as the tens of thousands of dollars such industries spend each year for other machinery, equipment, and supplies which also creates employment and profits to others.

With a continued downtrend in farm income and with the prospects of fewer and fewer farms it is highly desirable that we continue to promote industry in our small towns if our towns are to grow and prosper and if our banks are to continue to grow and prosper. Our deposits have increased from $5 million in 1956 to $10 million as of December 31, 1964. We feel this could not have been possible without the growth of these industries and these industries would not have grown and prospered without financial assistance from the Small Business Administration, our correspondent banks, and our bank.

From the above information it would appear that industrial development is simple. It is not my intention to convey or suggest that building industry in a small town or anywhere else, for that matter, is easy. First of all, we need someone with an idea, then we need men who are trained and have the ability to operate and manage an industry. Also we need men who are willing to furnish risk capital ahead of the bank and SBA.

There is a lot of untapped human resources in every community and men who are willing to risk funds if they are given some cooperation and encouragement.

At this time I want to give high praise to the Small Business Administration for the wonderful job that they have done in this community. Besides paying the SBA loans back with interest, in a matter of 5 years these industries will pay in Federal taxes more than the amount of the loans that they have received from the Small Business Administration. In other words, the Small Business Administration is making taxpayers out of Americans instead of taxeaters.

I hope that these examples furnished by this small town of Grantsburg, Wis., will be an inspiration to the thousands of other small towns in America as to what can be done.

Real Progress That Will Mean Real Prosperity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. MACKAY
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, Atlanta is a city that has been plugging and struggling and making progress for a long time, and the reason that it has its fine name today is its hard-working people. I want to include here just a brief article from a newspaper that publishes in my district—it will give my colleagues a glimpse of one of our Atlantans at work. Mr. Hubert F. Lee, editor and founder of the Dixie Business, is the author. For years, he and his newspaper have talked and written about and urged progress on our people—and this, to my mind, is one of the things that really counts. Mr. Lee wrote the article I am including here in May of 1922—that is how long he has been working for a better Atlanta. In the more than 40 years since Mr. Lee's article, Georgia has developed a fine system of parks, and Stone Mountain, in our Fourth District, has been developed into a busy, enchanting place to see.

The article follows:

REAL PROGRESS THAT WILL MEAN REAL PROSPERITY

(By Hubert F. Lee)

Progress and prosperity is the predominant thought of the entire citizenship of Atlanta now, and will continue to be during the merrymaking of next week. Atlanta has ever been constantly on the alert for anything that will further the cause of a greater and bigger city and State. Looming in the distance are prospects of continuing for Atlanta and the entire Southland not simply a week, but forever, this progress and prosperity idea.

That movement well on foot is to seek the creation of a national park out of our vast stretches of wooded mountain land in north Georgia. Looking to this end a party of government dignitaries will leave Atlanta Monday to thoroughly explore the potential national recreational grounds.

Out of having a national park located so near, millions of dollars will stream into the coffers of Atlantans. A supervacation place will be convenient at minimum cost. Interest in culture and extensive travel will be fostered and the Empire State of the South will be the twinkling star sought by all traveling Americans.

Let's stand ready to throw our concerted efforts behind this worthy project. Stone Mountain is a mere pebble, compared with its immensity.

The Tax Status of Professional Corporations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANCHER NELSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, I introduced a proposal, H.R. 4969, to amend the Internal Revenue Code to clarify the tax status of professional associations and corporations formed under the laws of the several States.

At this point in my remarks, I include the copy of Resolution 1 passed by the Minnesota State Legislature supporting the enactment of the proposal contained in my bill, H.R. 4969. The text of the resolution is as follows:

"RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ADOPT S. 177, H.R. 697, OR H.R. 4969

"Whereas self-employed individuals have for more than 20 years been discriminated against under Federal tax law because they could not adopt retirement plans covering themselves unless they incorporated or formed associations taxable as corporations; and

"Whereas the Internal Revenue Service in November 1960 issued the so-called Kintner regulations which laid down guidelines to be used in determining whether or not groups of self-employed individuals would be eligible to be taxed as corporations; and

"Whereas the Legislature of the State of Minnesota in reliance on the guidelines contained in the Kintner regulations and in order to remove the discrimination against professional persons under Federal tax law, passed in 1961 a Professional Corporation Act relating to physicians and in 1963 a Professional Corporation Act relating to attorneys; and

"Whereas the Internal Revenue Service on February 3, 1965, issued amendments to the Kintner regulations which would deny to physicians and attorneys organized under one or the other of the Minnesota Professional Corporation Acts and acts of other States similar thereto the right to be taxed as a corporation under Federal tax law and thus nullify the action of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota; and

"Whereas there has been introduced into the 89th Congress, S. 177, H.R. 697, and H.R. 4969, which would amend the definition of corporation in the Internal Revenue Code to make clear that professional corporations are included therein and would as a result require the Internal Revenue Service to recognize corporations formed under either of the Minnesota Professional Corporation Acts and acts of other States similar thereto as corporations for the purpose of the Internal Revenue Code: Be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, That the Congress of United States be urged to enact S. 177, H.R. 697, or H.R. 4969; be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the State of Minnesota send copies of this resolution to Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, to Senators MCCARTHY and MONDALE, and to all Members of the House of Representatives from the State of Minnesota.

"A. M. KEITH,
"President of the Senate.
"L. J. DUXBERRY, Jr.,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives."

Passed the senate this 11th day of March in the year of our Lord 1965.

H. Y. TORREY,
Secretary to the Senate.

Passed the house of representatives this 30th day of March in the year of our Lord 1965.

G. H. LEAHY,
Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

Approved April 1, 1965.

KARL F. ROLVAAG,
Governor of the State of Minnesota.

Filed April 1, 1965.

JOSEPH L. DONOVAN,
Secretary of the State of Minnesota.

Why Not March for White Rights?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LUCIEN N. NEDZI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, it is a tragedy when a human life is wiped out by violence anywhere in our Nation.

The city of Detroit has been in the news recently because two of its citizens were victims of violence, Mrs. Viola Liuzzo on an Alabama highway and Michael Railsback in a Detroit park. There was a national outcry over the first murder, relative silence over the second. Earlier, during the height of the Selma crisis, nine white high school students were stabbed by Negroes after a basketball game.

Some people are troubled by what they regard as a double standard of morality arising from the special attention being given to injustice in the South. Others realize the difference, but raise the point out of mischief.

In any event, I believe the matter should be clarified and put in perspective. Penetrating editorials in the Michigan Catholic, April 1 issue, and the Detroit Free Press of April 2, address themselves to the moral question.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, the editorials follow:

[From the Michigan Catholic, Apr. 1, 1965]

WHY NOT MARCH FOR WHITE RIGHTS?

"Nine White Students Stabbed by Negro Youths." It was a grabby headline and it was featured recently in our Detroit papers. The regrettable incident occurred, as most everyone remembers, after a high school tournament basketball game.

By unfortunate coincidence, it happened at just about the same time as the historic march on Montgomery, Ala., was being organized. And it led to some pretty scorching questions.

"How come," some Detroiters wondered, "everybody wants to march for Negro rights and no one is protesting this heinous attack on white boys?"

There was, perhaps, some sincerity in the question but those who asked it, if they were not tongue-in-cheek bigots, had missed the whole point of the drive for racial equality.

There are uncounted events so saturated with evil that no comment is expected. All over our Nation, every day, there are murders, beatings, assaults, thefts, and generally a myriad violation of God's law. Is it necessary to pick each one up by the ears and condemn it?

Well then, why the special attention to injustice in the South?

Precisely because the evil here is wielded by the power structure of a State. And that's a lot of power.

As citizens we have the right to assemble peacefully and protest. But when citizens do this and are met by all the massive power of a State in brutal retaliation, where can they turn? Who can you call when a policeman hits you?

They can call on the only civil power superior to a State, the Federal Government. But Federal power wisely does not want to get any more involved in States' affairs than it already is. Prudence makes us label the button that summons Federal aid, "panic."

But what if the situation is really panic? How do we let Federal "big brother" know the button was pushed?

We go south, young man, not foolishly to break any law, but to assemble, petition, and march. We give our voice to silent mouths, our hearts to crushed spirits. We do this, that is, if we've got the courage to face a white wall of hate that can and does kill.

Why we do not publicly protest the violence of the North? At the risk of multiplying marches, we could. But here criminals are realistically sought, frequently found, and often punished.

In the land of southern hospitality, one crime that apparently is a virtue is the extermination of rebellious Negroes and white outsiders.

Where is even an indictment for all the recent civil rights murders of the South? Even in the totally repulsive slaughter of Mrs. Viola Liuzzo, Federal agents were the first to capture and book four suspects. At this writing the State of Alabama is still dragging its heels.

Down South they're not just whistlin' "Dixie" anymore. It's a new song and dance. The tune is, "Leave Us Alone" and the dance is a time step—plenty of time. Everybody's doing it from Gov. George Wallace to Archbishop Thomas J. Toolen of Mobile-Birmingham.

It is, of course, no surprise that Wallace, the secular power structure and many ordinary white citizens of the South are committed to this thesis. What is disappointing is Archbishop Toolen's attitude.

It causes no little source of personal agony to disagree with a man who has given some 50 years of his life to the priesthood and whose dignity is marked by his apostolic succession.

It is easy to sympathize with the task of guiding a diocese like his, beset as it is with racial, conversional, and financial problems.

It is apparent, too, that the archbishop has deep and sincere involvement in the racial conflicts of his land. His offer of Catholic property for the last stage of the Montgomery march is evidence of that. And there are many more proofs.

But he is singing the song of the south. His refrain refers to these crusaders who are eager beavers and who are trying to divide the people.

Those injustices that need correcting, concludes Archbishop Toolen, "will be corrected in time." Here's the flat note. The time is now.

It has been said that no army is as powerful as an idea whose time has come. Beyond that power, the Christian conscience is awake now to racial injustice and prejudice. There is no turning back or, as Dr. Martin Luther King puts it, "We will not be turned around."

If this racial revolution will continue in a nonviolent movement of Christian love, then the Christian community must not only participate, but lead. We realize the near promise of martyrdom such a commitment would demand of Catholic leaders everywhere and especially in the south. But come it must.

The opportunity for neopagans to recognize us once again by our love for one another is indigenous to this movement. If we let it pass us by we should never again dare to claim we are followers of the crusading Christ.

W. X. K.

[From the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press, Apr. 2, 1965]

WHY MIKE IS A VICTIM, MRS. LIUZZO A MARTYR

Detroit—like every other northern city—is being criticized in the South today for hypocrisy and a double standard of public morality.

Southerners, and many northerners who agree in part with them, cite the murder of young Michael Railsback Tuesday night in a Detroit park.

Why, they ask, should Mrs. Viola Liuzzo be a martyr and not Mike? Why should the leaders of civil rights movements attend her funeral, and not Mike's?

The physical comparisons are close. Both were murdered in cold blood. Mrs. Liuzzo was taking part in a civil rights demonstration; Mike was exercising his civil right to walk in safety in a public place.

Mrs. Liuzzo was shot by white men who violently opposed the changing pattern of race relations in Alabama. Mike, white, was killed by a Negro.

Certainly some comparison is valid. Both were murdered, and murder must be fought with all the forces available. But there the comparison ends.

Mrs. Liuzzo was taking part actively in securing voting rights for Alabama Negroes.

Mike's role was passive. She was killed as a result of race hatred. He was killed, apparently, for the $9 in his wallet.

The fact that race was an issue in Mrs. Liuzzo's death was central. In Mike's death, it seems to have been incidental.

But the fact remains that our crime rate is higher than the reported southern crime rate. We have a job to do here, as well as seeing that a job needs doing in Alabama.

Both Mike and Mrs. Liuzzo were victims of ignorance in one form or another. Both were killed by people who had no regard for human life, or for the rights of others. Detroit must fight the battle here just as hard as it must be fought elsewhere.

The difference is that Detroit is fighting. Detroiters are working and studying to come up with answers, trying to wipe out the ignorance and poverty which breed most crimes. Alabama can hardly say the same.

And this is why Mrs. Liuzzo will be recorded as a martyr, and Michael Railsback as a victim. The force of society was on Mike's side. The community at large, the government, the police force were outraged at his death.

Mrs. Liuzzo, on the other hand, was killed in a society in which government has acquiesced in violence. The community of Alabama citizens might have been sickened, as James Kilpatrick said on this page yesterday, but public officials from George Wallace to Sheriff Jim Clark helped create the atmosphere in which such things are allowed to happen.

The blame for Mike's death belongs to the person who killed him. The blame for Mrs. Liuzzo's death belongs in part, at least, to the southern leaders who have either failed to lead or have led down a dark and bloody path.

Address by Hon. James K. Carr

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by a great public official, Hon. James K. Carr, the former Under Secretary of the Interior. The Federal Government's loss was the distinct gain of the city and county of San Francisco where he has become general manager of public utilities and, I am sure, contributing to the successful administration of our former colleague, Hon. John F. Shelley, the mayor of San Francisco.

The address follows:

EXCERPTS FROM THE REMARKS OF JAMES KENNEDY CARR BEFORE THE HIBERNIAN LUNCHEON CLUB OF SAN MATEO COUNTY, ST. PATRICK'S DAY, MARCH 17, 1965

This is the first time, as one proud to have four Irish grandparents, I have succumbed to the seductiveness of an invitation to speak on St. Patrick's Day. My action could mean that I am either courageous or utterly lacking in judgment, for in this assembly of Irish ancestry, doubtless there are tenors who can sing better than any selected soloist, and there are orators whose melodious voices are shackled in silence while a lesser man speaks. Perhaps the situation is akin to the fact that the only way to have a truly successful St. Patrick's Day parade is to have everyone march abreast.

Although there are " * * * greetings flung in Irish, and the flood of Celtic banter, and the hectic flush of racial pride upon St. Patrick's Day" some may consider it strange indeed that this annual unmatched enthusiasm and joy on March 17 is in celebration of a day that a man died. And equally thought provoking is the fact that the man died 15 centuries ago.

We celebrate not because the world was rid of that 76-year-old man on March 17, in the year 461; rather, we observe this day because in kindly Gaul, far from his beloved Armagh he received his eternal gift. That day the spirit of Patricius, the "Apostle of the Irish," the "Man of Providence," went forth to heaven to reflect God's glory forever.

We rejoice because this righteous man ignited a spiritual force that saved Europe for Christianity, a force that continues to reverebrate around the world.

We commemorate March 17 because from the flame St. Patrick lighted came an understanding of the dignity of man and from it the founding of this country of free men.

We celebrate because after tear-stained centuries of battles for freedom a modern developing Ireland is emerging economically and bringing the fruits of democracy to a people that never abandoned hope from centuries of seemingly hopeless oppression.

It is to this Emerald Isle and its harvest of hope that I should like to direct my emphasis today. This better life for the Irish people now and in the future is a just reward for a nation's devotion to St. Patrick.

Most of you are familiar with the life of St. Patrick. Imperfect and ignorant as he accounted himself, he became the fitting instrument of a divine design.

He was born in Britain. At 15 or 16 he became a captive of pagan Irish warriors, destined to herd swine on the hills of Slemish. Then his flight, his preparation, self-conquest, and his return in episcopal dignity to bring Christ's teachings to the land and the people that he loved. With the blessing of the High-King of Tara he went forth to overcome the Druids; to build churches and monasteries, heal the sick, cure the deaf and the blind until in Saul, although he longed for Armagh, victim of illness and pain, attended by St. Tassach, in mid-Lent, "he sent forth his spirit to Heaven." Then for 12 days the eminent men of Ireland stood watch with hymns and psalms and canticles through the dispute for his mortal remains, until his secret burial—probably in Downpatrick.

After the barbaric hordes laid waste a Europe that was the boast of Rome—decaying within and falling on the fringes—there were the followers of St. Patrick who were the core for the enlightenment and religious revival of the continent. Like a spring tide the monastic period swept over Europe. From Christianity and its respect for the dignity of man came the Bill of Rights and these beloved United States of America. It was the indomitable, perservering, St. Patrick that paved the way. And for 15 centuries the indomitable, persevering, humor-loving Irish have carried his influence to all the corners of the world.

The day before he died, President Kennedy eluded to this unconquerable spirit at San Antonio. He said:

"Frank O'Connor, the Irish writer, tells us in one of his books how, as a boy, he and his friends would make their way across the countryside, and when they came to an orchard wall that seemed to high and too doubtful to try and too difficult to permit their voyage to continue, they took off their hats and tossed them over the wall—and then they had no choice but to follow them."

And President Kennedy at Ireland's great Shannon Airport in June 1963, summed up what so many of us feel when he bid the Irish people farewell, a farewell that was forever. He said:

"So Ireland is a very special place. It has fulfilled in the past a very special role. It is in a very real sense the mother of a great many people, a great many millions of people, and in a sense a great many nations. And what gives me the greatest satisfaction and pride, being of Irish descent, is the realization that even today this very small island still sends thousands, literally thousands, of its sons and daughters to the ends of the globe to carry on an historic task which Ireland assumed 1400 or 1500 years ago."

On that same trip, at Cork, the President did not forget the Irish sense of humor.

He introduced Monsignor O'Mahoney, who came from Cork, as "the pastor of a poor, humble flock in Palm Beach, Fla."

On the same occasion after introducing Dave Powers, Larry OBrien and Congressman BOLAND, he said:

"I don't want to give you the impression that every member of this administration in Washington is Irish—it just seems that way."

It was my priviledge to be in Ireland for a few days about 3 months after President Kennedy's visit. The bond between the people of Ireland and the people of the United States was never stronger.

About a year before that it was my real pleasure to be the first of my family in 110 years to return to the boyhood home of my grandfather, Francis Carr, at Killybegs in County Donegal. I marveled how those people, planting and reaping by hand eked out a living on the rocky land of northwest Ireland. The fishing docks probably hadn't changed much since my grandfather left them for America. It was a great thrill to peruse the parish records at St. Mary's Rectory and find there his signature on two entries as a witness for baptisms.

But near Killybegs the Donegal woolen industry thrives. A short distance beyond the skilled artisans continue to produce the world-renowned hand painted Belleek china at the little village of the same name where the waters of Lough Erne start their cascade through the hydroelectric plants at Ballyshannon.

As one returns to Dublin through Sligo and Carrick-on-Shannon, the friendly people and beautiful countryside are reminders that industrial expansion at the cost of losing open space and green fields, polluting water, and polluting air, may not really represent progress considering the history of Ireland.

My red-haired maternal grandfather, Michael Patrick Kennedy, a native of Tipperary, must have felt somewhat the same when he left San Francisco in 1884. He moved to the more peaceful East Bay hills to operate a dairy on land near what is now Cedar and Arch Streets in Berkeley. Later he operated a larger dairy at College Avenue and Webster.

As a measure of how some people cherish the traditions of Ireland I recall the comment of a friend, Marcus McInerney of Limerick, as we stopped to permit a funeral procession to pass across the bridge at the River Shannon. The casket was enclosed in glass on a wagon, with the top-hatted driver high on the seat steering four handsome black horses. The dark-suited mourners walked behind on their way to the church. Marcus said, "I want to go the old way—not in one of these modern hearses." I couldn't help but think how sometimes in our frenetic modern world we are too busy to take time to reverently bury the dead—even to attend the funeral of a close friend.

During those trips in 1962 and 1963 I saw a new Ireland is emerging under the leadership of Prime Minister Sean Lemass and President Eamon de Valera.

Incidentally, last spring, a few months before I moved to San Francisco, I attended a luncheon for President de Valera at the State Department dining room. When we met I told him I had a special fondness for Ireland because my four grandparents

were Irish. He laughed and with reference to his Spanish name remarked: "That's better than I can claim."

Under the leadership of De Valera and Lemass Ireland for the first time in history is experiencing an economic boom. The decline in population which has continued for more than a century has been arrested and reversed.

No more is there an exodus to American shores in hope and agony which prompted James Joyce to describe the Atlantic as a bitter bowl of tears. The Ireland of the mists and the bogs is gone forever. The shamrock is the symbol of one of the more highly efficient jet airlines in the world, Irish International Airlines.

Young men such as Brian Lenihan of the Justice Department and Brendan O'Kelly of the Irish Sea Fisheries Board represent a new generation full of confidence with a will to succeed and set a new pace of economic progress.

Typical of their work is the promotion of a study on ways to improve the commercial fisheries of Ireland. It was my pleasure to work with them on the proposal which resulted in an agreement on October 15, 1963, between President Kennedy and Prime Minister Lemass. The report was the first cooperative report on the subject between the two governments and private industry. The first report on the study in July 1964 is the beginning of an effort to change the Irish fishing industry from a dawn-to-dark operation near shore to a high-quality fishing industry serving both foreign and domestic markets. It is another part of the economic program that will bring new wealth to Ireland.

The Irish Government's 5-year program for economic expansion beginning in 1959 was aimed at a modest increase of 2 percent annual growth in gross national product. In 4 years the annual increase was 4½ percent or 18 percent for the period through 1962. In a new enthusiastic program the Irish Government is aiming at a 50-percent increase in income between 1960 and 1970.

As one Irish representative said:

"If the Irish can be a success abroad there is no reason why they cannot be equally successful at home, given the appropriate opportunity."

Speaking of success—perhaps we can learn some lessons from the Irish of today.

In Ireland a free, cultural, law-abiding democratic society is financing publicly owned development projects from their own thrift. Ireland is not depending upon foreign aid funds from America. Her people are among the better fed and better housed peoples in the world. Ireland has a plentiful labor force, less crime, fewer juvenile problems and a better educated citizenry than many so-called, highly developed countries of the world. It is no wonder that U.S. firms are eyeing investment possibilities in Ireland.

I am sure a majority of this audience will agree that Ireland is an extraordinary country and the Irish and their descendants are extraordinary people.

George Bernard Shaw is reported to have said as an Irishman:

"Other people see things and say, 'Why?' * * * But I dream things that never were and I say, 'Why not?' "

And, to conclude, on this occasion in honor of St. Patrick, in honor of the Irish and all they represent, I cannot summarize it any better than President Kennedy did speaking before the Irish Parliament when he said with reference to Shaw's remark:

"It is that quality of the Irish, the remarkable combination of hope, confidence, and imagination that is needed more than ever today. The problems of the world cannot possibly be solved by skeptics or cynics whose horizons are limited by the obvious realities. We need men who can dream of things that never were, and ask why not."

Iowa Newspaper Points Out Effective Method of Fighting the Ku Klux Klan and Other Forms of Extremism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERT BANDSTRA
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, the Ku Klux Klan has been the center of a good deal of publicity in recent weeks. President Johnson has attacked it. The House Un-American Activities Committee has voted to investigate it. And there are proposals to pass new legislation to control it.

I have grave reservations as to the effectiveness of either investigating the Klan or legislating against it.

However, I think we should all remember that, in disposing of organizations such as the Klan, the Communist Party, or the Black Muslims, there is no real substitute for an informed and enlightened intellect among citizens on the local level. If these extremist groups are not sustained at the grassroots, they will wither and die.

In this connection, I would like to call to the attention of my fellow Members an excellent and appropriate editorial from the March 30, 1965, issue of the Centerville Iowegian of Centerville, Iowa.

As the editorial points out, the Ku Klux Klan has not always been confined to the South. During the 1920's the Klan had some influence in Iowa. But it has long since left that State. The reason, as the Iowegian editorial points out, is that it was not tolerated by the local citizenry.

The history of the Ku Klux Klan in Appanoose County, on the southern border of Iowa, is a lesson for the whole country. Once local citizens realize how divisive extremists groups can be in their community, examine their consciences and then stand up against them, the Ku Klux Klan and all other forms of extremism will disappear politically from America.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I hereby include the Iowegian editorial:

DISCREDITED KLANS

The Ku Klux Klan came in for some scorching criticism on the part of President Johnson last week. Four men identified with that unsavory organization were arrested and charged with the murder of a Detroit mother who was participating in the civil rights voting march on Montgomery, Ala.

The Ku Klux Klan has no place in American life. It operates under hooded secrecy and its method is to strike terror into the hearts of its adversaries. It has a reputation of resorting to brute force. Beating and clubbing are too frequently its allies. It is an organization that has no place in America.

Back in the 1920's the Ku Klux Klan gained some short-lived favor in Appanoose County. In those days members portrayed themselves as pure American, making it seem almost patriotic to be a part of their movement.

Fortunately, many people in the community vigorously resisted the spread of the Klan idea. The Klan had extreme prejudice against certain racial groups and religions, and upon close study its cause was un-American rather than American. It tried to dominate by bluster and threat rather than persuasion and example.

Some of our most responsible citizens in Centerville fought the Klan movement even though they were threatened. Businessmen who refused to join the Klan were told they would be driven out of business. It was a movement to forget in local history, because it was anything but a proud movement.

In the end the Klan movement came to its rightful end in Appanoose County. It was recognized for its true weaknesses. Shortly after mid-1920 the leaders of the local movement moved on, and the healing process started. For a generation it was almost a taboo subject since time had to be allowed for wounds to heal.

The South should do the same as we did 40 years ago. It should reject and discredit what is in reality an un-American organization that has no role or place in America.

Voting Rights Act of 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE D. WAGGONNER, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I know of no man in either body for whom I have more respect, both professionally and from a standpoint of personal probity, than the venerable senior Senator from Virginia, HARRY FLOOD BYRD. It behooves all of us in both Houses to hearken when he speaks; to consider at length his position on any item of legislation. He speaks with a wisdom that comes only from long years of unselfish dedication to the cause of responsible Federal Government.

His statement of April 2 on the so-called Voting Rights Act of 1965 is required reading, in my opinion, before any Member of the Congress casts his or her vote on this proposal. There are Members who have not had an opportunity, I am sure, to read all of his statement and, with unanimous consent, I insert it at this point in the RECORD.

I urge every Member to read each sentence. Take this issue of the RECORD home with you, if necessary, and study Senator BYRD's remarks. We are given, in this statement, every reason any man needs to defeat this proposal, now, before it is too late; before, in future years, we have to undo the mischievousness this bill will create if it is hastily and unwisely enacted.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD, DEMOCRAT, OF VIRGINIA, ON THE ADMINISTRATION'S SO-CALLED VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

To the People of Virginia:

This is a statement about the administration's so-called "Voting Rights Act of 1965." I am making it as a Member of the U.S. Senate representing Virginia under oath to uphold the Federal Constitution.

I am intensely aware of the democratic liberties to be achieved through our form of government, and to be guarded by it.

I am also dedicated to preservation of the principles and requirements of our State-local-Federal system and the checks and balances necessary to protect it.

The Federal Government of this country has worked itself into fiscal, monetary and military difficulties which are exceedingly serious.

Now the Federal administration is allowing itself to be influenced beyond reason by the emotion of domestic hysteria; and by its own actions it is inflaming so-called civil rights issues.

The so-called voting rights bill now before Congress is an act of the present administration. It admittedly was drafted by the Federal Attorney General.

It is a vicious bill. It clearly bears the unreasonable stamp of hysteria. Even Chairman EMANUEL CELLER, the New York chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, has called it "harsh."

The administration has pushed its consideration ahead of everything else. Committee hearings have been arbitrarily limited. Efforts to amend it are discouraged.

There is a terrific administration pressure to pass the bill before Easter. But this statement is not made with such intemperate haste. Instead, it is made with all deliberate speed.

I have analyzed all provisions of the bill. They are iniquitous in effect and contemptible in design. The administration has been advised of the odium in which I hold its proposal.

I have also studied the Federal Attorney General's testimony. He admits drafting the bill. Neither the bill nor the testimony is worthy of men entrusted with high office in the National Government of this country.

The proposal is made in the name of voting justice. It would be less hypocritical and more accurate to describe it as Federal law designed for vindictive use against six States selected in advance.

It is a proposal grossly to offend Virginia; and not only this. It is subversive of the Constitution of the United States and the whole system under which we are governed.

The Attorney General has documented his own cynicism. He has proclaimed his impatience with judicial process, and his lack of faith in it.

I quote directly from the prepared testimony of the Federal Attorney General before the Senate Judiciary Committee on March 23, 1965. He said:

"The judicial process, upon which all existing remedies depend, is institutionally inadequate to deal with practices so deeply rooted in the social and political structure."

I never expected to hear a responsible member of the legal profession or an Attorney General of the United States take such an attitude or make such a public statement about the judicial process.

Based on this rejection of government by law and not men, this Federal Attorney General seeks in a voting rights bill to arrogate judicial power to himself in areas of his own choosing.

A written Constitution protects us from despotic rule. For this protection against oppressive government we rely on the checks and balances of division of power and separation of powers.

The power of government is divided between State and Federal Government. And in both State and Federal Government, legislative, judicial, and executive powers are separated.

The Federal Attorney General, speaking for the administration, is demanding that the legislative branch of the Federal Government empower him—a political appointee in the executive branch—to preempt the judicial branch in areas he has chosen to punish.

That is not all. He is demanding power by Federal legislation to usurp the constitutional power of States he has already chosen to be his victims.

There is more. He is demanding this power under general Federal law which by his own design is limited to enforcement in only a handfull of States.

He decries racial discrimination in voting practices, but he deliberately wrote this bill to exempt all voting discrimination in a four-fifth majority of the 50 States from its application.

The Federal Attorney General tortures legal reasoning in the scheme he contrived to include and exclude States from the vengeful clutches of his bill.

The States he wants to incriminate are caught by his own dictates combined with a devious statistical formula. Under terms of the bill—

The Federal Attorney General—by asserting that the voting requirements in a target area are racially discriminatory—may indict a whole State or any subdivision as violating the Constitution of the United States and Federal law; and

If 50 percent of the voting age people in the area were not registered to vote on November 1, 1964, or if 50 percent did not choose to vote in the 1964 presidential election, the State or locality—with never a day in court—is automatically guilty of the Federal Attorney General's indictment.

When a State or locality is convicted by this kangaroo procedure, the Federal Attorney General orders invasion of the State or subdivision by an unspecified number of Federal registrars.

Occupation of the State or subdivision by the Federal registrars will continue for an unspecified and indefinite period of time.

The purpose of the Federal registrars is to impose and enforce the will of the Federal Attorney General with respect to voting laws, ordinances, and practices in the State or locality.

The practices, operations, and locations, etc., of the Federal registrars are limited only by the whim of the Federal Attorney General, but they will include registration of persons to vote when they claim they have been disqualified under State or local requirements. And the Federal registrars will collect annual poll taxes in States where they are imposed.

(And the Federal Attorney General says he will extend his authority to all elections—Federal and State, general and primary, and local and district, including those for bond issues and the like.)

The State or locality has no rights to any sort of judicial appeal until it is actually incriminated by the Federal Attorney General's drumhead court. Then it may enter an appeal from the position of a culprit already convicted and sentenced.

The appeal in that position cannot be to test the validity of the Federal Attorney General's action. It is in the nature of an appeal for a pardon which is necessary before the State or locality can be released from the clutches of the Federal Attorney General and his Federal registrars.

But like the State or locality, the pardon appeal is virtually prejudged by the terms of the bill.

The appeal can be made only in a remote specially selected three-judge Federal court in Washington, D.C. (The Federal Attorney General says this is desirable for uniformity of decision.)

The State or locality is convicted by the Federal Attorney General of racial discrimination in voting practices, but much more than this is involved in getting a pardon from the Federal Attorney General's special court at the doorstep of the Federal Justice Department in Washington, which is headed by the Federal Attorney General.

This court is allowed to grant a pardon to a State or locality only when it is able to prove to the court's satisfaction that for 10 past years—

Not only the State or locality, but also everybody in it, "acting under color" of its laws or ordinances, has been totally innocent.

Not only of racial discrimination in voting practices, but also totally innocent of all discrimination suggestive of voting discrimination.

(The Federal Attorney General says complying with the "equal but separate education" doctrine of the Federal Supreme Court which stood as the law of the land for a half-century would be an example of a practice suggestive of voting discrimination.)

Until a State or locality convicted by the Federal Attorney General is given such a pardon, under such conditions, by such a court, it is not allowed to enforce any change in any of its election laws or ordinances without permission from a district Federal court in Washington.

The extremes to which the administration and its Attorney General have gone to exempt the majority of States and convict a minority are beyond the realm of reason.

They demonstrate the bias and prejudice under which the bill was conceived and with which it will be enforced. The bill itself is literally based on discrimination as between States.

There is nothing in the Virginia constitution or statutes which can be honestly interpreted as discriminatory with respect to voting rights or registration.

I doubt that the Federal Attorney General can find a State where it is simpler or easier for anyone to register than it is in Virginia, or where election practices are cleaner.

If in truth, or consequence, there is any evidence of discriminatory voting practice or procedure in Virginia I am unaware of it.

If there is any evidence of racial discrimination in the registration laws or voting practices in Virginia, the Federal Attorney General has not given it the usual Federal fanfare.

Even the Federal Civil Rights Commission—with all of its bias and prejudice and snooping—has found that—

In Virginia there appears to be no racial discrimination with respect to voter registration and that Negroes "appear to encounter no significant racially motivated impediments in voting."

Despite all the activity of his own agents combined with that of the Civil Rights Commission agents, the Federal Attorney General says there is no widespread voting discrimination in Virginia.

But the Federal Attorney General persists in misrepresenting Virginia as a State with discriminatory registration laws or engaging in discriminatory voting practices.

He admits that this bill which he has drafted for the administration is fixed so that he can incriminate Virginia.

He admits also that he has designed this administration bill so that he can exempt Texas from its application.

In advance he has said that he will incriminate Virginia and exempt Texas.

He says Virginia is caught in his numbers game because 41 percent (not 50 percent) of its voting-age people voted in the presidential election of November 1964.

But he says Texas, where 44 percent (not 50 percent) of its voting-age people voted in the presidential election of November 1964, is not to be subjected to the application of his numbers racket.

When the Federal Attorney General was asked why Texas was to be exempt, he said:

"Texas is out for the reason that it does not have a literacy test. The literacy tests are the devices that have been primarily used in order to prevent Negroes from registering."

For those who may be misled by the Federal Attorney General into believing that Virginia has a literacy test, I shall compare

the so-called voting tests and other requirements for voting in Virginia and Texas.

Both States voted less than 50 percent in the presidential election of November 1964.

Both States have a relatively high percentage of nonwhite population.

Both States in November 1964 required the payment of poll taxes as a prerequisite for voting in all but Federal elections.

The voting lists for the 1964 presidential election in Texas were composed of the names of persons certified by the poll tax collectors as having either paid their $1.75 poll tax, or as having formally applied for and received a certificate of exemption from payment for voting in the Federal election.

Like Texas, Virginia voters were exempt from payment of their $1.50 poll tax as a requirement for voting in the 1964 Federal election. The voting lists in Virginia were composed of the names of persons who had been registered under the Virginia voting registration laws.

In Texas, the so-called test is applied to prospective voters by the tax collector when they undertake to pay their poll tax; or when they formally apply for a certificate of exemption.

In Virginia the prospective voter is billed for his poll tax along with other taxes. He is asked simple questions of identification when he registers to vote at the office of a registrar.

In Texas the prospective voter must be able to understand the questions asked by the tax collector, and give the answers. In certain cases a husband can apply in behalf of his wife, and a wife can apply in behalf of her husband.

In Texas, article 5.14 of the election code requires the following questions to be answered:

Name?
Age?
Sex?
Race? (This is presumed to have been outlawed by a recent Federal court decision).
Occupation?
Length of residence in the State of Texas?
U.S. citizenship?
Native-born or naturalized citizen?
State or county of birth?
Length of residence in county.
Texas post office address (if residence is in an incorporated city or town give the ward, street, and number of residence in lieu of post office address, and length of residence in such city or town)?
Political party affiliation?

In Virginia, title 24, section 68, of the code requires the following questions to be answered in writing by the person registering, without assistance:

Name?
Age?
Date and place of birth?
Residence?
Occupation?
Have you ever voted before?
State, county and precinct where you last voted?

(Members of armed services are required to give their service, serial number and discharge date where pertinent.)

(Naturalized citizens are required to give date, court and State where they received their naturalization papers, along with their petition and certificate numbers.)

All persons registering are required to sign the following oath:

"I ——— do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I am entitled to register under the constitution and laws of this State, and that I am not disqualified from exercising the right of suffrage by the constitution of Virginia."

But the Federal Attorney General, while admitting that both States are ensnared in his voting numbers trap, reveals that he has written this bill for the administration so that—

He can exempt Texas by simply asserting that Texas has no literacy test. But he can incriminate Virginia by inferring that Virginia has some kind of a voting test that will not get his approval.

The fact is that in State and local elections on questions of bond issues, debt, and other matters of public finance, Texas voters must own taxable property.

There is no such requirement in Virginia.

For State and local elections Texas requires payment of poll taxes for 1 year; Virginia requires their payment for 3 years, but the 3-year requirement does not apply to new voters coming of age or moving into the State.

What does the Federal Attorney General do about poll taxes? He exempts Texas from application of his bill. But his bill provides that his Federal registrars sent to poll tax States will collect the taxes for 1 year—as in Texas—from persons they qualify to vote.

Beyond this, he has testified that neither he nor his Federal registrars will "recognize" the 3-year poll tax requirement—as in Virginia.

But while the Federal Attorney General refuses to recognize the requirement to pay poll taxes for 3 years as a requirement to vote, he provides in his bill that he and his Federal registrars can disenfranchise persons they have qualified to vote contrary to State laws if they do not vote "at least once during 8 consecutive years while listed."

The people of Virginia, and the Nation, are justified in the condemnation of legislation such as the Federal administration and its Attorney General propose in the so-called Voting Rights Act of 1965.

They would pin a rose on Texas, but incriminate Virginia.

And when they incriminate Virginia, they deny it the judicial process accorded a murdered.

They would convict Virginia of voting discrimination, but deny it a pardon until it has proved its innocence of something else for 10 years.

They admit there is already ample law under which allegations of discrimination can be tested in the judicial process, but they want this special law to bypass judicial process for the punishment of the States of their choice.

For purposes of this law, the Federal administration and its Attorney General condone an eighth-grade education voting test in New York, but they want the power to qualify a moron to vote in Alabama.

They decry discrimination devices, but they have proposed a law which in itself is a discrimination device.

The Federal Attorney General has no patience with the judicial process for the victims of this bill. He wants the power to deal with them himself.

The Federal administration and its Attorney General propose to incriminate certain States by means of dictator-type decree and a statistical formula.

They demand for themselves the right, under certain conditions which they name, to disenfranchise people they themselves qualified to vote.

The Federal administration and its Attorney General propose by a single Federal statute to take away the constitutional rights of States and substitute Federal Executive decree.

If this can be done for this administration, for the purposes of this bill, to punish the States it has chosen, it can be done at other times for other purposes to destroy the constitutional rights of others, the Constitution not withstanding.

It is significant that this bill would extend Federal control over all elections—Federal, State, local, and party primaries.

Federal agents are not to confine their control only to elections for political office. They extend it to State and local elections with respect to public finance—bond issues, credit, expenditures, etc.

Simply by changing the statisical formula the Federal administration and its Attorney General can be empowered to extend their control over any and all States they wish to give this treatment.

What would remain of our form and system of government if all elections in all States and localities were controlled by the Central Government.

Only last month 99.9 percent of the people in Moscow voted in an election of candidates who had no opposition. And when Mr. Khrushchev voted, he was not required even to produce identification.

Negotiate What?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the demands for negotiations in Vietnam have increased in tempo and volume. Several nations have urged this course, as well.

Yet the United States remains reluctant to negotiate and not without reason. This is discussed with good logic in the following editorial from the Indianapolis Times of April 3, 1965:

NEGOTIATE WHAT?

Seventeen nations have signed a petition urging "negotiations, as soon as possible," to end the fighting in Vietnam.

The purpose of the negotiations, according to the petitioners, would be to find a political solution to the war "in accordance with the legitimate aspirations of the Vietnamese people and the spirit of the Geneva agreements on Vietnam."

The main legitimate aspiration of the people of South Vietnam is to be let alone, to get the Communist Vietcong from North Vietnam off their backs, so they may stabilize their government and go about developing their country—free of strife, for a change.

The spirit of the Geneva agreements was that South Vietnam would be a free country. What had been French Indochina was carved up, creating the states of North Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia and South Vietnam. The United States and South Vietnam did not sign, because there were too many concessions to the Communists—but Red China, the Soviet Union and North Vietnam, among others, did sign.

The violator of that agreement is Communist North Vietnam, encouraged at the least, by Red China and the Soviet Union.

In this light, what is there to negotiate?

The freedom of the people of South Vietnam?

This would repudiate the Geneva accord and every sense of moral decency.

That leaves only one other possible issue for negotiation—the complete withdrawal of all Vietcong guerrillas, infiltrators, killers, propagandists and bomb-throwers. With an adequate guarantee against their return.

North Vietnam does not offer this. Red China resists it.

The 17 small nations—none with a direct stake in the Vietnam war—submitted their petition to Secretary of State Rusk who properly received it "with great interest." They also sent it to Russia, Red China and North Vietnam, the only governments in a position to provide the only answer—by pulling the Vietcong out of South Vietnam.

This requires no negotiation—simply a decision to keep the promises they made in the Geneva agreement.

A Black and White Paper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL L. DEVINE
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, Dr. George R. Davis, minister, National City Christian Church, read a paper on Sunday, March 14, 1965, not as a part of the sermon, but as a statement before over 1,200 persons.

In the emotional atmosphere, sometimes bordering on hysteria as it relates to civil rights matters, all of us would do well to study the very thought-provoking and moving words of this respected clergyman. Dr. Davis' statement follows:

A BLACK AND WHITE PAPER

A call went out on Friday and again on Saturday from certain religious, civic, and civil rights leaders that the services of the churches in Washington, D.C., and everywhere across the Nation be used on March 14 to express militant demands for increased civil rights pressures, and that the services also be used as memorials to an outstanding minister who died at the hands of violent men this past week, in Alabama.

What I am about to do will meet those requests only in part, and I will meet the requests in a way which goes beyond the expectation and intention of those who quite rightly asked that the events of tragedy during recent days and weeks not be ignored by the churches. Because I will be expressing views at some points I have not heard expressed by the clergy this past week, in addition to making clear, very clear, some convictions I have against social injustices, and in addition to using portions of our services as brief memorials and for special prayers. I am sure I will not please all who hear me, perhaps will please no one at all. And yet I cannot remain silent. Across the years of my ministry, as I look back now, there were times when I remained silent, when I should have spoken, and times I spoke when I should have remained silent. Today I am confident, I must not remain silent. Only time will reveal the wisdom of my decision. Silence could leave the impression I am totally in sympathy with all that has recently taken place in Washington, and across the Nation, thus using my silence to let people draw their own conclusions about my feelings, without becoming involved personally in the crisis. On the other hand my silence could be taken as a complete lack of feeling, or concern, an unawareness of tragedy.

Let nothing I say later on in this paper, be taken as an effort to tone down the brutal facts of the assault upon innocent people engaged in Alabama or anywhere else in peaceful demonstrations, or to tone down the sickening happenings in Selma, Ala., last Sunday. Surely all of us, at least any of us who dare to wear the name Christian must be disturbed to the center of our being as we think about the senseless killing of the minister, as we think about his family, and of the many killings of human beings, Negro and white, in the South, yes, but also in the North. Later in brief moments of silence we shall remember these dead. And if there are those who would like to contribute to the memorial funds which have been established for the Reverend James Reeb family, and who wish to send those gifts through this church, that will be done. And such gifts would be fitting, even if they were not needed by the family, and I do not know of their needs, but they would be fitting nevertheless as symbols of concern. All of the above I wanted to say before I speak the one special word which has not been spoken by the "responsible clergy," this past week, or recently. At least I have not heard it, nor read it, from the clergy. Perhaps it has been spoken, but not reported by the press. This would not be surprising. The "responsible press, and radio, and television" seem to be willing at times to report only one view. I know this from having seen the word I speak, twisted, lifted out of context. So before I speak that word, which has not been spoken by the clergy, or the pickets, or the marchers, or the civil rights leaders, or at least I have not heard it spoken, I wanted to say the above.

And before I speak that word, I wish also to say the following: Can there be any among us, who wear the name Christian who do not feel shame for the long injustices practiced toward our fellow Americans, in the denial of voting privileges, the shameful patterns of segregation in most of the ways we have conducted our society? And let us now forget for a moment the so-called secular parts of our society, trains and buses, theaters, housing, jobs, schools, where men and women, youth, boys and girls, just because of the color of their skin, have been robbed of their dignity, their decency, their human rights, their American rights. Let us forget for a moment the pointing of the finger of scorn at the South. The North is guilty too. And this has been almost forgotten, if not totally forgotten, in the impressions left. The North is guilty too, perhaps even more so, with a kind of self-righteousness, a thin veneer of pretense. But let us forget all of the above for a moment, and think just about the churches across America, where we have allowed to be practiced what some have rightly called the most segregated hour of the week, the hour of morning worship on Sundays, in American churches. Let us pause to think just about the churches, forgetting, I say, for the moment, what we call the secular society. Let us think just of the churches, for the moment, where not considering the matter of church membership at all, men and women have not been made welcome even to enter, because of the color of their skin. [And I will not pose with self-righteousness myself, even though I have received into the membership of National City Christian Church all people who came forward, Negroes as well as whites, and during my ministry the church has been integrated. Indeed we have members from many national backgrounds, and of several races.]

Now that I have said all of the above I wish to say the one word, composed of many words, I have not heard spoken by the clergy. And it should be spoken. This is the word. I reject the mood which has been increasingly growing in this Nation, that is the movement of the solution of our problems to the streets. I reject the spectacle of laughing off, or condoning, or considering unimportant, or accepting as the normal pattern, by giving encouragement to such action, teenagers, children, and adults sprawled over the halls of the Justice Department, and the White House, especially the White House. I reject the spectacle of people throwing their bodies in front of vehicles, locking arms across busy streets and highways, marching in places and in numbers, inconsistent with a sense of real responsibility, all in the name of peaceful demonstrations. It is not the right to peaceful demonstrations, marches, picketing, against which I lift up my word. Free men have these and other rights. It is the encouragement of the mood as the way by which ends are to be gained, and the mood has been growing and encouraged, about which I speak my word. I take issue with clergymen who this past week laid down ultimatums to the President of the United States, ultimatums to be met "or else." I take issue with clergymen who this past week said there "are times to ignore law and order" to gain desirable ends. I take issue with clergymen who with surprising arrogance this past week left the impression God speaks to them alone, and may not be speaking to sincere men who sit in the desperately dangerous seats of our national authority and leadership, and who accused their fellow-clergymen of being snowed by the President, after they returned from talking with the President and were impressed with his sincerity and intentions. I reject men who said this past week, "If some are killed in Alabama, the blood will be on the hands of the President of the United States," who said, "The President should lead the march on Selma," who inferred "The spirit of Christ has left the churches in the South, all of the white churches, and gone elsewhere." There are those who will say, "But all of this was in the past, spoken under pressure, let us forget all of this." But these remarks were made by responsible men in times of great emergency, and gave encouragement to irresponsibility on the part of youth, and others. I insist therefore the word of caution and moderation I am speaking is not out of place, or irrelevant to the situation. I reject the arrogance which presumed to suggest that the President of the United States needed to be reminded by men who hardly knew him, of his responsibility, when he had shown such concern in so many ways for the welfare of all of our citizens, from the moment he assumed the Presidency under such tragic circumstances, and who with others of many groups and both parties has been leading this Nation along to higher and higher goals toward making the rights of all secure. Indeed our present President must be given major credit for last year's strong civil rights law. I have been profoundly grateful this past week, there has been a man in the White House, trained, mature, disciplined, who would not be pushed into hurried action (that is action based on momentary judgments), or "blackjacked" into a course of action by any pressure groups, and yet a man who made it very clear at his conference with the press yesterday, where he stands.

He does not need my defense, perhaps might even consider certain parts of this paper mentioning him to be presumptuous. Be that as it may. Well he might insist on his right and obligation to conduct that high office in such a manner (in his way), as one thinks of his long and faithful service at every level of our national life, as one thinks of his stability evidenced hour after hour since that black November day in 1963, and as one thinks of the overwhelming "yes" this Nation said to him in November 1964. Of course, what the President said on Saturday (March 13) concerning human rights, civil rights, citizen rights, he has said so many times before. And only those who had paid no heed or who were wrapped up in their own egotisms could have failed to hear and understand him. This Nation did not deserve last week to be made a spectacle before the world by having our national leadership lifted up to ridicule and their motives carelessly questioned. I truly believe the South was moving forward, in many areas, that many people of good will were beginning to break through the walls of resistance. And I also know, and so do you, or you should know, that long before last week our Government was preparing new legislation to strengthen, to put teeth into vot-

ing rights, and other rights. [And it is in a sense tragic now to leave the impression before the world that the recent pressures brought all of this about, and that it would not have been brought about otherwise. In other words that we as a nation are taking at last to the streets, as the real means to gain the goals. Our Attorney General on the "Today" show, during the week of March 15, himself declared, in answer to questions, that the legislation was on its way, had been on its way for months. Last week did not enhance our position, our image, in many ways, including our display before our marching, picketing, neighbors all around the world, that we too are finally dedicated to this way of the streets as the way. And the impression also has been left around the world, and this was the purpose of some irresponsible people in their stepped up activity, that our leaders were not prepared to take action, except when compelled to do so, by high pressures, or when blackjacked into doing so, or when given ultimatums. It is this sort of movement in our Nation toward a policy, a frame of mind, about which I speak my word. One thing may be said about us as a nation, we did "come through it," as we will come through much else, on the long, long road we have to travel in the world-wide revolution now upon us. I lift only a word against the drift to demonstrations and ultimatums as the way to which we must be finally committed.]

As one who supports the National Council of Churches, and will continue to do so, my whole ministry has been and will continue to be dedicated to the ecumenical movement, the "ecumenical church," I reserve however the right to declare, I think the most recent calls for militant action were ill times and did not serve well the interests of Nation or church. I reserve the right to declare that not only the violent and evil men who killed James Reeb are guilty, but also some who stand in self-righteous innocence, who were a part of the aggravation, when ill-timed, must also share the guilt. Perhaps all of us are guilty in one way or another. I am willing to accept my part of the guilt. [I wish now to reject the wild accusations some have made against the Councils of Churches, local, national, worldwide, as being in the grasp of leaders who cannot be trusted, and that the churches should turn away from the councils. The work, ministry, and record of the councils, and of the leaders, have been too vital, too outstanding, to listen to such voices. But one may still reserve the right to honest opinion concerning specific actions and pronouncements. And one may still object to irresponsible statements, such as some made in Washington, and elsewhere, recently, and to which I have previously referred, and to ultimatums laid down even by "men of God."] I reserve the right in the present dialog to take issue with an irresponsible public official, let us say a segregationist Governor, or a bishop who indulges in an irresponsible statement or ultimatum, though his basic purpose is sound.

[Often men fail their opportunities. I said in August, 1963, in a sermon, "Our Way of Life Is Threatened," "Unless States and cities, and persons, move more rapidly to bring justice to our social order, to deal with the problems of discrimination, Federal power will be used. It is always second best to take from communities and States, the power of law enforcement, but the continued denial of human rights to minorities, will offer no other course than Federal intervention." Governor Wallace and the State authorities of Alabama had the opportunity, the week of March 15, to retain to the State such rights related to guaranteeing peaceful assembly and marches. Not doing so, the President had no other choice than the one taken. But I also insist the civil rights leaders, in the light of the President's strong and eloquent address to the Congress, Monday, March 15, and in the light of other factors moving in the direction of real achievements, had a supreme and glorious opportunity to call off, at least for the time being, all marches, demonstrations, picketing, to give the Nation a time of ease, and calm. But because so many are committed to this way, the way of the streets, and no doubt for other reasons, the golden opportunity was passed by.

When the Federal Court through Judge Johnson spoke concerning marches and demonstrations, and in particular the march from Selma to Montgomery, law and order were upheld, and with guarantees from police power of the Federal Government. But I think we should also be reminded that before the judge issued his decision, there were "responsible men," even some clergy, who had already declared how they would act, whatever the decision of the court. It is all of this about which I lift up my word. In how many cities, and States, could we at one and the same time provide protection such as given for the Selma-Montgomery march? Back of that question is my real concern, the drift toward a way, a way men have used, and rightly so, at times, and in places, but always while they were still committed to some other way as the beter answer.] [We speak of the August 1963 march on Washington, as a peaceful march. It was indeed, and as I look back upon it now, though I spoke against it at the time, I would agree it may have contributed to the forward progress of civil rights. But let us take a second look. (1) That march had all of the power of military personnel in the military district of Washington, D.C., guaranteed to stand ready for any emergency. (2) That march had all of the police force of Washington, D.C., and hundreds from New York City in preparation. (3) That march had the urgent request of authorities of the District to all people to stay off the streets, unless they were in the march. In some ways for a day or more in Washington we lived in a police state to guarantee peace. Many stores did not open, and those open had little business. Before the march started, looking down the streets, one had the impression of a "ghost town." (4) That march had the guidance of many responsible leaders to control the "hot heads." In fact two clergy refused to go on the platform at the great mass meeting to give prayers, until one of the radical leaders "toned down" the written remarks he was to deliver. Twice they insisted that he tone them down, before the very moving, and religious program began, as reported by press, radio, and television. Even of that vast march it may now be sincerely asked, "Is this way, into the streets, and which is becoming increasingly the mood of our time, the way we wish to encourage?" The word I speak is merely to raise this question now, and I think it is a relevant question.]

[I think it should be pointed out that not only the Washington march, and the Selma-Montgomery march had to have a vast cover of police protection, and it had to be either State or Federal, but that any march of such size could not be held anywhere in the Nation without some such assurances. And the risks will be increasingly great. We have heard it declared that passage of the voting rights bill will not stop the demonstrations, indeed will increase them, perhaps their size as well as their tempo. And this we must count on no doubt. The voting rights bill should pass and as hurriedly as possible, within proper limits for intelligent debate, and perhaps allowing for minor and needed changes. And much, much else must be done. I only lift my word concerning the movement of the time toward the streets. There are those who tell me such a caution is irrelevant to the times, and is not in the "mainstream". There are those who will try to relate my caution to reaction. There was a time in the sad and tragic days of the McCarthy hearings when men and women were held up to ridicule as fellow travelers, "pinkos," Communists, because they dared to speak against right wing extremists, and because they would not go off the deep end with the McCarthy school of thought and behavior. Is it possible today, when a man dares to speak a word of caution about "the streets" that he will be accused of being against social justice? I am now on the defensive no doubt, but I will allow my pulpit utterances and my practical record in the ministry, in the ecumenical, interracial, and interfaith areas, long before I came to Washington, as well as since I came to Washington, to speak for themselves. And I will allow time to speak down the years.]

I urge my country and our people to reject the mood of our time, and to move away from complete surrender to a philosophy of seeking our answers in the streets, in gangs, in marches, in untamed crowds, in threats, in ultimatums. It is not only in civil rights we must confront this, it is everywhere. Do we wish to be rid of a chancellor of a great university, we march, we picket, we shout. Do some wish to subscribe to Castro's tune, in defiance of law, we ignore the Nation's request, violate her best interests, and humanity's best interests, and take to the streets. And if we watch carefully the faces and action of the participants, they are not all saints. To some all of this is a big joke, we do it for kicks, and there are also the beatniks out for the lark, and there are the extremists of all varieties.

And of course there are the earnest and genuine folk, and the saints. If I say or write anything which would suggest lack of respect for men like Ralph Bunche, many of my fellow clergy, and many faithful people, this is not my intent or spirit. But I do feel compelled to lift my word at the point where I have lifted it, and now. To open one's mouth today is to be misunderstood, misquoted, quoted out of context, and sometimes to be relegated to the company of people whose ideas you do not follow at all, but who will take advantage of a word of caution as being agreement with injustice, and the deep sickness of our time. But the word I have spoken I have not heard elsewhere. I doubt very much if in such a revolutionary time my little word will be heard, let alone followed, but I had to speak my word. Free men have the right to petition, to peacefully picket, to demonstrate, to march. There are deep, long injustices, to be removed, and they will be removed, as history shows, by peaceful means or by violence. It could have been hoped we were really ready for law and order, for an increasing turning to the courts, to the ways of mature men, and especially when we are trying to lead a strife torn world, and many new nations to the ways of law and order, to the way of world courts. And this is especially so, when this Nation has done so much, and made so much progress, and really did not finally deserve to be presented before the world in such a sad light. It is true indeed free men have the right to a great deal. They also have the right and obligation to be responsible. [In the present dialogue I offer my views sincerely, but not dogmatically in the sense that I reject the right of other men to question my views. I do insist the word I have spoken needs to be spoken, and I insist on the right of good conscience to speak it. And I hope I do so in good will and Christian charity.] [When men look back upon this time, and were to ask me, "Where were you?" I will have to answer, "I did not march." But I like to believe I have for a good many years been deeply involved, with some results, in my own way. And only God, not I, nor they could be the judge of that.]

GEORGE DAVIS.

Liberals Push Red Line for Peace in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I insert the following article from the Indianapolis Star of April 4, 1965:

LIBERALS PUSH RED LINE FOR PEACE IN VIETNAM

(By Michael Padev)

WASHINGTON.—Liberals, Socialists and other supporters of what is known as the left are often offended when they are accused of being soft on communism.

They point out that they are, in fact, more effective in their opposition to communism precisely because their liberal policies of social reform deprive the Communists of the most popular points in their program. The argument is that when the voters discover that not only Communists are for the poor or for social justice, they won't join the Communists but will, instead, support the liberals, the democratic Socialists and the other leftwingers. Only the left can fight communism effectively, these liberals argue, because only the left can present to the people popular and appealing political programs.

I have never been impressed by these liberal arguments for the simple reason that I don't accept the notion that Communist political programs are popular. The Communists have never come to power by way of the ballot box anywhere on earth. Communist political programs have never had popular appeal except with a minority of voters. The Communists themselves admit that. For this reason Communists reject the idea of democratic government and of free democratic elections. Those liberals who believe that you can fight the Communist danger effectively by a program of social reform haven't studied communism seriously in either theory or practice.

FOREIGN POLICY STAND TAKEN

It is in the international field, however, that liberals fail most of the time to see the true nature of the Communist danger. That's why liberal foreign policy programs can seldom combat international communism in any serious way. More often than not liberal positions on foreign policy problems actually help the Communists.

I used to think that the liberals did this out of sheer ignorance combined with political stupidity. But lately I have been asking myself, What is it that the liberals really want, say in Vietnam?

And I have come to the reluctant conclusion that in Vietnam most liberals want the same things which the Communists want. This does not mean that the liberals should be considered Communists or pro-Communist. But it does mean that, on the Vietnam issue, the Communists and some of the liberals find themselves on the same side of the political barricade.

Liberals, for example, or at least most of them, want the U.S. air strikes over Communist targets in North Vietnam stopped immediately. So do the Communists. Most liberals advocate a phased American withdrawal from South Vietnam. So do the Communists. Most liberals want some form of neutralization of South Vietnam. So do the Communists.

CRY OF COLONIALISM RAISED

Most liberals are horrified to see the United States expand its political influence and military power in southeast Asia. So are the Communists. Most liberals argue that the Communist guerrillas in South Vietnam are not agents of the Communist regime of North Vietnam but are local patriots and revolutionaries who want to free their country from "colonialism." This, of course, is exactly what the Communists are saying.

Perhaps the most revealing document on liberal thinking on Vietnam was published the other day in an editorial in that New York daily newspaper which rightly claims to be the official organ of the liberal establishment in the United States. The editorial favors an American-sponsored "regional development plan" in South Vietnam to supply the necessary food for the hungry Communist states of North Vietnam and Red China. The editorial said "the Communist effort to seize the rice surplus areas of southeast Asia by war would appear less attractive once it became clear that vastly larger supplies could be obtained through peace."

I submit that such a solution of the Vietnam crisis would be welcomed by the Communists. Nothing suits better the Communist purpose than to obtain, in Winston Churchill's words, "the fruits of war without war."

Senior Citizens' Health Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to call to the attention of the membership my views on medicare as outlined in my monthly report to the residents of my congressional district last month.

SENIOR CITIZENS' HEALTH PROGRAMS

(From Congressman ELMER J. HOLLAND, 20th District of Pennsylvania)

At long last it appears that Congress—both the House and the Senate—will act favorably on legislation to provide adequate hospitalization, nursing home care, home nursing care and diagnostic services for our elder citizens, 65 and over, the program will come under the Social Security Act, as I have long advocated.

President Johnson sent the following message to a recent luncheon meeting held in Washington and sponsored by the Senior Citizens Golden Ring Council of New York. In substance, he said:

"The crusade for health care is on the verge of victory.

"The long debate is drawing to a close. There is going to be a program of health insurance for older people in this country. And the basis of that program is going to be our great social security system.

"For far too long older Americans have had to cope as best they could with the steeply rising costs of hospital care and other health services that you need.

"You have been patient in your actions, progressive in your thinking. Now your patience is to be rewarded by action."

Congressman MILLS, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee—attended that luncheon, and told the guests the health care package would include the following:

1. A basic social insurance program of hospital care, based on the King-Anderson bill.

2. An increase in social security cash benefits.

3. An optional supplementary program covering many health expenses—not included in the basic hospital insurance program—to be partially financed from Federal funds.

4. Improvements in the existing Kerr-Mills Act (medical assistance for the aged)—to include provisions for medical care to needy children, as well as the needy elderly who cannot qualify under the social security program.

The bill—including the four programs—was reported out by the Ways and Means Committee on March 23. It is now in the Rules Committee awaiting a rule under which it will be considered by the House. (The Rules Committee determines whether a bill comes out under a closed rule—meaning no amendments can be offered from the floor—or an open rule—meaning that amendments can be offered by the Members for consideration.)

One thing is certain—however—the bill will reach the floor of the House for a vote. Early this session, Members of the House passed a resolution reinstating the 21-day rule—which authorizes the Speaker of the House to call up for House action any bill approved by a legislative committee that has not been cleared for House consideration by the Rules Committee within 21 days. In other words, the Rules Committee received the legislation on March 24, and if it takes no action, Speaker MCCORMACK can have the measure placed before the House for consideration after April 14. Therefore, we will soon have the opportunity to vote for the legislation.

In 1956, when I ran for Congress in a special election, I campaigned on a platform stating my support of the Forand bill to provide hospitalization, medical care and drug costs for persons receiving social security and railroad retirement benefits. After my election, I introduced the Forand bill and became a cosponsor (84th Cong.).

I have reintroduced that bill each Congress—up to the present—(89th Cong.). This session I cosponsored the King-Anderson bill (H.R. 1813). The administration backed the King-Anderson program, and while it did not provide broad coverage, I have stated I would vote for it if a better program was not obtainable. However, I felt the provisions of the Forand-Holland bill were preferable. In an effort to appease the American Medical Association, the administration deleted the portion of the old Forand-Holland measure "to provide coverage of medical and drug costs" and kept the hospitalization and nursing care coverage.

The AMA was not to be appeased, however, and it opposed even the limited version. That organization, over the years, has prevented the legislation from coming before Congress.

The AMA first opposed, then endorsed—and finally supported—the Kerr-Mills Act (medical assistance for the aged). This is a welfare program under which all persons 65 and over, who are on relief, can receive needed medical and hospital care, plus dental and eye care, diagnostic services, home nursing services and drugs with all costs paid by the State and Federal Governments. Under that program persons, 65 and over, who are receiving Social Security and Railroad Retirement benefits are entitled to hospitalization and nursing home care only, provided the pensioner can prove that he and/or his children cannot afford to pay for such care. * * * His income is below a certain

amount * * * and * * * he has no private life insurance or property over a specified amount. (Each State is different.)

Pennsylvania citizens—65 and over who are on relief or pensions—do not receive any benefits under the Kerr-Mills Act which they did not already have under the State welfare program. The only help the act gives our State is to reduce the cost to the State, as the Federal Government now pays half the costs. Several other States with welfare programs similar to ours—New York, Michigan, New Jersey, etc.—also participate in the Kerr-Mills program, since it authorizes the Federal Government to share in the State's cost. Many States, however, do not wish to pay their share of the cost—so they do not participate in the program; consequently, their elder citizens (with or without pensions) receive no health care.

In the November 1964 election, the people of America elected a President and Vice President, as well as Congressmen and Senators, who campaigned on platforms including adequate health care for our senior citizens. There was little doubt that the limited program—under the King-Anderson bill—would be enacted into law.

However, the American Medical Association—in a hysterical, last-ditch stand—came up with a fancy-named program, eldercare, and it claims to cover everything at no cost to any individual (just the State and Federal Governments * * * who are really you and me), but in the fine print—you find out that maybe you will have to pay something after all.

Supposedly, the main concern of the AMA is the lack of health insurance coverage for doctors' fees and medicines, yet, this coverage was provided by the Forand-Holland bill, and the AMA claimed it would result in socialized medicine. Now, it laments for the poor pensioners because inadequate care is not offered under the original King-Anderson bill. But under the King-Anderson bill, as amended by the committee, this is not true.

The amended King-Anderson bill has a provision of considerable interest to our pensioners not included in the other bills. It grants a 7-percent increase to the 20 million social security beneficiaries (about $1.3 billion a year).

Another section of the amended bill increases the Federal share of public assistance programs in the various States, helping old-age assistance recipients, blind pension recipients, and persons receiving assistance because of disability (other than social security disability). Needy children—on relief—will also be included.

Federal funds to the States will be increased under this section—for programs conducted in behalf of the aged in mental and tuberculosis institutions.

Following is a résumé of the major medical care proposals. You may judge for yourself, the true facts.

Résumé

Provisions	King-Anderson bill (medicare)	Herlong-Curtis bill (eldercare)	Byrnes bill (GOP)
Who is eligible?	All persons 65 years of age and over	All persons 65 years of age and over	All persons 65 and over.
Benefits	60 days inpatient hospital care; patient to pay cost for 1 day (approximately $40). 60 days in nursing home if posthospital care required and patient is transferred from a hospital. 240 health care visits at home. Outpatient hospital diagnostic services; patient to pay ¼ amount required under inpatient service (approximately $20) for each 30-day period of diagnostic service furnished. Optional voluntary insurance to cover doctors' fees, surgical fees, and medicines, $3 per month by pensioner and $3 per month by Federal Government.[1]	Would depend upon type of contract that State would make with private insurance companies. Would hope to have all medical and hospital costs covered.	Would pay first $1,000 (except for $50) and 80 percent of remaining costs of hospital and 80 percent of medical costs.
Who would administer the program?	Social security system	States, either through the department of welfare or the department of health.	Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and Treasury Department of Federal Government.
How program would be financed?	Increase in social security taxes; not over 50 cents per week, $26 annually, and general revenue taxes for those not covered by social security or railroad retirement (persons on relief).	Federal Government and State government would participate, and in many cases the pensioner would have to pay part or all of the premium, other than Government share, if personal income so merits. (States will decide maximum income allowed to permit pensioner full benefits, free of personal cost, like Kerr-Mills.)	Graduated premium contribution by pensioner based on income, by State and Federal contribution.
Estimated maximum yearly cost to individual.	$26 while working	Would depend upon State plan	$114 after age 65.
Total cost of program (estimated).	$2,000,000,000 (without optional insurance)	$2,100,000,000	$3,400,000,000.

[1] Private insurance companies, that pool resources to provide, on a nonprofit basis, approved low-cost health insurance to the elderly for health costs not covered under social security plan; the Federal Government will exempt them from antitrust laws.

Eldercare: Let's look at it—calmly.

This is a medical insurance program for all persons 65 and older—and would be voluntary on the part of the States and individuals—(meaning the State legislatures would have to vote to take part in the plan before it would be available to its citizens—same as the Kerr-Mills program). Benefits would differ with the various States (according to private insurance policies contracted by the States) * * * and financed by "matching funds" with the Federal Government paying up to 84 percent to States to help pay costs of private insurance coverage.

Now—here is an interesting item, little publicized or discussed, the legislation provides that "recipients would pay all, part or none of the premium costs, depending on their income and the State plan. * * *

"Participants would certify their income to the State agency administering the program. Persons paying the full premium would have the benefit of an income tax deduction for payments, as well as statewide bargaining for * * * health insurance" (Congressional Quarterly, Mar. 5, 1965). States could administer the program through their department of health or department of welfare (as Kerr-Mills), and private insurance companies—such as Blue Cross and Blue Shield—could also help administer it through contract with the State.

The cost would depend on, if and how, the States used the plan. It has been estimated, however, that $2.1 billion of State and Federal funds would be required.

There is little doubt the American Medical Association is spending millions of dollars on spot announcements on 792 radio stations, the ABC television network and 166 independent channels, on page-size ads in the three national newspapers chains, small weekly publications, and in the 14 million pamphlets and circulars distributed in doctors' offices throughout the Nation.

Yet the sponsor of the AMA's eldercare bill, Congressman A. S. HERLONG, rebuked the association last week, as reported by the New York Herald Tribune:

"'These advertisements,' Representative HERLONG said, 'stated or implied that if and when H.R. 3727 (the eldercare bill) passed, these comprehensive hospital, medical, and drug benefits would automatically follow.' This is 'not accurate,' he said, 'because such benefits would flow only if a State chose to participate in eldercare.'

"'I knew what was in the (eldercare) bill before I sponsored it,' Representative HERLONG said. 'I was strongly for it' because the States would determine a patient's eligibility and the extent of benefits he would receive. 'I am still for that principle and I don't think you have to make any exaggerated claims for it.'"

PERTINENT FACTS

1. Our population now has more than 18 million persons—65 and over.

2. Four out of five have a chronic ailment.

3. After age 65—over 90 percent are hospitalized at least once, 66 percent are hospitalized two or more times.

4. Persons over 65 usually stay in hospital twice as long (15 days) as younger persons.

5. One-half of aged couples—where one is hospitalized sometime during the year—have total medical bills over $800 in 1 year.

6. Fifty-four percent of aged have no hospitalization insurance and many have inadequate coverage. Two-thirds of aged—with incomes less than $2,000—have no hospital insurance.

On the basis of the information furnished, I feel certain you will approve my vote in support of the administration's King-Anderson program.

Rugged Individualist Writes to His Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following statement entitled "The Rugged Individual," which unfortunately describes the attitude of too many

of our fellow citizens who want to have their cake and eat it too:

THE RUGGED INDIVIDUAL

A young man lived with his parents in a public housing development. He attended public school, rode the free school bus, participated in the "free lunch" program, played in the State parks, swam in the city pool. He entered the Army and, upon discharge, kept his national life insurance. He then enrolled in the State university, working part time in the State capitol to supplement his GI check.

Upon graduation, he married a public health nurse, and bought a farm with an FHA loan. He then obtained a Small Business Administration loan to go into business. A baby was born in the county hospital. He bought a ranch with the aid of another GI loan and obtained "emergency feed" from the Government.

Later, he put part of his land into the soil bank. His parents live comfortably on the ranch with their social security and old-age assistance checks. REA lines supplied electricity. The Department of Agriculture helped clear the land. The county agent showed him how to terrace it. Then the Government paid part of the costs of a pond and stocked it with fish. He was guaranteed a sale for his farm products by a Federal agency and was also paid for not growing the crops.

Books from the public library were delivered to his door. He banked money which a Government agency insured.

Then one day he wrote his Congressman:

"I wish to protest excessive Government spending and high taxes. I believe in rugged individualism. I am opposed to all socialistic trends and I demand a return to the principles of our Constitution."

A Bad Voting Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the highly respected Cleveland, Ohio, Press. It is an excellent editorial and should have the attention of the Members:

A BAD VOTING BILL

The sole purpose of enacting new voting rights legislation is to end voting discrimination, once and for all, wherever it exists.

This is a purpose to which the American people should have dedicated themselves 100 years ago, but did not. It is a purpose which now must be fulfilled by a firm, clear, and unimpeachable act of Congress.

The proposal now under consideration would not achieve its noble purpose.

It would end discrimination in certain States and localities while permitting it to continue in others.

It would substitute a statistical formula for the constitutional guarantee of due process in courts of law.

It would abolish literacy tests and other voter qualification requirements in some sections of the country but leave them standing elsewhere.

It would allow an illiterate white man to vote in Alabama, but let New York State deny the ballot to an intelligent Negro who could not prove he had the equivalent of an eighth grade education.

It would make the U.S. Attorney General, through his agents, sole arbiter over voting practices in the Deep South but permit local authorities to retain control in Northern States.

It is bad legislation.

What should a Federal voting rights law do?

First of all, it should make clear that the privilege of the ballot box may not be denied to anyone, anywhere, for reasons of racial, religious, or any other type of prejudice.

Second, it should set up effective legal machinery for making sure that registration and election laws are administered as fairly as is humanly possible.

It should apply with evenhanded justice in every locality—South Side Chicago, the delta counties of Arkansas, Texas as well as Alabama and Mississippi. It should admit the truth—that discrimination has no home locality.

Such a law could be written, and in far simpler terms than the administration's cumbersome document.

When Martyrdom Becomes Bigotry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON FUQUA
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I would like for the Members of the Congress to have the opportunity to read the very fine editorial from the Tallahassee Democrat, of Tallahassee, Fla., of March 29, 1965.

Condemning entire States and regions for the actions of a few is bigotry. This is a nation of laws, and the day that we abandon this concept, our Nation will be at an end. We may not agree with the law, but we have to obey the law. It is past time that many of the problems of mass demonstrations we have been confronted with in recent times were moved off of the streets and into the courts, where they rightfully belong.

The editorial follows:

WHEN MARTYRDOM BECOMES BIGOTRY

Martin Luther King is on firm philosophical ground when he says any man is free to violate a law or official order which his own conscience tells him is immoral or unjust—if he is fully willing to bear the punishment for violation.

The willingness to bear the punishment is the essence of freedom. It is in the classic pattern of martyrdom. We have too many who demand the academic freedom of Socrates without being willing to drink his poison, who insist on emulating Joan of Arc without risking her immolation at the burning stake. On this point, the Negro leader rates hero stature.

Where King goes wrong, though, is in presuming to define "the conscience of America" and the moral law of mankind according to his own beliefs, as he did yesterday on a national television program when he attempted to justify his violation of a Federal court order at Selma.

Then, on that false premise of any mortal's right to dictate matters of conscience, he proceeded to pass judgment on the whole State of Alabama because of the derelictions of some officials and the vicious criminal acts of a few individuals. He called on the whole Nation to boycott and penalize all the residents and nonresident interests of the State of Alabama until they are willing to conform to the conscience of King and his minority group.

This becomes assignment of guilt by association, punishment of the community for sins of the few as surely as was the destruction of Lidice by vengeant Nazis.

It is the difference between leadership through personal conviction, and tyrannical dictation of conscience.

It passes beyond the boundary of freedom to the risk of martydom, in the field of bigotry which so many of King's followers see only in the activities of those who oppose him.

Carrying freedom that far can bring only strife between contending consciences; then anarchy, or the tyranny which inevitably arises to keep order until men can restore their freedom to live by rational laws of their own making. This process could result in several generations ahead of us hardly ever hearing the term "civil rights" from the past, or for their future.

A Tribute to Mr. Richard Klinck, 1965 Teacher of the Year

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY H. McVICKER
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, at the White House today, President Johnson paid further tribute to the field of education by presenting the 1965 National Teacher of the Year Award to Mr. Richard E. Klinck, a sixth-grade teacher of Wheat Ridge, Colo.

This award, "in recognition of outstanding achievement as a teacher," is sponsored annually by Look magazine in cooperation with the council of chief State school officers. The purpose of the national awards program is to encourage all teachers to aspire to greatness in their chosen profession and to interest more young people in pursuing teaching careers.

I am very proud of Mr. Klinck's citation, since he is both a very close friend and a constituent. I feel very fortunate that he taught my daughter in the sixth grade at Reed Street Elementary School in Wheat Ridge.

My family and I can personally attest that Mr. Klinck maintains the highest standards of excellence in the teaching profession.

The April 20 issue of Look carries an article on the national teacher of the year and on the four other teachers named to the honor roll. In the Look article, Mr. Klinck outlines some of the principles he follows in his teaching. I would like to include some of these notable statements in the RECORD:

I am trying to help develop thoughtful citizens, people who will know what to do with their responsibilities, so I try constantly to relate what we do in class to the world around us.

In Look, Mr. Klinck also reveals the reasons for his love for the sixth grade, which he has continued to teach rather

than move into the other grade levels or administrative positions—

You have children you can begin to talk to in an adult manner, yet they are still young enough to accept discipline; it is the age of intellectual transition—just at the borderline of independent thinking. As far as possible, I want to master the sixth-grade psyche.

In March of 1965, Richard Klinck wrote an article for the Colorado School News which is an exposition of his educational philosophy, and which I feel expresses the high standards we hope our educational system will emulate. I heartily recommend this article for the reading of my colleagues, their constituents, and all people interested in educational excellence.

The article follows:

[From the Colorado School News, March 1965]

I AM A TEACHER

(By Richard E. Klinck, Colorado teacher of the year for 1965)

I am a teacher.

I do not believe anyone has ever had a more proud statement to make. I do not whisper it, or say it offhandedly, for I am proud, glad to have been somehow chosen for what is certainly one of the greatest opportunities in all of human endeavor. I say it sincerely, for everyone to hear. I believe it fully. I am proud to be a teacher.

As a teacher I have a classroom—a miniature world—where every day a group of students comes. Some come willingly, openly curious, and anxious to know and to learn. Others come for comformity, by necessity, with a certain reluctance to learn and a deep unawareness of the magic of knowledge that is all around them. They come from a variety of homes, from a variety of pasts, to the present. And I for awhile am their future. They have come together and they are my class and I am a teacher—their teacher.

I am no mere gatherer of information that I shall use to make mimeograph minds—each exactly like the others. To be but this is not to be a teacher. Instead, I shall teach the thrill of absorbing knowledge, the need of possessing knowledge, the pleasure and satisfaction in the attainment of knowledge. When each day is done I will have passed a few pages along in each of the texts, in each of the subjects, but if I have done that, and no more, I have failed. My day—and, more especially, theirs—was worthless. But in that day—each minute of each hour—I will have taught how to think, how to study, how to select fact from fiction, how to form opinion, how to laugh at one's self, how to select and create a code of conduct, how to observe and collect and record ideas. Every minute—every hour—with no time wasted, for we have so much to learn.

And the learning comes in sitting quietly and dreaming for a moment or two; in listening to a fellow classmate and evaluating what he did or what he had to say; in joining in laughter when something is funny; in listening for the sounds that make up our world; in looking to the mountains and to the sky and wondering, always wondering; and in a multitude of other things—but never wasting a moment on the crude and the vulgar and the worthless.

It is a big order, being a teacher. I can never escape it. Every moment of my waking hours is a part of being a teacher. The way out does not exist, nor should it. There is no 8-hour day in my profession. For my attitudes, my ideals, my activities all seem to gravitate around the fact that I am a teacher. I become—or try to become—what I challenge others to become—aware of their world, awake to its romance and adventure and weaknesses. And so I am always alert to an idea I can use in class; a bit of knowledge that may apply here or there to prove a point or cause one of my students to better see; an observation that is illuminating to me and may be so to those I teach; a situation that needs improvement; an opportunity to learn myself. So I am a teacher all of the time. I reach out to every chance to learn and to teach, finding the chances are always all around me.

I teach how to think, more than what to think. But by thought, deed, and example I teach the what to think as vividly as I can. Therefore, I must be constantly self-critical or I cannot teach. I must attempt to be constantly humble and unassuming as I try to find the path to what must be the proper thought, the proper deed, the proper example.

I speak knowing some of my words will never be heard, while others will take root and flourish. It does not bother me that all I say is not heard—only that the wrong part will not be heard. I do not know which words will make the point, turn on the mind, cross the bridge to a student's learning—and so I must choose every action and every word and every deed properly.

Not that I do. I often fail. So I must constantly look at myself and criticize what I find there—finding it insufficient and in need of improvement. I will find myself never to be the teacher I would like to be. When I have become that, I shall have begun to fail. I am no better than my students—simply more experienced. I am prone to mistake and apt to make error, and I must always be human.

Yes, they will forget the fact that I teach—much of it—but it makes no difference if I have taught them to use the minds God has given to them. Then I have been successful. And because I am teaching the mind I have an opportunity that cannot be surpassed. I possess the opportunity to help my America by stressing the ideals and bases that have made this country what it is and what we wish it to remain. But I must beware of teaching such beliefs blindly. I must not imitate or merely reflect the beliefs of others. I must draw conclusions, constantly search for answers, and share these to help each of my students arrive at a set of well-defined and well-established ideals.

As a teacher, every day gives me the opportunity of teaching the importance of being one's self—of being an individual; of teaching the necessity of having goals, a good enough that is good enough; of setting standards for one's self and constantly raising those standards so that they remain just out of reach. Every day gives me the opportunity to teach in terms of concepts, with facts fastened to them in meaningful ways—not merely the accumulation of facts alone. I must teach conceptual thinking so that when the facts have been forgotten a basic understanding persists. Then I have taught and the student has learned. Then—and only then—I have been successful.

Every day gives me the opportunity of teaching the love of learning—the desire to absorb and go ahead for the sheer pleasure of gaining in wisdom and self-esteem. I must help each of my boys and girls—no matter what his esoteric IQ—to have pride in himself, to be able to admire and like himself. I shall teach daily the pleasure of working hard.

I shall know a curious blend of emotions day by day: despair and elation, frustration and contentment, impatience and realization, sadness and happiness, fulfillment and defeat. I will know the soaring spirit that comes from hearing of one of my students who went on to be honored and acclaimed and I will take a bit of the credit for having caused him to succeed. And I will know sorrow when I hear of a youngster of mine who has failed and acted against our society—and I will take a bit of the blame for not having helped him to avoid that deed, that defeat.

The sorrow and frustration, the despair and impatience and defeat will linger only for awhile. They will drive me on and make me desire another tomorrow so I may make amends and try again and do better this time—and perhaps succeed. From time to time will come elation and contentment, fulfillment and happiness, which will be most remembered and most cherished and make going on possible and desirable.

I see the future in my classroom and I have the power to make that future brighter and richer in mind and in heart. I am something special. I am something beside which I can stand proud.

I am a teacher.

South Africa: A Bright Spot on a Dark Continent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the Republic of South Africa has consistently proven itself to be one of our staunchest friends.

South Africa has never asked for nor received foreign aid.

South Africa is the most politically stable government on the continent.

South Africa is economically stable.

South Africa's imports from the United States are a great deal larger than its exports to the United States, thus contributing immensely to our balance-of-payments problem.

In an address to the Commonwealth Club of California at San Francisco, Calif., on March 5, 1965, the South African Ambassador to the United States, H. L. T. Taswell, presented interesting facts about his great country. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include Mr. Taswell's remarks on that occasion:

SOUTH AFRICA—A BRIGHT SPOT ON A DARK CONTINENT

During the last few months, the American flag has been torn to pieces and defiled in certain countries in Africa and Asia. There have been violent demonstrations against American Embassies and abuse has been hurled at the American Government.

I am sure you will have noted that none of these violent anti-American demonstrations have taken place in my country, the Republic of South Africa. We in South Africa remain friendly and well disposed toward the United States of America, and anxious to strengthen the natural bonds of friendship we have with you.

Many of those who have been hurling abuse at America are the very ones who have been so rigorously maligning and criticizing us in recent years.

DEVELOPMENTS IN AFRICAN COUNTRIES CAUSE CONCERN

I have entitled my talk today, "South Africa—A Bright Spot on a Dark Continent."

Let us take a look at some of the things which have been happening in certain other parts of Africa during the past year or two.

In many newly independent African states, the story has been one of the establishment of one-party dictatorships, of the suppression of justice and freedom of the press, of falling standards of living, health and education, of collapsing economies.

In one country, the white non-Arab population has dwindled since independence from 1.2 million to 100,000 as a result of shocking and ruthless discrimination.

Not so long ago, a small African island state received its independence in what was termed a classical handover of authority. Only a matter of days later, its government was deposed by armed revolution which resulted in the slaughter of hundreds of Arabs and Asians. A Communist regime took over. A satellite tracking station operated by the United States was forced to close down.

In three independent African countries there were mutinies in the armies. Unable to cope with the situation themselves, their African governments had to invite white troops to come in to restore order.

Serious border clashes took place between several African countries, resulting in many people being killed or wounded.

Tribal warfare in a central African country resulted in the slaughter of an estimated 8,000 men, women, and children.

The recent barbarous atrocities committed by rebel forces in the Congo have made the civilized world shudder with horror. Thousands of people were shot or savagely beaten to death. They included many whose only crime was that they could read and write, and accordingly fell into a class termed the intelligentsia, which the rebels wished to exterminate. The loss of life in the Congo revolt is put at 40,000.

REACTION TO AMERICAN-BELGIAN RESCUE OPERATION

You will, I am sure, recall the details of the humanitarian operation undertaken in November 1964 to rescue the American and other white hostages who were held and threatened with death by the rebels.

America and Belgium were roundly condemned for the operation by Communist sources, and particularly by the Red Chinese.

But isn't it most significant that so many African states took a line that so closely followed the Communist one?

For several years we in South Africa have been warning against Communist penetration and subversion in Africa. Our warnings have fallen on ears not so deaf as unwilling to hear.

Every month now brings fresh evidence that we have been right.

In the last 5 years there has been a most marked expansion of Communist influence in Africa. Russia is now represented in about 21 African states, European Communist countries in about the same number. Red China is represented in about 16. Roughly one-third of Peiping's total diplomatic missions abroad are in Africa. Communist China is extending its influence with financial aid, with arms, guerrilla training and direct subversion. Chinese policy is based on color. It is antiwhite.

In recent years we have been accused of being out of step with developments on the rest of the continent. But let me ask this question. With developments in so many parts of Africa taking the turn they have, who would want to be in step with them?

We are not prepared to adapt conditions in our country to suit the whims and fancies of hostile politicians in African countries who cannot bring about stability in their own lands.

We in South Africa do, however, have great sympathy for the African peoples and understand their ambitions. We are ready and willing to cooperate and develop sound and friendly relations with all responsible African countries which feel the same way toward us.

INTERNAL RACIAL POLICY

Let me turn now for a few minutes to our internal racial policy.

When looking at our racial picture in South Africa, do not try to equate it with the position in the United States. Our country is made up of a number of national groups, still preserving their own customs and traditions, talking their own languages. Our problem is more of a multinational one.

When the first white people settled in South Africa over 300 years ago, the country was virtually unoccupied. At about the same time that the whites moved northward into the interior black people—or Bantu, or Africans—were moving southward from central Africa. The two groups met for the first time in the vicinity of the Fish River in about 1779.

About the turn of the last century, roughly half of an area, extending southward from the Limpopo River and constituting British South Africa, was occupied by whites, and half by blacks.

What has happened since? Three areas within this general sphere were set aside by the British Government as areas within which the interests of certain black national groups, or nations, were paramount. They today constitute the Protectorates of Bechuanaland, Swaziland, and Basutoland.

In 1910, the remaining territory in this general sphere became the Union of South Africa. In 1913, those areas within the union in which the interests of the various black peoples were paramount, were set aside for them by the union Government. They have consistently been preserved ever since as the homelands of the various black national groups or nations.

So the position remains that that part of the whole sphere which was occupied by black national groups at the turn of the century, is still occupied by them today.

Apart from the white and the black people who originally settled in South Africa, we have two other main groups. One is the colored community, comprising people of Malay descent and others of mixed blood. They live principally in the cape. The other group is our Indian community, centered principally in Natal.

What is our basic policy?

We believe that there should be no domination of any one race by another. To achieve this, our policy is aimed at the creation of separate states for the national groups which originally settled in South Africa, and the development of the greatest possible degree of governmental separation for the groups which have grown up in our midst.

In this way, each group can have a future of its own, in this way, the various groups can live on an equal footing. In this way, we can form a consultative body in which the leaders of all races can meet on a basis of equality to consider matters of common interest and ways of removing friction. In this way, we can create a multinational commonwealth or common market, with political independence and economic interdependence.

POSITIVE PROGRESS

Positive progress has been made in this direction. The Transkei, centures-old home of the Xhosa people, already has its own all-Bantu African Legislative Assembly. It is composed partly of traditional leaders, partly of members elected on a one-man, one-vote basis by all Xhosa citizens. In area, the Transkei is about the same size as the Netherlands or Switzerland, but larger than Belgium, Israel, or the Protectorates of Basutoland or Swaziland.

Executive power is vested in an all-Bantu African Cabinet, consisting of a Chief Minister and five other Ministers.

The Transkei serves as a model, toward which the other Bantu national groups are progressing, in keeping with their own traditions.

The South African cape colored people, have a national council, currently consisting of appointed and elected members. The basis of the council is to be expanded and its powers increased.

For the Indian population group, a National Indian Council has been formed.

With all these bodies, the government of the Republic maintains the closest contact.

Race relations are improving, harmony is increasing in South Africa. Internally, our country is one of the most peaceful in the world.

SOUTH AFRICA HAS HIGHEST STANDARDS

Nowhere in the other independent countries of Africa do people, regardless of their race or color, have as high a general standard of living, education, or health as they do in South Africa. What is more, the gap is widening, we are racing ahead of the rest of independent Africa.

There are already over 2,000 Bantu African university graduates. In 16 years, South Africa produced more Bantu African graduates at local universities than nine African states, with a combined population of 70 million, have succeeded in doing during the past 50 years. Three Bantu university colleges in our country are now swelling the number of our university graduates.

Already there are 29,500 Bantu African teachers. Each year an additional 2,000 graduate from 47 teachers training colleges.

There are Bantu African doctors, lawyers, professors, nurses, etc. Over 12,000 Bantu Africans own their own businesses. One of the largest gasoline service stations in the Republic is owned by a Bantu African. Some businessmen bank as much as $2,800 a day. Three are reputed to be millionaires. The purchasing power of Bantu Africans today is roughly $1.4 billion per year. A solid middle class is developing.

A similar story of success may be told in connection with the colored and Indian communities.

Striking proof of how favorable conditions are in South Africa is given by the fact that thousands of Africans are constantly streaming illegally across our borders in order to seek the superior benefits which South Africa can offer. Over 1 million foreign Africans are in our country—that is 10 percent of the Bantu population.

A further indication of South Africa's advance is that, with only 6 percent of Africa's population, we generate 20 percent of the continent's total geographic income.

Our country produces six times as much steel as the rest of the continent combined, twice as much electricity, and four times as much coal. Our railways carry as much freight as the rest of the continent combined. We have almost as many telephones, cars, buses, tractors, trucks, as the rest of Africa. The nonwhite people in South Africa, incidentally, own more motor cars per capita than do the citizens of the Soviet Union. We take nearly 18 percent of the continent's total imports, and supply about 20 percent of its exports.

Our economy is booming, we are marching vigorously ahead on a path of dynamic progress.

SOUTH AFRICA—WHAT DOES IT MEAN TO THE UNITED STATES?

What does South Africa mean to our friends in the United States?

The United States is encountering a serious balance-of-payments problem. This is imposing a severe strain on the dollar and on American gold stocks.

Instead of drawing money away from the United States, South Africa is actually contributing to the strength of the dollar and helping the United States in its balance-of-payments problem.

It is doing this, firstly, by importing far more from the United States than it sells to the United States. Our imports from you in 1964 reached a record figure, estimated

at $385 million. Considerably more than you imported from us.

Incidentally, about 33 percent of all U.S. exports to the African continent go to South Africa.

We are aiding your balance-of-payments position in a further way, for South Africa is a lucrative field for American investment. Your investments in our country, which have been built up over a period of many years, now total about $450 million. On these investments, your annual dividends, interest and transferred profits give you a return of 13 percent. When you include your reinvested profits, your total return is 17 percent.

Is there any country in the world where you get a better return?

American firms investing in South Africa include many of the largest and most highly respected firms in American business and financial circles. They invest, not because they like us or dislike us. They invest on sound business principles.

Some of your industrialists are increasing their investments in our country—not with dollars, but by raising funds out of investment capital generated in South Africa.

Total American and foreign investment in our country is equal to that in the rest of the continent of Africa put together.

South Africa has never asked for, nor received, foreign aid. Your proposed expenditure on foreign aid in Africa this year is about $145 million. Not one penny of this finds its way into my country. We do not increase your balance-of-payments problem, we lighten it by standing on our own feet.

We are one of the very few countries in the world which have paid all their war debts.

My country is the world's largest producer of gold. Our annual production has reached the record figure of 29.1 million fine ounces, valued at just over $1 billion. This gold flows into the free world. It enables Western countries to bolster their currencies, it contributes to stability, and promotes international trade.

One final point—I mentioned earlier that an American satellite tracking station was forced to close down in an African country now cooperating with Red China. In South Africa, an American satellite tracking station and an American missile tracking station are doing valuable work for you with the fullest cooperation and help of the South African Government.

In the First World War and in the Second World War, men of our armed forces stood shoulder to shoulder with men of the American Armed Forces. Since then, South Africa has again on two occasions responded to the call and come to the assistance of the United States and the free world—once was during the Berlin airlift, the other was in the Korean war.

In many other parts of independent Africa, chaos is gaining ground and a power vacuum is forming. In South Africa, there is prosperity, stability, and hope for all peoples of all races. What is more, South Africa stands as a guardian of the strategic tip of southern Africa.

Congressman Zablocki Discusses General de Gaulle's European Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, in a statement broadcast yesterday over station WAUK in Milwaukee, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Representative CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, gave a thoughtful and informative appraisal of General de Gaulle's policies toward Germany and Eastern Europe.

Congressman ZABLOCKI's talk also includes a concise description of the European policy proposed for the United States by Dr. Zbigniew Brzezinski, director of Columbia University's Research Institute on Communist Affairs.

I believe that Representative ZABLOCKI's remarks will be of wide interest in the House:

DE GAULLE, FRANCE, AND THE WESTERN ALLIANCE

(Broadcast by Hon. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI, of Wisconsin, on WAUK's "Report from Washington," April 4, 1965)

One of the most significant trends of the early 1960's has been the growing breach between France and the United States—two traditional allies. Today, I would like to explore briefly some of the causes, effects, and implications of this growing foreign policy problem.

France today is led by one of the great men of its history—President Charles de Gaulle. He is a strong leader who has brought France into the ranks of the world's prosperous nations, while liquidating its colonial empire.

For many years this otherwise brilliant man has had an unreasonable prejudice against those he terms "Anglo-Saxons," that is, the British and the Americans.

Part of this attitude may result from still-smoldering resentment at his treatment by Prime Minister Churchill and President Roosevelt during World War II. Those two leaders often acted in ways that enraged De Gaulle.

There is more to the rift in the Western Alliance, however, than De Gaulle's personal pique. He views France as a great nation with a glorious past and an even more promising future.

He believes that France can best work out its destiny as the leader of a Europe which is free of the influence of England and the United States.

The Europe which De Gaulle envisions goes far beyond the six nations of the Common Market—France, West Germany, Italy, Netherlands, Belgium, and Luxembourg.

His vision encompasses also Eastern Europe and at least that part of the Soviet Union west of the Ural Mountains in west-central Asia. To this end France has been developing friendships with East European states, including Poland.

Through this policy he hopes to help Germany to achieve reunification within a European framework.

Although France and Germany have been age-old enemies, De Gaulle has attempted to bind the two nations closely together. He apparently believes that a reuinted Germany, led by France and dependent upon France for nuclear protection, would no longer be a threat to Europe, but rather the opportunity for Europe to emerge as a third great power.

At the same time, De Gaulle opposes any organized unity in Europe. He seeks to keep ties between Western European nations loose in order to allow the eventual admission of the eastern bloc countries into his federated states of Europe.

To achieve both the reunification of Germany and free intercourse with Eastern Europe, De Gaulle knows he must have the agreement of the Soviet Union.

For that reason he has made efforts to enlist the Soviet Union as a collaborator. The Russians, eager to exploit any trend which weaken NATO, the Western Alliance and the position of the United States in Europe, have been receptive to these moves.

France and Russia appear to be alining their policies on the future of Germany.

Both want to exclude the United States and Great Britain from discussions on German unity, the frontiers of the German state and the level of armaments which it will be allowed to maintain.

They want to substitute as negotiators the neighbors of East and West Germany—including Poland and Czechoslovakia.

The United States, of course, vigorously opposes such a move. It is still the American presence in Europe which is the principal deterrent to a Soviet attack on Berlin and Germany. Our nuclear-armed planes and missiles still form a protective umbrella over all Europe—including France.

The present German Government—and the opposition German Socialist Party—recognize the necessity for continued American influence in European affairs. Germany, therefore, has not been enthusiastic about De Gaulle's so-called grand design for Europe.

While the United States has opposed initiatives by President de Gaulle, our own policies in Europe largely have been frustrated—often largely because of the hostility of the French leader to any concepts that originate in Washington.

President Kennedy's European policy largely was centered around the concept of encouraging increased economic and political unity among the states of Europe, including Great Britain. This integrated Europe would then deal closely with the United States in a political and economic alliance.

This strategy, for all its merits, was wrecked by De Gaulle's refusal to allow Great Britain to join the European Common Market.

Also thwarted have been U.S. efforts to fortify NATO by creating a nuclear-armed fleet of ships to operate in European waters with crews of mixed nationalities. Once again, France refused to cooperate. Our other European allies—with the exception of Germany—also were generally reluctant and so the plan has been shelved.

That is the situation today. We are attempting to stop initiatives by France, and France is attempting to short circuit our policies in Europe. The result has been virtual stalemate and the deterioration of the Western Alliance.

Many feel that there is a great danger that America may cease to be relevant or important to the future of Europe, and that Europe itself may become increasingly dominated by narrow nationalisms.

Among them is Dr. Zbigniew Brzenzinski, the noted Polish-American expert on communism. Dr. Brzezinski, who is director of Columbia University's Research Institute on Communist Affairs, recently testified before the House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee of which I am chairman, during hearings on the Sino-Soviet split.

In his testimony, Dr. Brzezinski presented a program for American initiatives in Europe which he proposed as a Johnson plan.

Although I do not agree entirely with all aspects of this proposal, I think it deserves careful study at the highest levels of policy-making in our Government. Dr. Brzezinski believes that American policy in Europe should have five main objectives:

First, to convince the East Europeans—particularly the Poles and the Czechs—that East Germany limits their freedom without enhancing their security. This would require greater contacts with Eastern Europe by the United States while isolating East Germany.

Second, to promote Polish-German reconciliation. This would require an American declaration that the present Oder-Neisse frontier would be formally and finally recognized at the very moment that Germany is reunified.

Third, Dr. Brzezinski proposes that U.S. policy should aim to minimize Russian fear

of Germany by encouraging West Germany to assure the Russians that under no circumstances will it develop a nuclear capability.

Fourth, it should relate the expansion of trade with Eastern Europe to more extensive cultural and social contacts with the people of that area. In this way, Dr. Brzezinski believes, the position of the Communist governments can be undercut.

Fifth, he believes that the United States should promote multilateral ties with West Europe and in East Europe. As Soviet control wanes and Eastern European nationalism reasserts itself, it should be the goal of American policy to promote political and economic integration—both in East and West Europe.

To achieve these goals, Dr. Brzezinski proposes a general all-European economic development plan which would cut across present East-West partitions, in which the United States would take the initiative and participate.

The Columbia University professor believes that by seizing the initiative for reuniting Europe, the United States would thwart the ambitions of President de Gaulle and reestablish our influence on the Continent.

This is one proposed solution to the present impasse in Europe—caused largely by President de Gaulle. Undoubtedly there are other approaches. The President and the State Department presently are giving the situation careful study.

I am confident that their policy decisions will be aimed at retaining for the United States its historic role in fostering a new Europe from the ashes of nations ruined by World War II.

The Voting Rights Bill Is Constitutional

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by the distinguished publisher of the Atlanta Constitution, Mr. Ralph McGill. It appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on April 4, 1965:

Surveys of opinion from some of the Nation's best-known lawyers and professors of law heavily support the belief that the proposed voter legislation now before the Congress is constitutional. Some southern political figures are contending it is not. Most of these are doing so merely to keep potential opposition off balance and to silence segregationist extremists.

There is no argument that many of the Southern States have been abridging the rights of voters because of race for 85 years and more. Until recently, these restrictions were statewide in a few States with some small relaxation in cities. In others, denial was confined to the more rural counties. In some States abridgments continue to the present in the more rural counties.

Southern tests vary widely. All must be measured against the 15th amendment which states:

"The rights of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States, or by any State, on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. The Congress shall have the power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

Opponents argue that article I, sections 2 and 4, of the Constitution makes unconstitutional the legislation now before the Congress. These sections give the State legislatures the right to set qualifications for candidates and to establish "the times, places, and manner of holding elections." (Even the laymen will hardly insist this wording permits the practice of establishing voter qualifications that abridge the rights of the voter.)

The 15th amendment is quite clear. The congressional approach is merely a means of enforcing the main article of amendment 15 by the "appropriate legislation" specified in the concluding sentence of the amendment. The manner of holding elections is not in any way touched by the pending legislation.

Decision by Southern States to disfranchise the Negro directly and the poor white indirectly came with a rush after the Tilden-Hayes election in 1876. (Mississippi, to be sure, had made earlier beginnings.) The Hayes forces made a deal for southern support to assure Hayes' election. The price was an end to reconstruction and a removal of troops. The 14th and 15th amendments quietly and conveniently were forgotten. In 1895 the "separate but equal" court decision, brought in a case of rail travel, quickly was applied to all aspects of life.

Since that period of the previous century most southerners have grown up without questioning that the discriminations and disfranchisement were legal and proper and were the undoubted, settled "way of life."

Southern "tests" vary according to State history, the presence of large cities—or lack of them—the amount of industrialization, population percentages, and so on.

In Alabama, for example, a new State bill was introduced this year by State Senator Hawkins, of Gadsden. "We know," he said, in putting his bill before the legislature, "that voting registration has been very restrictive in Alabama. It has been designed to keep people from voting."

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

Bluefield, W. Va., Selected as All America City—Community Projects Result From Civic Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the city of Bluefield, W. Va., has been honored with a merited citation as an All America City. The community has under planning and construction projects totaling more than $20 million.

The citizens of this progressive Mercer County city are "licking their problems instead of their wounds." The resourcefulness and cooperation of the men and women of the area are helping themselves through local contributory funds and the aid of moneys of government invested in building a better Bluefield.

Recently I addressed the annual dinner meeting of the Junior Chamber of Commerce. I sensed then, as on previous visits there, that youthful initiative was being directed by young businessmen in coordination with experienced industry leadership. And this remarkable record of effort has been recognized on a national level.

Mr. President, in today's Charleston, W. Va., Gazette a news article provides the essential facts in announcing the award. I ask unanimous consent that this informative story be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BLUEFIELD WINS HONOR AS ALL AMERICA CITY

BLUEFIELD.—Community projects that involved thousands of persons and cost more than $20 million resulted Wednesday in Bluefield's selection as an All America City.

The programs have been underway almost 5 years. During that period, unemployment has declined from 20.6 to 8.1 percent and bank deposits have risen from $49.6 million to $68.6 million.

The National Municipal League and Look magazine, cosponsors of the All America City Award, said citizens of Bluefield "were honored for pressing toward their own solution to the economic sag in depressed Appalachia."

The announcement touched lightly on racial relations which have caused demonstrations in the Mercer County city. "The last traces of discrimination in town began to fade when the board of trustees of the YMCA-YWCA voted unanimously to desegregate the new $750,000 building," the announcement said.

Earlier, the Tazewell-Mercer County Council on Human Relations said that race relations in Bluefield are so poor as to make an All-America Award inappropriate.

But on the standard of a city's helping itself, there was no argument on Bluefield's qualification.

Among other accomplishments of the city and its 19,000 residents are:

Development of Skyland, Inc., a tourist and recreation area atop East River Mountain, at a cost that will eventually reach $2.5 million.

Formation of Bluefield Development Corp. with a capital of $750,000. The corporation was primarily responsible for obtaining a textile plant for the city that employs 240 workers and is valued in excess of $1 million.

Implementation of a fundraising drive for Bluefield State College that raised $500,000.

Passage of bond issues that enabled the city to accomplish $10,514,000 worth of improvements, including urban renewal, expansion of a city park, a public housing program, and construction of an armory and county health center.

Fred Langenheim, manager of the Bluefield Chamber of Commerce, estimated that in addition there have been about $7 million in industrial and business developments during the period.

"While we are delighted with the recognition given our community," Langenheim said, "we realize that we are at the beginning of programs that will be going on for a long time. Being named an All America City doesn't mean our problems are solved."

Langenheim said it would be a mistake to assume that the chamber or any other single institution or individual was responsible for Bluefield's success.

"This accomplishment was the result of a strong city manager form of government, excellent support from the news media and was directed by a group of courageous, energetic and enthusiastic citizens."

Langenheim said City Manager Randolph Whittle, Mayor Henry F. Warden, and Al Modena, Melvin Grubb, Robert Connor, and Edward Steele, members of the chamber's municipal affairs committee, warranted special praise.

Langenheim said that if duplications of persons who worked on more than one project were not counted, more than 12,000 men and women had been directly involved.

In addition to Bluefield, All America City Awards were made to Hopkinsville, Ky., Winston Salem, N.C., Columbia, S.C., Niles, Ill., South Portland, Maine, White Bear Lake, Minn., Keene, N.H., Hazleton, Pa., Fort Worth, Tex., and Green Bay, Wis.

Winning cities were picked from a field of nearly 100 by a jury which included Dr. George H. Gallup, director of the American Institute of Public Opinion, and chairman of the council of the National Municipal League.

In addition to Dr. Gallup, selectors were William E. Dauer, president of the American Chambers of Commerce Executives; Miss Lois V. Edinger, president of the National Education Association; Mrs. Dorothy W. Ford, president of the Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs; and George W. Jones, secretary of the San Francisco Labor Council, AFL–CIO.

Others: Mark Matthews, former president of the Junior Chamber of Commerce of the United States; Willard V. Merrihue, chairman of Effective Citizens Organization; Vernon C. Myers, publisher of Look; Mrs. Robert H. Rawson, assistant to the president, Greater Cleveland Foundation; Allen H. Seed, Jr., vice president, Keep America Beautiful; Mrs. Robert S. Stuart, president of the League of Women Voters of the United States, and Dr. Donald H. Webster, director of the bureau of governmental research and services, University of Washington.

Baltimore's Most Exclusive Key Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, the Baltimore Sunday Sun recently brought to light the secret of the success of the district office operation of my very able colleague CARLTON R. SICKLES, Maryland's Representative at Large.

I think all of us would be interested in knowing how to keep a busy, active district office in operation 5 days a week with an exclusively volunteer staff, so I commend the following article which appeared in the Sunday magazine of the Baltimore Sun, March 7, 1965, to the attention of our colleagues:

BALTIMORE'S MOST EXCLUSIVE KEY CLUB

(NOTE.—It's the "Sickles Score." Its 20 women members staff the Congressman's office in Baltimore—free.)

(By Cherrill Anson)

The most exclusive key club in town is the Baltimore office of Representative at Large CARLTON R. SICKLES.

The keys belong to the "Sickles Score," a group of 20 attractive women who have made the Maryland Democratic Congressman the envy of Washington's Capitol Hill by running his office cheerfully, efficiently, and without pay.

"Their work is excellent," he says happily, "and their esprit de corps is tremendous."

They are also the reason that an office can be run without as much as a budget allocation for paper cups. (Score members buy them out of their own pockets.)

Although as the State's only Congressman at Large SICKLES has a constituency of 3,200,000, he receives no more for office expenses than any other Member of the House with more than 500,000 constituents.

Last spring the 43-year-old former attorney from Prince Georges County actually considered closing the Baltimore office so that funds could be diverted to hire additional help for his beleaguered Washington staff.

But Mrs. Robert Smelkinson, a longtime friend who became a $2,800-a-year Baltimore field representative for the Congressman in May, was opposed to having a dark office.

She conceived the idea of a volunteer office staff and called on a friend, Mrs. Eugene Schreiber, to act as volunteer coordinator and shaper of the project.

Together the two recruited the Score, most of whom are suburban housewives and

mothers in their early thirties. Twice a month each fastens a tiny gold Sickles pin to her collar, travels to St. Paul and Fayette Streets, and unlocks room 717 of the Calvert Building with a key attached to a Sickles key chain.

The efforts of Score keep the office, where the Congressman works at least one day a week, open Monday through Friday from 10:30 a.m., to 3:30 p.m., or later. Some members even take work home.

Alice Schreiber, a tall, ebullient girl with Carol Channing eyes, three children, and experience as a Federal economist, had never managed an office before. But she didn't see why it should differ much from running a home. Both, she reasoned, would alternate between crash programs and periods of routine operation.

You know, most of the time you may be able to run a house with the help of one person. But you may need three for a big dinner party, without being in a position to keep three on full time.

In the office the problem is solved by having a second group of 50 volunteers called corps whose womanpower can be called on for such special projects as the sending out last year of 500 enlarged texts of the Kennedy inaugural address, with accompanying letters.

Some of the corps are unable to leave their homes regularly, but others are on the waiting list for the smaller group. Score members relinquish their duties unwillingly; Mrs. David Yumkas, who was in the original group when the project started late in August 1964, has since moved to Richmond but commutes to Baltimore twice a month rather than be dropped.

Such enthusiasm delights the Congressman and mystifies his colleagues on the Hill, where observers say they know of no identical congressional office setup.

Although most were politically unresponsive to begin with, all the Score members have become fervently interested in government. They sponsor a series of monthly bipartisan political seminars on important issues, visit Washington and Annapolis, and attend local political functions which they never would have attended before.

"Working closely with a legislator is what does it," one of the 20 explains.

"It has made us aware of the fascination of politics and government. I feel personally related to the Federal Government now. Before I started working here I thought, 'It is so big—what can one person do?' But I realize now that the answer is 'A lot.'"

"Congressman SICKLES's expression of his sense of our importance and his warmth and rapport sustain this operation," another adds.

The continuity and heart of the operation lie in three boxes of folders on the radiator (marked "nontypist," "medium typist," "top typist"), and a 28-page office manual, and a clearly labeled cabinet of supplies brought in from Washington.

The volunteers, who rate their own typing ability, take work from the appropriate box, where it has been left by the volunteers of the previous day. So that skills will be husbanded, top typists concentrate on letters, medium typists on envelopes and file cards, an nontypists on the drafting of letters and the clipping of newspapers and periodicals.

The manual compiled by Mrs. Schreiber makes the office virtually self-explanatory. It not only suggests graceful exits for sticky situations (when the constituent on the other end of the line demands to know the SICKLES stand on Vietnam or the price of steel, the volunteer can turn to the telephone section and be counseled to "sweetly but firmly * * * refrain from giving the congressman's views. Ask the caller to write to the Washington office"), but also spells out office procedure in detail.

Since most of the volunteers were originally not only politically unknowing but also secretarially green, there were some early S O S's. One came from a girl who could not open the file drawer. (She was advised to push the button in with her thumb.)

But the Score members learned fast and quickly began to turn out an impressive volume of work. From the papers which are clipped each day, lists are compiled of constituents who are to be congratulated on marriages, births, 25th or 50th wedding anniversaries, awards, or honors. Each gets a letter from the Congressman. New parents also get a copy of the Government booklet on infant care, while brides are sent 10 useful pamphlets.

Letters (the grand total is 100 or more a week) also go out to Peace Corps appointees and to persons who have been granted rural route postal service because of the Congressman's efforts in their behalf. After SICKLES invited the farmers in his constituency to request Department of Agriculture publications, the Baltimore office sent out 5,000 bulletins. They also prepared the dossiers on 130 applicants for appointment to the service academies.

In addition, the Score handles invitations from organizations which want the Congressman to speak or appear; processes requests for copies of bills passed by or before the House; keeps the mailing list for the monthly newsletter up to date; prepares weekly summaries which brief SICKLES on news of the city and State and on what civic and political leaders in the area are doing and saying; and deals with a steady stream of constituents who walk in or telephone to ask for the Congressman's help.

The volunteers find that many who come in seeking Federal benefits (for which they are often not eligible), essentially need, and might have their lives changed by, a more immediate kind of help—food, eyeglasses, medicine, legal advice. Out of this realization has evolved the special project of compiling a directory of private, city, State, and Federal aid sources.

"We have no limit on our activities," a Score member says. "The Congressman lets us use any idea which has value."

"Incidentally," another chimes in, "we have a ball."

The Score members are: Mrs. Bernard Aiken, Mrs. Arnold Fleischmann, Mrs. Joseph Francus, Mrs. Leonard Freedman, Mrs. Bertram Goldstein, Mrs. William Goodman, Mrs. Alfred L. Hurwitz, Mrs. Mitchell Katz, Mrs. Michael Kitt, Mrs. Joseph LaVan, Mrs. Eugene Lewis, Mrs. Harold Peremel, Mrs. Allan Resnick, Mrs. Larry Rosenthal, Mrs. Sheldon Roth, Mrs. William Ross, Mrs. Sherald Seidman, Mrs. Joseph Sills, Mrs. Allan Thomas, Mrs. Charles Yumkas, Mrs. David Yumkas, who commutes from Richmond, actually makes the group number 21.

The lively group attended inaugural festivities in the Mayflower Hotel after they and their husbands had been transported to Washington by a chartered bus. On the side of it they fastened a large sign: "SICKLES for something in 1966."

One of only 12 Congressmen-at-large in the House of Representatives, SICKLES has frequently been mentioned in connection with the 1966 Maryland gubernatorial race. He has held the congressional seat since 1962, when it was created as a temporary solution to the reapportionment hassle.

Several Baltimore civic groups which would love to have the same kind of enthusiastic support have contacted Score members to get the secret of the groups' success. "And, of course, we're glad to tell them anything we can," Mrs. Schreiber says. "But their real problem is that they don't have Congressman SICKLES."

A svelte blond Score member raised her head from her work long enough to agree. "He," she proclaimed, "is a doll."

Opposition to Railroad Subsidies—Letters from George M. Campbell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE
OF OHIO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, recently an eastern railroad, in order to continue its commuter service, has sought Federal financial assistance, rather than place its own house in order and increase fares to a cost-covering basis.

George M. Campbell, of Cleveland, Ohio, has written letters to me and to Under Secretary Clarence D. Martin, Jr.,. of the Department of Commerce, condemning further subsidization of this line or of railroads in general.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Campbell's letters be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLEVELAND, OHIO,
March 18, 1965.

HON. FRANK J. LAUSCHE,
Senator from Ohio,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Attached is a copy of my letter of today's date to Under Secretary of Commerce Clarence D. Martin. As a regular rider on the "Shaker Rapid" I expect to pay whatever fare is necessary to enable that operation to be self-supporting, and I would not expect the taxpayers of Larchmont, N.Y., or Greenwich, Conn., to be any more willing to subsidize the commuting cost of Shaker Heights residents than I am to subsidize them. * * *

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE M. CAMPBELL.

MARCH 18, 1965.

HON. CLARENCE D. MARTIN, Jr.,
Under Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MARTIN: I have read with interest and considerable displeasure the attempts of several Senators to have the people of the United States "bail out" the long mismanaged New Haven Railroad so that the commuters from Westchester and Fairfield Counties can continue to receive transportation to and from work at below cost.

I see no reason why I or other taxpayers not using the New Haven's facilities should subsidize, even in part, the traveling expenses of basically well-paid individuals so that they can enjoy the pleasures of suburban living. I suggest, instead, that the price of commutation tickets be brought in line with actual costs and that those who use the railroad pay their own way in full. I doubt very much if any of those commuters would be interested in helping to subsidize either the private commuting service which I use to get to my office or my business, which also provides a service to others.

I believe you advised the Senate Commerce Committee of the administration's opposition to this form of subsidy. I appreciate you taking this action and hope you will continue opposing the proposals of those Senators who appear to be more interested in giving financial help to their individual

affluent constituents than in making the the best use of either all taxpayers' money or the Federal Government's credit.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE M. CAMPBELL.

View of Left Out of Focus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, when one political columnist quotes another political columnist, it is generally on a pretty serious matter. In her column which appeared in the Memphis Commercial Appeal on March 20, 1965, Alice Widener quotes William S. White to point to a new, ugly intellectual objectivity which accepts, without question and without even identification, the well-known Communist infiltration and influence in leftwing organizations.

The column speaks for itself. Under unanimous consent, I insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

VIEW OF LEFT OUT OF FOCUS

(By Alice Widener)

NEW YORK.—Decent Americans should join with columnist William S. White in recognizing and deploring what he describes as the ugly new intellectual objectivity in our Nation. This alleged objectivity, he says, accepts as student leaders those rabble rousers, radicals, and anarchists at university campuses and other places who substitute howling license of speech for genuine freedom of speech.

In some quarters, Mr. White points out, there is far more sympathy for these extremist student demonstrators than for other boys of the same age risking their lives in Vietnam in a fight for real freedom against Red tyranny.

On March 15, the very same day that White's column appeared in New York, the New York Times carried a front page article entitled "The Student Left: Spurring Reform" by Fred Powledge. In my opinion, this article is characteristic of the ugly new "objectivity," for it presents an out-of-focus picture of what he describes as the leftist "new activist intelligentsia" rising on college campuses.

Part of the Powledge article reports in 16 paragraphs of 130 lines on the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs of America. A single paragraph states, "Last October, J. Edgar Hoover, the Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, wrote that the DuBois Clubs had been spawned by the Communist Party, U.S.A. and that the club's ideology was one of 'discord, hate, and violence.' "

The foregoing sentence in the Times is immediately followed by the "objective" subhead "Hoover Viewed As Threat" and the paragraph, "Many members reply that Mr. Hoover is part of the reactionary force that the DuBois group believes is the greatest threat to American society."

Thus Times writer Fred Powledge equates "objectively" the highly informed, expert statement of a superior, distinguished public official such as J. Edgar Hoover with the subversive slander of him and the FBI by a Communist youth group.

There follows in the Times article seven paragraphs about Miss Bettina Aptheker, a DuBois Club member at the University of California at Berkeley who calls herself a "Marxist Socialist." Miss Aptheker is quoted as saying that the "sort of society" she believes should exist has "almost been achieved" in the Soviet Union. Fred Powledge identifies her as "the daughter of Herbert Aptheker, a writer on Negro history and director of the Institute for Marxist Studies here (New York City)."

Now it is true that Herbert Aptheker is a writer and director of the institute mentioned. But Mr. Powledge did not inform his readers that Herbert Aptheker appearing on behalf of indicted Communists, testified in Federal court in 1949 and again in 1954 that he had been a member of the Communist Party since 1939. Moreover, the House Committee on Un-American Activities reports that Aptheker was officially listed by the CPUSA in 1961 as a member at large of its national committee.

Columnist White writes that it isn't popular to say Communists are exploiting extremists of right and left in our country, inside and outside the civil rights situation. "No, it is not popular to say this," says Mr. White, "it is only true."

Wisely, he points out that this truth should not serve neofascists or any other extremist group as an excuse for brutality or violence, or as an excuse to deny to Negroes their absolute right to vote in all elections.

In addition, Communist exploitation of freedom of speech and assembly should not serve as an excuse for description of the "Filthy Speech Movement" at the University of California as merely the puerile current expression of student revolt—as did the New York Times in an editorial of March 15.

I agree with William S. White that our rich Nation is becoming poor in old and once-irreplaceable values. These are all the values, middle class morality values, which the Communists seek to destroy. Decent Americans should band together and put a stop to it.

Lincoln as a Surveyor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

Hon. EVERETT McKINLEY DIRKSEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled, "A Lincoln Survey Boomeranged," written by Sidney M. Harris, and published in the February issue of the American Surveyor and Photogrammetrist, published in Washington, D.C., for land surveyors and mappers throughout the free world. This article gives some little-known facts about the period in Lincoln's life in which he served as a land surveyor and points out in an interesting manner some of his activities in this field. It also reveals that even in failure, Abraham Lincoln was undaunted and continued to pursue his goals and to build the friendships that later were to stand him in such good stead.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LINCOLN SURVEY BOOMERANGED

(By Sidney M. Harris)

Abraham Lincoln was a natural born "surveyor," but not a surveyor of land; that came later—the hard way. He was a surveyor of mankind, and this distinguishing quality of character paid him well in friends, which meant more to him than possessions.

In his youth, Lincoln's great desire for knowledge made him appear lazy to his hard-working, unlearned neighbors. He could often be found "lounging around" with a book or paper. If he had work to do, he did it well, but steady work was not easily found in that day by a person who was unestablished and unsettled, and he did not marry until he was 33.

He was somewhat of a drifter, but he had chosen the New Salem area as his home and always returned there after making a flatboat trip to New Orleans, or fighting in the Black Hawk War as captain of the Illinois Militia.

Lincoln had many jobs of short duration, and wherever he worked he made friends. In 1833, at the age of 24, he was made postmaster at New Salem, Ill., by President Andrew Jackson, a Democrat, although Lincoln was a Whig, later Republican. Author Carl Sandburg said in his writings that, "No Democrat wanted the job."

Abe was more learned than most ordinary men in the area with a similarly low income. He was glad to get the job—not so much for the salary (which he surely needed) but for an opportunity to read the papers that passed through the office.

Reading and discussing local and national current events delighted Abe. The newspapers were his main source of information. His salary as postmaster, which was based on the revenue that passed through his office, amounted to $6 or $8 per month. The infrequent arrival of the mail, and the small amount of it left Abe with plenty of time to read and to engage in other activities.

At that time, the Illinois country with its fertile prairies was a sought-after home for many migrants from the East. Business was so good in Sangamon County that County Surveyor John Calhoun was compelled to find an assistant. He had heard of Abe Lincoln's aptitudes and trustworthy qualities.

Calhoun, a Jackson Democrat, sent word for Lincoln to come to his office. He explained his need for someone who could help him with the surveying work, and asked Abe if he thought he could do it. Abe, always ready to accept a challenge, thought he could.

Abe agreed to take the job, providing he could speak as he pleased and not be tied up politically; Calhoun agreed to let Abe run his own private affairs. Abe believed his job as postmaster would not interfere with his job as surveyor—if he ever became a surveyor. He had never done any surveying, and knew he would need to study a great deal to gain a working knowledge and skill that could turn out creditable work for the county.

Mentor Graham, a schoolmaster, was sought by Abe to help him conquer "The Theory and Practice of Surveying," by Robert Gibson, published in 1814. They studied until the late hours of the night, and sometimes Lincoln worked alone until daylight. It was a tedious and exacting study that included decimal fractions, logarithms, trigonometry, the use of mathematical instruments, changing the scale of maps, operating the circumferentor (now the transit), the art of leveling, and mastering the methods of the times for measuring areas.

Abe pursued his studies so thoroughly that his friends feared for his health, but in 6 weeks time he had mastered the book and surveying instruments. Calhoun assigned him work in the north end of Sangamon County as a deputy surveyor. Abe took his assignment seriously, as he did any job he contracted to do. His first recorded report as deputy surveyor was submitted January 14, 1834. Other records reveal his work was accurate, although he used a grapevine for his surveyor's chain until he could afford to buy the proper instruments.

Lincoln also delivered mail, which he carried in his hat for the people he might meet in the area in which he was working. As much as he liked being a postmaster, and "moonlighting" as a surveyor, he had failed to conquer poverty. The chain of adversities that had pursued him through life continued. Debts from a prior adventure in the grocery business, which failed, were a source of embarrassment to him.

A man who had one of Lincoln's outstanding notes brought suit against him when he could not meet the demand for payment. The court ordered Abe's possessions sold to satisfy the debt. As it happened, his only possessions of value were his horse and his surveying instruments which he needed in his business.

James Short, a Sand Ridge farmer, heard about the sale by the court, and was present at the auction. Short bought the horse and surveying instruments for $125 and gave them back to Abe.

Lincoln's salary as a surveyor was $3 per day, when he worked, and $2.50 for making a plat and report. His earnings as surveyor and postmaster left him little or nothing to apply to his $1,100 debt incurred as a result of his failure as a merchant. But the two positions made him many friends and brought him a certain amount of distinction which proved beneficial in later ventures.

Lincoln pursed his work as surveyor with much diligence, laying out roads, township lines, and town lots. He surveyed a 10-acre plot of land on the Sangamon River northward from New Salem. Soon settlers were flocking into the area and building homes. The spot became known as Petersburg. Lincoln laid out one street in the village crooked because if he had made it straight the home of Jemima Elmore would have been in the street.

As Petersburg became recognized as a better location for a growing community many people from New Salem relocated in Petersburg. As Petersburg grew, New Salem diminished. In a short time there were so few families, and so little business left in New Salem that the Post Office Department, in 1837, considered it unwise to continue the post office. As a result, Lincoln lost his job of postmaster.

Lincoln's inability to keep a steady job was not due to his lack of integrity, skill, or industry. It was, perhaps, his temperament and the times that wrought so many changes in his career. But he applied himself wisely and diligently and each job he lost catapulted him onward into something better. He became a lawyer, a legislator, a Congressman, and 24 years after surveying himself out of the position as postmaster he became President of the United States.

An Unwelcome Spring

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the Southern Star, Ozark, Ala., on April 1, 1965:

AN UNWELCOME SPRING

An easing of racial tensions in Alabama is the hope of all citizens who have a sincere interest in the welfare of this State. However, this is not likely to come about soon, as Martin Luther King runs amuck and unchecked, calling for an economic boycott, and attempting to bring about anarchy in Alabama.

Judgment has been passed on Alabama without a fair trial. We have been found guilty in the eyes of the Nation of every vile, slanderous insult that King can concoct. Certainly not guilty in the eyes of many, but in the kangaroo court presided over by the molders of public opinion—the national news media—Alabama has been made out to be in the same class with the Nazi butchers of the Hitler regime. This is a malicious lie which demands retracting. However, we have little recourse with most of the powers that be, from the President of the United States on down, holding the deck stacked against us.

When we read the analogies of Nazi Germany and Alabama it makes the blood boil. If anything we see the analogy the other way around. Watching King spouting his diatribe, and listening to his followers shout slogans in return to a prompter, we have a feeling that many Germans must have had in the 1930's when they saw Hitler rising to power, and were virtually powerless to do anything about it.

We do not think that this country is headed for a dictatorship immediately, but there exists so little hope for State and local government to exercise any authority over areas previously reserved for them, it makes one wonder in fear.

The question that keeps wanting for an answer is—will there be a leveling of tensions? Will the Nation wake up in time to see the true color of the movement led by Martin Luther King?

The only hope for a sane solution to racial strife is compromise between responsible leaders of both races, both in Alabama, and on the national level, as this is a national revolution in the truest sense.

Compromise is difficult to visualize now, becuase all we can hear is the strained voices of extremists on both sides. The ravings of King and his followers make any sensible solution to the problem extremely difficult. They want everything now, their way, with no compromise.

On the other hand we have the element in Alabama, just as other States have them, who think the solution to the problem lies in the gun, and the club. This is the way to lasting disaster. Those who killed the Detroit housewife, the minister in Selma, and Negro youth in Marion, are just as much an enemy of Alabama as Martin Luther King is, perhaps more so.

These killings cannot be justified by any standard. The reasoning that Mrs. Liuzzo should have been at home with her family is sound. But on the other hand, she should be free to travel the highways of Alabama without fear of harm, just as we should be free to ride through sections of Chicago or Harlem without fear or threat of harm. But unfortunately this is not the case, there are sections of this country where the life of an Alabama citizen would be in grave danger, just as Mrs. Liuzzo found her rendezvous with danger and death on a lonely rural Alabama highway. This is the shame of this Nation.

We have lived for generations in peace and harmony with the Negro in Alabama, and can continue to do so—if the powers that be will let the State attempt to work its own problems out free of outside interference. This is wishing a lot, as there is no indication the State will be free to do anything on its own any more.

Negroes have been wronged in Alabama in many areas, in many ways. Responsible, sensible citizens acknowledge this. Most are willing to let bygones be bygones, and accept change, and work for the betterment of both races with the least possible conflict. But again, how can this be done when agitators are calling for the impeachment of Governor Wallace in one breath, and an economic boycott of the State in the next.

If King and his leaders were sincerely interested in the welfare of the Negro in Alabama they would call off the dogs, and give the leaders of this State a chance to show definite plans of making certain changes which would improve the status of the Negro. But we don't believe they are sincere in their beliefs. They are not really interested in Alabama's welfare. They are interested in its destruction along with other areas which still believe in a form of government free of socialism, pinko-Communist tinges and all that goes with the Great Society.

We acknowledge many of our faults in Alabama, and believe the people of this State are willing and able to work for a better day, correcting injustice where it exists, and continuing a way of life that is based on respect for local government, and respect for the principles of Christianity.

The people of Alabama as a whole are a churchgoing, God-fearing people. Their souls must be greatly disturbed at the spectacle they have recently witnessed. A spectacle that condoned practically every form of debauchery along the route of march from Selma to Montgomery that is imaginable. Yet this spectacle was endorsed, supported, and sanctioned, lock, stock, and barrel by the President of the United States, and it moved with the Reverend Martin Luther King at its head, professing to be a minister of the Gospel, and having at his back scores of northern clergymen.

King told an audience in San Francisco, and broadcast it over the national airwaves, that evil is deep rooted in Alabama. What, pray tell does he think was deep rooted among his imported followers and marchers? We call it evil in the rawest form. But obviously President Johnson, and the majority of those living King's lie, look on it as a Sunday school picnic.

We are far from being prudish about many things, but lately we have been firmly convinced that moral decay has its roots in Washington, D.C., and is bursting into full bloom this spring.

"A Choice for Americans"—Address by Senator Thurmond

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, earlier this year, my home State of South Dakota was privileged to have as one of its visitors our distinguished colleague, the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND].

He was the guest speaker at the annual meeting of the chamber of commerce in Aberdeen, and delivered a most forceful and thoughtful address on the problems of our times and the prospects that lie ahead for the type of free society that has been ours for nearly two centuries.

Mr. President, the fact that his speech is, indeed, a vital one is demonstrated by the fact that the publication, "Vital Speeches of the Day," printed Senator THURMOND's address in its February 15, 1965, edition.

I request permission that this important address be made a part of the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CHOICE FOR AMERICANS—THE CHALLENGE IS YOURS

(By STROM THURMOND, U.S. Senator from South Carolina, delivered before the Aberdeen Chamber of Commerce, Aberdeen, S. Dak., Jan. 9, 1965)

This gathering tonight is so pleasant and congenial that it would be appropriate on my part to fit my remarks to the occasion, and if I could not add to the good spirits, to at least refrain from saying anything that would be other than palliative, avoiding at all costs anything that is not palatable.

Yet the recent past and the apparent future course of our Nation is such that I cannot but speak to you in a serious vein of matters which to me are most discomforting.

It is possible that what I have to say would not be acceptable for even a less congenial occasion. In the book "Cold Friday," published posthumously last year, Whittaker Chambers made this observation: "The West is swayed by a profound will to die. * * * Actually, and with the profoundest vindictiveness of unhealth, it does not wish to be defended; it deeply resents anyone who would defend it and will seek to destroy him. * * * Because it cannot be defended without facing the truth about itself. Nor can anyone truly defend it without, ultimately, speaking the truth about it. That it cannot stand and so, first of all, it must long to destroy those who would save it."

Only time will tell whether Chambers' conclusion is accurate, but I feel certain that the events of the years since he recorded this observation would not have shaken his belief. It may well be that our society will not now face the truth, nor permit the truth about itself to be presented. Yet Chambers also admitted, in his words, that "truth has become the one consuming need, since nothing else has real worth." With this I am in wholehearted agreement, and to the best of my ability, I want to discuss with you the truth about where we as a nation and a society are now and where we appear to be going.

The fruits of a futile U.S. foreign policy pursued since World War II have ripened. U.S. interests are suffering at new lows everywhere.

In Vietnam, our Nation is involved in an undeclared war with the forces of communism. While we maintain the guise of mere training and assistance of the military forces of South Vietnam, we are actually engaging the enemy directly in combat, and American casualties are mounting steadily and at an increasing rate. We are not winning this war; indeed, we have not yet resolved that winning the war is our first and prime objective in the area. Despite the vague official assurances being given, the war in South Vietnam is going so badly that our policymakers are now worrying not about saving southeast Asia, but about saving face. After Gen. Maxwell Taylor, on his recent visit to the United States, reported to the President on the situation in Vietnam, the New York Times quoted Secretary of Defense McNamara saying to the President as the newsmen entered for the conference: "It would be impossible for Max to talk to these people without leaving the impression the situation is going to hell."

Certainly the fate of southeast Asia, all the way to the coast of Australia, and probably the fate of all of Asia, hangs on the outcome of the war in Vietnam. As pointed out recently by Columnist Joe Alsop, a loss or withdrawal by the United States from Vietnam will mean moving the boundary of freedom back to the beaches of Waikiki.

In Western Europe, the NATO alliance has fallen into a shambles. What was conceived and organized as a "mutual defense pact" has become a "mutual fencing pact," each with swords drawn and attempting to carve up the other, diplomatically, of course. Our Government has expressed its lack of confidence in the competence of our NATO partners to share in the control of nuclear weapons, and Western European nations have not concealed their lack of confidence in U.S. willingness to defend Europe with nuclear weapons as the agreement provides. Another new discordant element has been added to the relations, as Germany now fears that the United States will depart from our historical position on reunification of Germany in direct negotiations with the Soviets.

In Africa, the situation is chaotic. All the blame cannot be laid on the Communists. The United States, as a reaction to Communist anticolonialism propaganda, has for years followed a policy of "independence now," pressuring our allies such as France, Britain, Portugal, and Belgium to grant independence to their colonies when there was inadequate preparation for self-government, and the total lack of stability essential to, an independent government's operation. In the Congo, for instance, we were prime movers and financiers in bringing the relatively stable Katanga province under the completely unstable central Congolese Government. We supported the expulsion of Mr. Tshombe. Recently, in desperation, we supported the return of Tshombe to head the Central Congolese Government. We transported Belgium paratroopers into the Congo in an attempt to rescue white people from the Communist-supported rebels. Again, we were forced to desist by a well-operated propaganda campaign. Nasser of Egypt and Ben Bella of Algeria, as well as the Soviets and Red China, are supporting the Communist rebels with both men and arms, although both Egypt and Algeria have been the recipients of generous U.S. assistance.

In Latin America, Communist subversion, terror, and influence continue to flourish from Cuba, where communism is now an entrenched bastion. Our Government has chosen the alternative of constructing a canal as a means of circumventing the recurring crises in Panama, but that is likely to end up a blind alley. The economic feasibility of a new canal depends on the use of nuclear energy for its construction, and that route is now barred by the Treaty of Moscow, entered into in 1963.

Even in less turbulent areas, U.S. interests are suffering. Pakistan, formerly one of our staunchest allies, has been disillusioned by U.S. shipment of arms to India, while the United States refuses to consider the possibility that India may commit aggression against Pakistan as it did a short time ago against Goa—this time using American arms. Greece, where the cold war first turned hot, has now at United States urging signed a 12-point treaty with Communist Bulgaria; and Turkey, our staunch ally and an enemy of communism, has with U.S. approval, signed a trade pact with the Soviet Union.

Our policy of accommodation toward the Soviets has not caused the intended mellowing. True, at the moment, their words are milder; but this has occurred frequently in the past when the Soviets needed a surface hiatus in the cold war. Their propaganda and actions tell the true story. Their propaganda on the Congo situation is as untruthful and vicious as any ever disseminated. The Soviet leaders have thrown down the gauntlet in southeast Asia, warning the United States that any retaliation against North Vietnam or Red China by the United States would bring the Soviet Union to the assistance of their Communist allies. Meanwhile, the Soviets, far from abandoning the alternative of nuclear arms as a means of conquest—as was concluded by our Government at the time of the test ban treaty—are straining mightily at a program of weapons research and development for qualitative breakthroughs, particularly in the areas of ICBMs to carry monster bombs and antiballistic missile defenses. They are also using this breathing period for a massive program of submarine production, both nuclear and conventional.

Despite the obvious failure of our policies of accommodation, our Government has prescribed more of the same in bigger doses. The latest aspect of this policy is trade with the Soviet Union and the Communist bloc satellites. The Soviets make no pretense about their intentions. Their first priority in the current period is to build their materiel base by obtaining from the West those products, materials, and processes which will fulfill the needs that their government-managed, forced-labor, "planned" economy can never meet. Despite the fact that the Soviets have proved themselves a hopeless credit risk and invariably untrustworthy, our Government seems intent on once again bailing them out of their economic crisis. Not only will trade with the Soviets strengthen an avowed and unswerving enemy, but it was be at a net economic loss to the United States.

The United Nations, rather than becoming an instrument for solution of world problems, has virtually become a part of the problem rather than a part of the solution. The United States, after some very strong words, backed down on its threat to have a showdown with the Soviet Union on its failure to pay assessments for U.N. peacekeeping operations for which the U.N. Charter prescribes a nation shall lose its vote in the General Assembly. The financial crisis of the U.N. continues. Meanwhile, Indonesia has announced its withdrawal from the U.N., and logically we can expect other "neutralist" and not so "neutralist" nations to follow suit when they have a real or imagined pique at some action or inaction of the U.N.

Our country has placed great emphasis on attempting to create a favorable image of the United States around the world—probably, far more emphasis than was due. Yet the U.S. image across the world is at an all-time low. Our embassies are being stoned and stormed, our diplomats attacked, and our property burned.

Of far more significance is our international monetary position. In the last decade, our short-term liabilities to foreigners, which are callable in gold, have increased from $13.6 billion to $26 billion. In the same period, our gold stocks have diminshed from $21.8 billion to $15.6 billion. We have been assured that no one has any basis to doubt the value of our dollar. Basis or no basis, we had better hope that none of our foreign creditors have their doubts raised to the point they start demanding gold; for at that point we will face an impossible dilemma. Nor is the situation improving. Our balance-of-payments deficit continues at about $3 billion per year.

Nor is our national defense posture reassuring. Despite the huge sums appropriated for defense, there has been a minimum of progress on qualitative advances in strategic weaponry. Although the scientific and technological revolution continues, there is a marked complacency about new concepts in strategic weaponry which causes to be ignored the inevitable toll of deterioration and obsolescence. The philosophy of arms control and disarmament wields persuasive influence on the research, development, test, and production decisions in the Department of Defense. Criticisms of false economies are parried with aversions to the mythological reductions by the Soviets in their defense spending. It is impossible, of course, to determine how much resources are being devoted by the Soviets to armaments. It can-

not be measured in terms of monetary values, whether the funds come from their formal defense budget or are diverted from elsewhere. This is because the materials consumed by defense and civilian industry are not priced uniformly on an economic basis, such as cost, but rather is variably priced according to the priority of the use as established by the Soviet Government. Thus the price of steel, for instance, may be fixed for military uses at one-half the price that it is fixed for uses in consumer production.

Although we now have a clear superiority in strategic nuclear strength, the prospect for the period after 1967 is fraught with vulnerabilities. The Soviets may well draw abreast, and perhaps even surpass the United States, particularly if we go through with our announced intention of trading with them.

Our situation domestically is no less serious.

Fiscally, we are continuing down the primrose path. The formal national debt has now increased to $318.9 billion, requiring annual interest payments in excess of $11 billion. Three times during the last completed fiscal year it was necessary for Congress to increase the statutory debt limit. Last year's deficit was a resounding $8.26 billion. The total informal national debt including accrued liabilities now exceeds $1¼ trillion. This is by no means the whole picture. The total formal governmental debt in the United States has now reached $434 billion, and private debt has reached the awesome proportions of $826 billion, bringing the total of formal public and private indebtedness to $1¼ trillion. These figures tell more than a story of money. For instance, they reflect the expanded (and consequent) influence of Government. As an example, the first U.S. President, back in 1789, reported 350 civilians on the U.S. Government payrolls—1 for every 11,225 citizens. By the end of the next 100 years (1889), there was 1 Government worker for every 400 workers; 35 years later (1924), the ratio was 1 for 215. Today there is 1 U.S. employee for every 76 Americans. The gross national product of the United States has increased about 33 times since 1900, while the labor force increased 1½ times. During the same period, however, Federal Government expenditures increased by 234 times.

From this starting point, the prospects for the coming session of Congress should be considered. Another substantial tax cut is proposed. The appropriations for the poverty program are requested to be doubled. A new program for Federal aid to education, beginning at preschool level and going through graduate studies in college, at a beginning cost of $1.5 billion is demanded. In the medical field, it is proposed to go beyond research and establish regional diagnostic centers and community treatment centers. The task force which recommended this program estimated its cost at $7 billion. Separate antipoverty programs for regional application are proposed. Among the almost innumerable other demands are highway landscaping programs, new programs for controlling air and water pollution, urban park and street landscaping programs, additional conservation programs, and even a "wild rivers" bill.

Of even greater import than the fiscal aspects of these proposals are the political consequences. Each such intrusion of Government into the affairs of individuals, however beneficial to the individual from a materialistic standpoint, places more power over the individual's life and conduct in the Central Government.

Already our political and social structures have undergone drastic changes from the individual-based system envisioned by the Constitution. The Supreme Court has, of course, been the primary instrument in these drastic departures from the Constitution. One good example is the intrusion by the Federal judiciary into the political question of State legislative apportionment. The power of decision on the structure of State governments has been taken from the people and usurped by the Court in these decisions. Another major change has come through the cases on prayer and Bible reading in the public schools. The Court has declared unconstitutional a practice that had become traditional through years of unchallenged usage.

There are other areas equally significant, although less publicized, in which the Court has accomplished radical changes in traditional and constitutional concepts. For instance, the Court recently handed down a decision in a labor-management relations case. The issue in the case revolved around whether a company could discontinue one phase of operations and subcontract for it without negotiating first with the union. The Court held that the matter was negotiable, and that the company could not make what some have long called a management decision without agreement of the union. Interestingly, the Court also implied that the Government had a legitimate voice in the scope of activity of a given private enterprise, and in the nature of the investment.

Other changes are quietly in process. There is a strong movement underway to convert the Federal Bureau of Investigation into a national police force, a change which the present Director, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, has in the past successfully prevented.

Crime is at an alltime high, particularly crimes of violence and crimes against property. The threat of violence and disorder hangs ominously over many of our communities.

Corruption and misfeasance in high places draws little public clamor, even when exposed in all its ugliness. You are familiar, for example, with the many ramifications of the Bobby Baker affair.

This, in brief, is the state of our Nation as we begin a new year.

I am reminded that the studies of R. G. LeTourneau show that the average age of the world's great governments has been 200 years, and that the general steps through which they progressed and regressed were: from bondage to spiritual faith; from spiritual faith to great courage; from great courage to liberty; from liberty to abundance; from abundance to complacency; from complacency to apathy; from apathy to dependency; and from dependency back again to bondage.

In this connection, the five basic reasons given by Gibbon in his "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire" for the death of that great civilization are also worthy of note. As Gibbon listed them, the reasons were: "(1) the undermining of the dignity and sanctity of the home—the basis of all human society; (2) higher and higher taxes to fund the spending of public money for free bread and circuses for the people; (3) the mad craze for pleasure; (4) the building of great armaments for the defeat of an external enemy when the real enemy was within—the decay of individual morality and responsibility; and (5) the decay of religion, faith fading into mere form, losing touch with life and its power to guide the people."

I leave it to your individual judgment whether and where our Nation falls into the ladder of life of the average great government, and whether there is a parallel between the reasons isolated by Gibbon as responsible for the decline and fall of the Roman Empire and the state of our own society.

It is my fear that the forces of atheistic materialism are not conveniently confined within the Communist bloc or even excluded beyond our shores. What other reason than the dedication to atheistic materialism here in our own society can account for failure to even attempt to inspire the nations of the world with the spiritual values of liberty and free enterprise instead of our accepted traditional policy of attempting to light a guiding beacon powered by inert materialism? Do we fear to offer the world more than greater material abundance because in so doing we might have to admit to ourselves that the foundation of our own society has been shifted from spiritual values to materialistic clay? Do we refrain from pointing out to the peoples of the world the fallacies and tragic results of atheistic materialism underlying Socialist philosophy because we fear too much of the criticism might be applicable to our own society?

It has been well said that the greatness or weakness of any society depends, in the final analysis, on the outlook and attitude of the individuals which comprise it. It follows that the course and destiny of a society depend on the individual.

This is particularly true in the United States today. No longer is there a strong and balanced two-party system in the Congress to moderate the excesses of a political majority. If there is to be a moderation of our course, much less a return to original values envisioned by the Constitution, the direction must, at least for the next 2 years, come from the people themselves. Under existing circumstances, this will require something little less than a miraculous change in the sense of responsibility and capacity for effective expression previously evidenced by the individuals which comprise our society.

In the final analysis, it is not only the fate of our society which is at stake, but a final judgment on each of our personal lives. In considering this judgment, it is not amiss that we consider the judgment of the church in Laodicea, which was in these words from the Book of Revelation: "I know thy works; thou art neither cold nor hot: I would thou wert cold or hot. So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spew thee out of my mouth. Because thou sayest, I am rich, and increased with goods, and have need of nothing; and knowest not that thou art wretched, and miserable, and poor, and blind, and naked."

Can we, or will we, escape the same judgment?

The guidelines for those of us who choose to avoid such a judgment are clear, but demanding.

We must choose to fight for a recognition of the supremacy of God in national and individual affairs, for without Divine guidance we can accomplish nothing.

We must choose to fight for a return to the Constitution, for it is the best political charter yet devised by which men can govern themselves.

We must choose to fight for freedom, for without it our existence is meaningless.

We must choose to fight for honesty and integrity, in private and in public life, for without them our society is doomed to degradation.

We must choose to fight for law and order, for in the absence of law and order, society is reduced to mob rule.

We must choose to fight to keep the Nation strong economically through support of free enterprise, for without responsible stewardship of our resources, we forfeit our stability.

We must choose to fight to keep the United States strong militarily, for without superior military power we cannot maintain both freedom and peace; but in so doing, we must keep ever in mind that within ourselves are potentially our most dangerous enemies—spiritual poverty, preoccupation with materialism, complacency, and apathy.

It is a formidable task; I challenge you to its undertaking.

Results of Fifth Annual Questionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES HARVEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am happy to announce the results of the fifth annual congressional questionnaire in Michigan's Eighth District. I am indeed most grateful for the tremendous response—over 14,000 questionnaires have been received. As tabulation was started several days ago, the results are based on the returns of 11,465.

I am inserting a news release on the results which follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C., April 7, 1965.—In record numbers, Michigan's Eighth District voters called for less Federal taxes in Congressman JIM HARVEY'S fifth annual questionnaire. Obviously delighted with the number of returns, Congressman HARVEY said that 11,465 returns were tabulated, far and away the greatest response ever. "It was necessary," he said, "to turn over the returns on hand last week so that the results would not be unduly delayed. Returns still are coming in and I would estimate that we have received over 13,000."

Congressman HARVEY added, "As I have done each year, I intend to have the results published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and sent along to the President. The questionnaire has many values but none as important, I believe, than to encourage citizen interest in our Government."

With only two exceptions—one on the question of increasing trade with Communist countries of Europe and the other on balancing the budget except in periods of recession or national emergency—the voting was relatively close. On the Communist trade issue, voters turned down any expansion by 70.3 percent to 22.7 percent, and decisively supported a balance budget by 92.1 percent to only 4.2 percent.

Among the closest votes on an issue which remains of paramount importance, present United States policy of military and economic support in South Vietnam, some 51.1 percent supported the Nation's current course, while 36.9 percent objected. Many of those not voting on this question, 12 percent, added such notes as "What policy?" or "I don't have all the facts to answer this."

The closest vote of all dealt with increasing social security benefits and liberalizing existing earning limitations, accompanied by appropriate increases in social security taxes. This was just slightly favored, 51 percent to 43.8 percent. Without question, the need to raise taxes to support the increase deterred acceptance of this proposal. Without the overwhelming support of those voters who indicated they were retired, it never would have carried. The retirees supported the question, 73.6 percent to 18.8 percent.

Congressman HARVEY was particularly interested in the results on the elimination of the Federal excise taxes on automobiles and another question concerning the right of any State to apportion one house of its legislature on factors other than population. Eighth district voters strongly supported Congressman HARVEY who has introduced legislation on both of these matters.

Voters carried the elimination of the excise taxes on automobiles by a margin of 61.5 percent to 32.5 percent, and were even stronger for the right of States to handle apportionment of their legislatures more freely by a vote of 66.6 percent to 24 percent. On the question of repealing section 14–2 of the Taft-Hartley Act, nullifying State right-to-work laws, only 24.9 percent favored it, while 60.2 percent were opposed. It was interesting to observe that even hourly employees failed to favor such action, turning it down 46 percent to 41.3 percent.

Altering immigration laws to base admission on skills rather than country of birth gained good backing, 62.1 percent to 29.3 percent.

Voters also approved Federal funds for public school construction and teachers' salaries by a 53.3 percent to 37.4 percent margin. Though it was fairly close, textbooks, special teachers, and library aid for private and parochial schools were turned down, 54.4 percent to 33.8 percent.

A new Federal medicare program for elderly citizens, by the social security approach, was firmly rejected, 62.2 percent to 21.8 percent. A health program for the elderly to be financed from the Government's general funds, together with an average of $6 monthly premium to be paid by participants, carried by a rather slim margin, 47.2 percent to 35.7 percent.

Here are the results of the questionnaire:

	Percent—		
	Yes	No	Undecided
Do you favor—			
1. A new Federal medicare program for our elderly citizens:			
(a) To be financed by increased social security taxes on employers and employees?	21.8	62.2	16.0
(b) To be financed from the Government's general funds, together with an average $6 monthly premium to be paid by participants?	47.2	35.7	17.1
2. Elimination of Federal excise taxes on automobiles?	61.5	32.5	6.0
3. Increasing trade with Communist countries of Europe?	22.7	70.3	7.0
4. Repeal of sec. 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, nullifying State right-to-work laws?	24.9	60.2	14.9
5. Balancing the budget, except in periods of economic recession or national emergency?	92.1	4.2	3.7
6. Altering immigration laws to base admission on skills rather than country of birth?	62.1	29.3	8.6
7. An additional $1.2 billion in aid to education for—			
(a) Public school construction and teachers' salaries?	53.3	37.4	9.3
(b) Textbooks, special teachers, and library aid for private and parochial schools?	33.8	54.4	11.8
8. Present U.S. policy of military and economic support in South Vietnam?	51.1	36.9	12.0
9. Legislation increasing social security benefits and liberalizing existing earning limitations, accompanied by appropriate increases in social security taxes?	51.0	43.8	5.2
10. Guaranteeing the right of any State to apportion 1 house of its legislature on factors other than population?	66.6	24.0	9.4

Save Cumberland Falls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled, "Save Cumberland Falls" which appeared in the April 2, 1965, issue of the Gleaner-Journal of Henderson, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

SAVE CUMBERLAND FALLS

The Cumberland Falls Preservation Association has been reactivated to continue to fight the proposal of the U.S. Corps of Engineers that hydroelectric dam be erected near the beautiful Cumberland Falls in a State park.

The association is made up of eastern Kentucky residents, but there is no reason why this organization should not be statewide, for the objective of the group is of interest to all Kentuckians.

Such a dam certainly would affect the flow of water over the falls, which would be a mile downstream from the proposed dam location.

Cumberland Falls is one of the works of nature that has attracted thousands to the State park, not only from other parts of Kentucky, but from other States.

Since the park has been established, constant improvement has been made to provide room for more tourists who want to see one of the State's most beautiful attractions. Now facilities for camping have been added to the comfortable lodge and its cabins, and hundreds visit the park daily during the summer season.

The dam proposal is being studied now by the State department of State parks, recommendations will be turned over to Gov. Edward Breathitt.

It would appear that acceptance of such a proposal would be contrary to the goal of the parks department, which has spent much money and effort in building one of the finest State park systems in the Nation.

The deterioration of one of the finest attractions Kentucky has to offer tourists certainly would appear contrary to the goal of the State.

Father Lemieux Retires

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take a few minutes today to pay tribute to a very close friend of mine in Seattle, the Very Reverend Albert A. Lemieux, S.J., a man who is greatly admired and highly respected by all who know him.

Since 1948, Father Lemieux has been president of Seattle University, and the list of his achievements there is a long and brilliant one. Under his dedicated

and untiring leadership, the university has flourished to an extent that in itself stands as a silent tribute to his love of humanity and devotion to duty.

Father Lemieux retires today from the position to which he has been so faithful, and if, as he hands over the reins of administration to another, he looks back with pride at his contribution to the cause of good citizenship, he will find his feeling shared by all of us who have followed his activities through the years.

We have seen that his service has not been limited to the students who have drawn upon his magnificent store of education and experience, but has been equally generous in response to calls for participation in civic affairs, charitable endeavors, guidance programs, and so forth. In fact, I do not think I am wrong in saying that his beneficial influence has been felt in every aspect of community life. His years in Seattle have been years of concern for the welfare of every citizen.

The outstanding ability of Father Lemieux has not been without formal recognition, for he has received awards and honors from several civic and educational groups. In 1952, he received an honorary doctor of laws degree from Portland University, Portland, Oreg.; 1956 brought him a Seattle First Citizen Award from the Seattle Real Estate Board, and in 1958, he was given a distinguished service award by the Seattle University Alumni Association. In 1959, the Seattle Chapter of B'nai B'rith honored him with its man of the year award, and in 1962, Gonzaga University, Spokane, Wash.—where Father Lemieux had spent time as a student and instructor before coming to Seattle—presented him with an honorary doctor of laws degree.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I take this means of congratulating Father Lemieux for having expanded to such an extent the work begun by the two members of the Society of Jesus who came to Seattle in 1891 to establish a church and school. These two priests, the Reverend Adrian Sweere, S.J., and the Reverend Victor Garrand, S.J., in erecting these first buildings, imbedded deeply in our soil the roots of the splendid institution that is Seattle University today. The university's growth has been assisted by a great many excellent faculty members and generous benefactors since that time, who will always be remembered with love and gratitude, but I am sure that no single one of these has done more than has Father Lemieux to earn a place of honor in the hearts of all of us. I feel I can speak for all citizens of Seattle in expressing thanks for a job well done, as well as extending to this distinguished educator our best wishes for the future.

An editorial in a recent issue of the Seattle Times adds emphasis to all I have just said, and I should like to quote the editor's words at this point:

> Under the 17-year leadership of the Very Reverend A. A. Lemieux, Seattle University grew from a little two-block college to become the largest private university in the State. The university is now an asset of incalculable worth to the community and the Northwest.
>
> This week Father Lemieux departs the office in which he has so ably served. His last special project here has been raising funds for a $2.5 million library which will become the academic center for the campus of 4,000 students.
>
> Friends of Seattle University have thought, from the very beginning of the fundraising project, that the library should be considered a monument to Father Lemieux's leadership.
>
> This feeling was made official Thursday evening at a farewell, appreciation banquet, when it was announced that the magnificent new addition to the campus will be named Lemieux Library.
>
> Indeed, a fitting tribute.

The 1964 Stokes Award—Miss Juanita Greene, of the Miami Herald

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, on April 9 in Miami, Fla., the Thomas L. Stokes award for the best daily newspaper writing on resource issues in 1964 was presented to Miss Juanita Greene, a staff writer of the Miami Herald.

This coveted award for distinguished journalistic endeavor was given to Miss Greene for her "penetrating series of articles on public utility rates and ratemaking procedures in Miami and in Florida." The judges said Miss Greene's work "reflected deep digging into the records of the utilities and the regulatory agencies, and translation of the complex material into articles easy for the public to understand—all in the finest Tom Stokes tradition."

I want to express my own congratulations to Miss Greene for her tremendous accomplishment. I have read her work in the Miami Herald and the Stokes award committee does honor to itself and to the memory of the late, great Tom Stokes, the syndicated columnist for whom the award is named, by honoring Miss Greene for her notable series.

Miss Greene searched tax and earnings reports, questioned members of the Florida Public Utilities Commission and officers of the utilities, and talked to experts who had prepared a $12,000 survey of utility rates for the city of Miami. She reported both sides of the issue in simple language.

She commented at the end of her series:

> I am convinced now that the public can be effectively informed because the situation is not as complicated as the utilities and their attorneys would like their customers to believe.

I also wish to congratulate the Miami Herald for its great public service in encouraging Miss Greene to pursue her assignment and for courageously publishing her articles.

The Miami Herald found Miss Greene's digging so fruitful that it had this to report to its readers in an editorial entitled "Who Protects the Public?"

> There is obviously nothing public about the Public Utilities Commission in Florida—

The Herald declared:

> It is clear that the railroad and the utility companies can do as they please because the State agency has fallen down on the job. At best, it is incompetence. At worse, it demands an immediate investigation by the Governor's office.

The Herald editorial continued:

> Whether the people of Florida deserve a reduction in the electric and phone bills is a question that will have to be decided by the courts. We certainly cannot look to the Utilities Commission for the answer.
>
> But one thing is clear immediately. The people of Florida are indebted to the Miami commission for that $12,000 survey. It has uncovered a real mess in Tallahassee.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that Miss Greene's series has helped bring about hearings on electric and telephone rates in Florida. I expect that Florida's utility consumers will benefit as a direct result. But I find it supremely ironic that this documentation of the shortcomings of utility regulation in my State does not deter the Florida Public Utilities Commission from urging that existing Federal regulation of electric sales be weakened.

S. 218 which is urged in the name of "States rights" would mean the end of responsible regulation of electric utility systems in the United States. It would substantially wreck the regulatory system created by the Congress in 1935.

This proposed legislation seeks to deprive the Federal Power Commission of its authority to regulate interstate wholesale electric sales. But if this power were taken from the FPC, the Florida Public Utilities Commission would not be able to fill the void in my State. The Florida commission has no jurisdiction over wholesale electric rates.

Mr. Speaker the Nation's electric consumers deserve better treatment than enactment of S. 218, or its counterpart, H.R. 5955.

The recent national power survey estimated that modern technology and cooperation in the electric power industry can result in savings to consumers of $11 billion a year by 1980. The key to realizing savings of this magnitude is more and more interstate movement of electric power, as more and more power systems pool their operations and join their systems with regional and national transmission lines to take maximum advantage of time, load, and seasonal diversities.

But at the same time that more power than ever is moving in interstate commerce, there are those who seek to destroy the one source of protection which consumers have—the Federal Power Commission.

I hope the progressive leaders in all segments of the electric power industry will stand up and oppose this attempt to turn back the clock to pre-1935 days, when there was virtually no Federal regulation of the power industry and when the State commissions which did exist were powerless to regulate operations beyond their respective State borders.

Healthy, fair, effective utility regulation can work. The FPC has been proving that since 1961.

I urge those forces which are now trying to destroy the FPC's ability to regu-

late to go back and reread their history. The Federal Trade Commission investigation of utilities in the late 1920's and early 1930's stands as a clear and present warning. The abuses unearthed in that investigation resulted in enactment of the Public Utility Holding Company Act and the Federal Power Act, in 1935.

To repeal substantial portions of those acts, as S. 218 or H.R. 5955 would do, would be to invite disaster.

Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous agreement to insert in the RECORD at this point several of the articles which won for Miss Greene the 1964 Stokes Award.

The articles follow:

[From the Miami Herald, Nov. 15, 1964]

REGULATION BY EAR?—STATE WITHOUT RATE BASE FOR TWO KEY UTILITIES

(By Juanita Greene)

The State's rate fixing agency has nothing in its records to refute or support claims of an outside expert that Florida's two biggest utilities are overcharging customers.

The near empty files of the Florida Public Utilities Commission offered little last week except the suspicion that it is regulating the utilities by ear. Or at best, by scratch pad.

No current rate base could be found for either Florida Power & Light Co. or Southern Bell Telephone Co. Not even reasonably current. And the rate base is the key to utility regulation, because it shows how much money the utility has invested in its plant.

Without it, the PUC can't say whether the utilities are making more, less or as much as they are allowed.

The last rate base for Florida Power & Light Co. was worked out in 1960. The last for Southern Bell was in 1952.

Investigating to the last detail all the things that go into a rate base is a time-consuming job. And even its critics acknowledge that the PUC is overworked and understaffed.

But a rate base is not necessarily a complicated thing.

Even its definition, as found in Florida law, is simple:

Into the rate base should go "the money honestly and prudently invested in such property used and useful in serving the public, less accrued depreciation."

The gold-plated controversy stirred up by the city of Miami and utilities expert Arnold Hirsh revolves around a few simple points.

The problem is not so much understanding these figures, but getting them.

Try, for example, to find out on what basis the PUC ordered FPL to make its last and much-publicized rate reduction—the $10 million cutback last spring.

There are no work sheets in the files in Tallahassee to support it—no "underlying data."

"I'm sure there must have been a rate base worked up of some kind, but where it is, if it still exists, I don't know," said F. H. Romig, director of the PUC's finance department.

WHERE'S SCRATCH PAPER?

Romig, in Tallahassee, told Herald Capital Bureau Chief Robert Sherrill: "The whole thing may have been done on scratch paper until we finalize it. (It hasn't been finalized.) Maybe the scratch paper is around."

Romig then offered another clue. Working with him on the case was J. D. McClellan, an assistant.

"Maybe," said Romig, "he has it in his head."

McClellan was reached in Miami, where he is going through the books of a gas company.

He reported that his head contained no recent FPL rate base. None, he said, was worked out last spring during the negotiations.

All the PUC did, said McClellan, was take the company's 1963 annual report and divide what it earned into what it had invested.

That is similar to what Hirsch did in his independent study, using figures on file with the Federal Power Commission in Washington.

But the PUC's calculations are nowhere in the record.

So there are no PUC figures to compare with those arrived at by Hirsch.

The Washington, D.C., consultant disturbed the historic tranquillity on the utility regulation front last month with a report that both FPL and Southern Bell are being allowed to make far too much money.

In the past 5 years, he claims, they overcharged their customers more than $225 million.

Hirsch made his computations not only on book figures picked out of Federal Power Commission files in Washington (which are more complete than PUC files), but also on various adjustments he considered necessary. So the totals on his overcharges vary, depending on the adjustments made.

He called the $225 million figure conservative. Proportionately, it would be split by about $133 million for FPL and $92 million for Southern Bell.

FPL, Hirsch said, should be made to cut back another $29 to $33 million this year.

Southern Bell, he said, is making $25 million a year too much just on its operations inside the State—not counting the long-distance business that goes outside.

Impressed with the big figures, and Hirsch's experience and ability, Miami is pressing for some answers. It has put the burden not on FPL and Southern Bell, but the PUC, the only agency in Florida that can regulate them.

In preliminary remarks to what may develop into a long and hard-fought battle, the PUC called the Hirsch report "fantastic" and Southern Bell said it was "absurd." FPL, studying the report, has said nothing yet.

But Miami is sticking with Hirsch. It put his report in the hands of its legal department and has demanded an answer from the PUC in 30 days.

UTILITY BILLS? STATE FILES NO HELP

The city figures $225 million is too big a wad to be brushed aside with adjectives.

The "excess" profit would put a lot of the overhead wires in both systems underground.

It could build a superhighway of more than 200 miles, or a giant medical complex, or enable the State to forego its sales tax for more than a year.

Hirsch's principal complaint is that FPL and Southern Bell are padding their rates with expenses that don't belong there.

Though there are no official files to go on, it can be presumed that a comparison of Hirsch's figures and PUC figures would show:

That the PUC allows utilities to put more in their rate base than Hirsch does. And the bigger the rate base, the more income allowed.

That the PUC allows the utilities to deduct from their net operating income many items that Hirsch would include. The companies are allowed to make only a certain percentage of net operating income before, in theory at least, they are ordered to cut rates. So utilities try to divert as much as possible from "net operating income."

When the PUC last worked up a rate base for FPL, it took the period for the 12 months ending September 30, 1960, and arrived at a rate base of $471,994,000.

Hirsch took the year ending December 31, 1960, and figured it at $451,300,824. That's about $20 million less than the PUC allowed.

The PUC put net operating income at $35,900,000. Hirsch insured it at about a million more than that.

The PUC concluded that FPL was making too much money and ordered a reduction of gross revenues by $6,250,000. But Hirsch claims the company's excess was more than $20 million.

The PUC first worked up a rate base on FPL in 1957, 6 years after the State legislature took electric utility regulation away from the municipalities and put it in the hands of a State agency. After the first rate base came the first rate cut of $4,725,000. There was no public hearing and FPL didn't fight the order.

Two years later the PUC ordered a second, smaller reduction—$2,864,000. Then in April 1960, it cut another $200,000 by restricting excess capacity charges.

Then, also in 1960, the PUC and the public got curious about FPL's income when the power company came up with a loose half million dollars as retroactive payment for a new Metro franchise tax.

By July of that year the PUC staff was convinced the power company was making too much money. It was December before a reduction—of $6,250,000—was ordered. Like all reductions, it was to take effect on future, not past bills.

Seldom is a rate cut made retroactive, requiring refunds to overcharged customers. The PUC and most regulatory bodies operate on the "water over the dam" theory.

Hence the longer a reduction order is delayed, the more excess profits the utility is allowed to keep.

The 1960 order was preceded by a hearing, which was recessed after FPL officials suggested the two staffs get together and work out a compromise. Agreement was reached before the hearing reconvened.

The PUC study that led to the $10 million reduction last spring was prompted by the new Federal income tax law, which gave a break to all utilities and set off reduction orders all over the Nation. The FPL order was announced in April, at the time PUC Chairman Ed Mason was running for election.

When the PUC was handed the job of regulating fast growing utilities in a fast growing State, it had little to allow it to keep pace. For years it subsisted on stingy budgets appropriated by legislatures not unfriendly with the utilities. It got more money last time, but has a lot of catching up to do.

At the beginning, Romig recalls, there was only one man in the finance office.

Until 1956, there was no such thing as a field staff.

"About the only time we got to look at a company's books," said Romig, "was in a rate case."

In 1957 Romig went to the legislature and got money for a field staff of two, to ride herd on 200 utilities. In 1959 he got two more. Now there are 10. Three cover the Miami area, checking on more than 70 utilities.

The PUC staff is able to spend an average of 2 weeks of every quarter in FPL's office, checking over what FPL hires more than a hundred persons to compile. Much of the company's work is done on computers. When the PUC men go in to check this work, they have to employ the same techniques that would have been employed 50 years ago.

Public apathy also works as another handicap to the PUC, claims Lewis Petteway, its veteran general counsel, now also executive director.

In 1961 the PUC held a public hearing in Jacksonville on some significant changes in Southern Bell's rate structure. It was widely publicized in advance, though it was not to be a full scale hearing on all rate aspects and no rate base was worked up.

Hardly anybody showed up and the protests that were made were on minor points.

By contrast, in 1952 when a full scale rate hearing was held in Miami, the community raised about $100,000 and brought in outside experts. The hearing lasted for days, pro-

duced a pile of testimony that when stacked, stood three feet higher than Petteway.

That was the last time Southern Bell was called on the carpet and extensively challenged. Since then the rates have been adjusted up and down, but usually by informal negotiation.

Petteway stresses an important point in utility operation:

"The consumer pays for everything."

He also points out that it is the utilities that are regulated that get the regulatory laws passed.

Last spring Petteway complained in an interview:

"We don't get much help from the public. There are no organized consumer groups, and local government seldom lends us assistance."

Later the city of Miami appropriated $12,000 for the Hirsch report. It asked Metro and the 26 other Dade municipalities to participate but got no response. Miami, too, learned a lesson about apathy.

[From the Miami Herald, Nov. 25, 1964]

BIG JOB, NOT ENOUGH TOOLS: AN INDIFFERENT PUBLIC PICKS ITS THREE UTILITY GUARDIANS

(By Juanita Greene)

The decisions of three men affect the utility bills paid by millions of consumers. Curiously, they are not well known to the public which elects them. Their role is explained in this last article of a series on the utilities controversy.

Playing the role of public watchdog over Florida's private utilities today are three elected officials.

They are supposed to throw their weight into the democratic system of checks and balances.

Their decisions also have a definite bearing on bill balances and the checks that ratepayers mail monthly to electric, telephone, and some gas companies.

Despite their tremendous responsibilities, these three officials are little known to the general public, which elects them to office with yawning indifference.

On the Florida Public Utilities Commission is 77-year-old Jerry Carter, a wisecracking politician of the old school; 46-year-old Billy Mayo of Tallahassee, member of an old and politically entrenched Florida family; and 47-year-old Edwin Lee Mason from Miami, who rose rapidly after starting out as a peace justice in the once politically powerful Allapattah area.

With a stingy budget and an overworked staff, the PUC administers laws lobbied through the legislature by the utilities themselves.

Until recently, Florida spent more money on the livestock board's screwworm eradication program than it did on utility regulation.

Today the budget is up to a little over a million dollars a year, and it includes salaries for 144 persons, including the three commissioners who recently got raises from $12,500 to $14,000 a year.

Over the years, when few except the private utilities were paying much attention to the PUC, it developed a philosophy which the commissioners still expound today.

It deemphasizes the role of the ratepayer and underlines the importance of allowing the utilities plenty of financial flexibility so they can borrow money at good rates to continue rapid expansion.

When Mason was running his easy race for reelection last spring he declared the commission's task was that of fully protecting the public from excessive charges, yet assuring a healthy climate that will attract investors.

Lewis Petteway, the commission's veteran general counsel who now also serves as executive director, declared in a recent speech before an investors' group:

He called this a "huge irreparable loss to the ratepayer."

"We are convinced that nitpicking regulation can never make a worthwhile contribution to the economic growth and development of our State. On the contrary, we recognize that regulation must merit the respect and confidence of the sophisticated investors."

He said the attitude of a ratemaking body should be one of healthy cooperation rather than one of strained aloofness.

PUC: WATCHDOG IS ELECTED BY A YAWNING ELECTORATE

There are times, however, that the Commission does exhibit strained aloofness. It did so recently in an order rejecting a petition of a local attorney for a full-scale public hearing on what he termed were excessive rates charged by Florida Power & Light Co.

Said the PUC, in part, in its order of September 22:

"General rate investigations of large utilities are time consuming and tremendously expensive for all parties concerned. Ultimately, of course, such expense must be borne by the ratepayer."

Then it commented that some people are always dissatisfied with rates, regardless of the level, and ask for costly investigations.

It added:

"Even if it were feasible from a practical viewpoint, it would be economically unsound for a regulatory agency in the Nation's fastest growing State to permit and encourage continuous rate investigations."

History bears out this philosophy. Seldom in recent history has the PUC involved itself in a full-scale rate investigation of a big utility, and even less seldom has it taken its fight to court. Reductions usually are ordered after compromise conferences where the attitude of general cooperation prevails, and the utilities are seldom dissatisfied to the point of suing.

Despite its September decision, the PUC now plans a full scale hearing on FPL and Southern Bell Telephone & Telegraph Co. rates in January.

Both hearings were prompted by a report made for the city of Miami by an outside rate expert who claims the State's two largest utilities are overcharging their customers. Miami sent the report, by Arnold Hirsch, to the PUC and asked for a reply.

The city, like all others in Florida, lost its right to regulate private power companies in 1951, when the legislature passed a bill giving the sole authority to the PUC. The bill had the acknowledged support of FPL and other utilities. Six years later the PUC called its first major hearing on FPL and ordered a reduction.

In his report, Hirsch charged that FPL and Southern Bell overcharged their customers by more than $225 million over the past 5 years.

To prevent this in the future, he suggested that the Governor be empowered to appoint a citizens board of review each year to look over the general rate situation in the State.

It would have the authority to examine all records of the PUC and the utilities it regulates, including their Federal income tax returns.

Other suggestions have been advanced from other sources for improving the effectiveness of the PUC. The PUC itself claims with more money to hire a bigger and better staff it could do a better job. This need was partly met by increased appropriations by the last legislature.

Petteway believes more public interest in and support of the PUC would be as effective as anything else.

Some of the most effective regulatory bodies work with a staff that is not under the direct control of the elected or appointed heads. This is the case with Metro's Water and Sewer Board. The staff is on the regular county payroll and does not take orders from the board, so its recommendations can be made more independently.

In discussing utility regulation and rate hearings, Petteway makes a point that he fears the public often overlooks. The cost of both the legal defense and prosecution is paid by the ratepayer.

The utility passes on the cost in its rates. The PUC lawyers and staff are paid for with State funds.

The utility lawyers are not only high priced, but frequently well known. Former Gov. LeRoy Collins, Petteway pointed out, once got $20,000 for handling a Southern Bell rate case while he was working as a private attorney. And Gov. Farris Bryant, he said, represented a gas company while in private practice.

Many members of the legislature also have private utilities among their private clients.

Drawing on his long experience in the business of public rate regulations, Petteway makes two other important points:

"It is the utilities that are regulated that get the regulatory laws passed."

And, "In the end, the ratepayer pays for everything, because all a utility's expenses are passed on to him."

[From the Miami Herald, Dec. 13, 1964]

UTILITIES' TAX SAVINGS MAY BRING RATE CUTS

(By Juanita Greene)

(The Federal Government is enabling, Florida's private utilities to save a lot of money this year, and even more next year. In this report, Herald Staff Writer Juanita Greene shows how it could affect the ratepayer. The report is one of a series on the State's utility picture.)

Thousands of Florida's electric, gas, and phone customers can look forward to the New Year with some hope for lower utility bills.

The savings, if they materialize, will be compliments of Uncle Sam, partly or entirely.

For among those benefiting from last year's cut in Federal income taxes are all the State's privately owned utilities. They're saving millions. And they're due for another tax reduction next year.

The cut raises two significant questions.

Will Florida's Public Utilities Commission order all, or even some, of the companies to pass along the savings to their customers?

If a cut is ordered, will it be retroactive to cover all the extra revenue realized this year?

The first decision is up to the PUC. The second may be up to both the PUC and the courts.

The utilities started benefiting from the tax break last January 1. That is when the first Federal cut, from 52 to 50 percent of corporate income, went into effect.

Ten months later the utilities commission ordered each of the 75 companies it regulates to put the savings in a special account and await further instructions. Though it ordered the money set aside, the commission did not promise it would order it passed along to the consumer in the form of a rate cut. But it said it might.

Even if it does, however, there is some question whether the accumulated savings, piled up since last January, will ever reach the pocketbook of the ratepayer.

THEY'LL FIGHT ANY REBATES

The utilities are expected to fight a retroactive rebate. They will claim that any order for rate cuts can apply only to future, not past, earnings. Their main argument will be the well recognized "water over the dam" theory of utility regulation. It holds, and so have the courts, that reductions go into effect only after official hearings and the issuance of an official order.

Had the PUC ordered rate reductions in January or shortly thereafter, there would be less doubt that the savings would be passed along to the consumer. But, except in the case of Florida Power & Light Co., it made no official pronouncement until Novemberber 12. And that was not an order to cut rates.

Asked about the legality of a future rate cut order which would take in savings accumulated since January 1, or even to November 12, Lewis Petteway, general counsel for the PUC, replied:

"I'm afraid you are just going to have to speculate about that one.

"I am reasonably sure," he added, "that the utilities will think it can't be done."

The utilities will benefit from another income tax reduction to take effect January 1, 1965, when the tax goes down from 50 to 48 percent.

The fact that the utilities got a tax break this year and will get another next year was part, but not all, of the reason an outside consultant hired by the city of Miami is claiming that FPL and Southern Bell Telephone Co. are collecting excessive revenue from ratepayers.

Arnold Hirsch, Washington, D.C., said in his report that FPL should have been made to reduce its rates by at least $39 million this year and another million next year. Southern Bell, he said, should have cut $24 million this year on intrastate rates and another million next year.

REPORT CITES OTHER FAULTS

He said the companies were making excessive profit not only because of the income tax reduction but also because depreciation was excessive, the rate base too broad, and the allowable return too high. In addition, he claimed Southern Bell's capital structure was too unbalanced and too much of its profit was being siphoned off by American Telephone and Telegraph Co., its parent company, and Western Electric, its chief supplier.

Hirsch took note of the fact the PUC got FPL to agree to cut its rates by $10 million last May, but he said that was not enough. This year FPL will still make $29 million too much, he said.

The PUC also took note of the $10-million reduction when it called for public hearings, prompted by the Hirsch report, to be held in Miami early next year. Those on Southern Bell will be January 18 and March 29 and on FPL January 28 and April 12.

"A small part of the current year's reduction," reported the PUC on the FPL rate cut, "was due to the reduction in the Federal income tax rate on corporations, granted by the Congress, effective retroactive to January 1, 1964. No consideration was given in the $10 million reduction to the further decrease in the income tax rate for the year 1965, it being the purpose of the commission to take another look at the earnings of this utility in 1965, in light of the further reduction in the tax rate."

Of the $10 million cutback in revenue, only about a million and a half was attributable to the income tax break, FPL officials have reported.

PUC STUDIED FOR MONTHS

Apparently stung by the Hirsch report, which the city of Miami filed with the PUC in November with a request for "affirmative action," the PUC declared in an order for next year's rate hearings:

"The commission has been constantly involved since early March of this year in a series of investigations involving the earnings of all major utilities under its jurisdiction for the purpose of determining whether any rate reductions were in order for the various utilities involved."

It reported that Petteway had, on March 11, "announced in the city of Miami that the commission had even then begun an investigation" of the major utilities earnings.

This March 11 statement by Petteway, however, was no broadscale, general announcement. Petteway had come to Miami to address the Traffic Club on another matter and did not mention the tax cut or its effect on rates in his speech.

While he ate lunch a Herald reporter, asked him about the utilities' tax break, which by that time had already resulted in rate cut orders by some commissions in other States.

Petteway's remarks to the reporter were informal and off the cuff. He said the PUC had called for financial statements from regulated utilities to determine if rate cuts are in order. To date, except in the case of FPL, no determination has been made.

EXCESS GAINS IN MILLIONS

Hirsch figures that on the basis of the company's own books, with none of the adjustments re recommended, FPL will make an excess of $18,100,000 this year above the liberal 6.98-percent return on investment allowed by the PUC. Some, but not all, of this excess is due to the tax cut. Next year, he said, the excess, based on company records, will be $20,600,000 if no cut is ordered.

On the same basis he figures that Southern Bell made an excess of $9,950,000 over its allowable 6.6-percent return on intrastate investment this year. With a further tax break due next year, the excess will go up to $11,600,000 if no cut is ordered.

These figures do not take into account the other changes recommended by Hirsch, but only the surplus resulting from present procedures and the tax break.

In one of its orders the Commission reported that the hearing called on Southern Bell was the result of investigations in which "the Commission has been constantly involved since early March."

The purpose of the hearing, it said, will be that of "reviewing its earnings and rate structure, and making whatever adjustments, if any, may be appropriate and in the public interest."

Yet neither the Southern Bell nor the FPL hearings will be on orders of the PUC to show cause why its rates should not be reduced. Such an order would have put the burden of proof on the utilities. The orders, instead, put this burden on the city of Miami and Hirsch. They state that the Hirsch report, filed with the commission by the city, "constitutes a very serious indictment" and add that Miami has an "obligation" to support it.

SESSIONS SET "TO HEAR ALL"

FPL and Southern Bell have not been ordered to do anything in connection with the coming hearings. The PUC orders state the hearings were called "for the purpose of hearing all interested parties who desire an opportunity to testify" in order that "the commission may be fully advised," and "make whatever rate adjustment, if any, may be appropriate and in the public interest."

FPL and Southern Bell, declared the orders, "should be given an opportunity publicly to justify rates, charges and earnings."

The opportunities to be heard at the hearings were also extended to include the public—and the PUC itself."

It wants to bring "to the public's attention its various ratemaking policies and philosophies so that the public may know how its interest is protected."

Miami City Attorney John Barrett said several weeks ago that the city of Miami would bring Hirsch to testify at the hearings.

Other PUC-regulated utilities benefiting from the income tax are gas companies that supply customers through underground systems. That includes all natural gas and some manufactured gas companies. One of the largest and fastest growing—City Gas—still is operating in Dade and several other counties on temporary rates set by the PUC without public hearing.

Society, the Judge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNN E. STALBAUM
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct the attention of the House to an original prize-winning speech written by Miss Regina Bailey, a student at the University of Wisconsin Kenosha Center. Miss Bailey recently received a first-prize award for this presentation at the 17th annual intercenter forencis tournament. I am convinced that you will find this as informative as I did.

The speech follows:

SOCIETY, THE JUDGE

(By Regina Bailey)

What a wonderful country we live in. How great to belong to a free, rich nation. Just look at all we have. Our modern skyscrapers are among the greatest manmade structures in the world. Our dams hold back mighty rivers. We have conquered our sky and are reaching forward to begin a conquest of the universe.

And man, what have we done for man? Why that's easy. Educational institutions are booming throughout the Nation. Research is developing at a pace more rapid than ever. New methods of teaching are continually being brought to light.

But is man really being taken care of in our modern society? I mean the inner man. What has society done to aid man in his search for truth and self? Well, it is this society which often leaves man wandering aimlessly in spirit, that claims the right to judge a man's actions, though often these actions are the result of the temperament and trends of this very society. Let's take a look at what's happening to our people today.

A young high school girl got a hold of a quart of whisky. Because of a fight with her boyfriend she drank the entire contents during noon hour. That afternoon the girl was rushed to the hospital from school where she'd collapsed. She narrowly escaped death.

More often this carelessness with potential dangers is showing up. On February 10 our city's newspaper reported the following: "Sunday, five juvenile boys, 14- and 15-year old's, were brought to police headquarters several of them completely intoxicated as the result of drinking stolen liquor." The question that comes to my mind is where were their parents and their training? Especially when it happens over and over again.

It isn't only the younger generation which is losing its balance in life. In New York, one of the top violin makers shot his wife in front of their 12-year-old daughter. They had had an argument over visitation rights concerning their child. They'd had their marriage annulled.

About the same time two men were arguing as to whether or not the dog of the first would bite the second. The argument became violent and one man was shot in the chest. Is this the reaction we must come to expect?

A politician in our town had a lovely wife and children. But the world began to overpower him. He had moody spells, and began to drink heavily. He lost interest in family responsibilities. Finally he killed himself. Others, some famous like Marilyn Monroe, have also found the world just too much to take.

The saddest documentary of our times is the unreasoned killing. A boy, who stabbed

a girl he knew because he'd had the urge to do it. Another boy, denied use of the car, took a shotgun, killed his parents and sister, then turned himself in to the police.

These horrible cases, children killing, suicide among young adults all help us see the deadly diseases which are afflicting our society. I believe that in some way, most of these tie in with the loss of, or indifference toward a deep religion and faith. Let us see in one case what this loss of religion helped to bring about.

In the February Reader's Digest, in an article entitled "If They Had Only Waited," a mother tells her story. The story in which she is preparing the wedding of her 18-year-old son, class valedictorian, to his already pregnant girl. She says, "Long ago I had given up attending church, assuming that Paul could learn the difference between right and wrong at home, could select his own religion when he was older. Naturally, he soon abandoned Sunday school. But what spiritual inspiration had I given him as a substitute for church?"

Paul did just as his mother wished, but he chose the religion of self indulgence. His mother was very good about giving him the marks of success in our society, a jalopy of his own, and a nice, good-looking girl. What she failed to give him, as she herself admits is the strong spiritual background necessary to cope with our modern world.

Then we have Paul's religion of self indulgence. This shows lack of concern and disregard for others. This concern is a very essential part of almost every religion. Could we say that his girl, Nancy benefited from his selfishness? Did the parents of these two children deserve the slap in the face they received? Paul and Nancy in their selfishness succeeded only in bringing heartbreak to two families.

It's strange, isn't it, the way society is willing to compromise its morals, and people are ever ready to rationalize a judgment so they can do it their way. People no longer think much of the already pregnant bride. What of the girl who follows the same course yet is unable to get married? Society seems to soothe its conscience be scorning this girl and the child she may bear.

What I want is a religious person. No, not the individual who goes to church as though he were a machine. Rather a person who thinks of success or failure in terms of good and bad, not in terms of riches; a person who realizes an act is wrong even though it may be something he wants. A person who is concerned about others.

This individual would also get the bonus of improved mental health. Here again society tends to look down on and judge harshly the mentally ill. And again it may be in part society's attitude toward religion which helps bring about the commonness of mental illness.

On Sunday, February 21, This Week section of the Milwaukee Journal was devoted entirely to mental health. On the very first page was an article entitled "Faith as Medicine." It stated, "A strong and determined faith creates mental and emotional security and helps allay anxieties within the family as well as those strains and pressures outside it." Maybe the loss of faith has a greater effect than just the protection of moral standards. Maybe society should not smile quite so condescendingly at the believer.

Maybe the man who sought suicide as the answer to his problem could have used the strength and consolation of faith to help him when the world became too trying. Maybe the children and adults who drink and use dope wouldn't need their world of fantasy. I believe that part of the reason a strong faith helps us so much in our daily lives, is that it helps us keep our view of the world from becoming too distorted. It keeps in our mind a purpose for doing what is right, and an aid to accomplishing it.

We have called society a judge, and that she is. Throughout our lives she observes, either approving or disapproving. But I claim that society is an irresponsible judge. The people of our society often condemn individuals for situations and incidents made possible by values which society as a whole accepts.

It is you and I who form the backbone of society. If we refuse to compromise our morals, and refuse to stand by as our fellow man approaches defeat. Only then will others follow. Only then can we look upon the whole of the people of our country the Great Society, and say the words of praise, "You are just in your judgment."

The So-Called Voting Rights Act of 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial which recently appeared in the Southwest Virginia Enterprise, a newspaper published in the city of Wytheville, Va. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues and particularly to all at the executive level of the Federal Government who assisted in drafting and recommended passage of the so-called voter rights bill.

The editorial follows:

THE SO-CALLED VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

Only a mighty tidal wave of public protest, rolling from all sections of the country can prevent the passage of what in our opinion is the most vindictive law ever presented to a Congress of the United States. The radical, mentally disturbed, hatred-filled brain of Thaddeus Stevens who strutted in Congress during the Reconstruction era years never devised a plan or a punitive law more un-American in content, and unconstitutional in aim than the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (H.R. 6400-S. 1564), the President's law. It is a law that could well dismember the United States even while we fight our deadliest enemy on the other side of the world.

Never have we had a greater concern or deeper worry for the future of this Nation as a democracy than at this hour. We are not thinking in terms of any political party, be it Democrat or Republican, for some leaders in Congress of both parties stand today by virtue of their own statements and actions as sponsors and supporters of the bill. The venerable and highly respected HARRY F. BYRD (30 years of service in the Senate) called it a "vicious bill. It clearly bears the unreasonable stamp of hysteria * * * the provisions are iniquitious in effect and contemptible in design * * * the extremes to which the administration and its Attorney General have gone to exempt the majority of States and convict a minority are beyond the realm of reason * * * they demonstrate the bias and the prejudice under which the bill was conceived and with which it will be enforced * * * Neither the bill nor the testimony is worthy of men entrusted with high office in the national Government of our country." With these and many, many more, truthful and factual statements, the Virginia Statesman that has steadfastly pursued and advocated the precepts of Patrick Henry, Jefferson, Wilson and others has done so in pointing out that he issued the statement "as a member of the U.S. Senate, representing Virginia to uphold the Federal Constitution."

It has been our belief that all Senators—all Members of the House—the President, are pledged and have taken an oath, with hand placed on the Holy Bible to uphold the Constitution of the United States. If we are correct, then how can any official stand before the people of the Nation, and the entire world crying out his determination to uphold the Constitution, as he swings his right hand, while the left hand remains like it was tied to his body. In other words, to enforce that part of the Constitution that appears to be poliitcally expedient, but stomp, cover over, bury, forget that portion which assures States rights and protection for all Americans—yes, even the minorities? Is not this what has been taking place? Has any other person, aside from Dr. Martin Luther King, who is welcomed to the White House with open arms had the intestinal fortitude to tell the Nation that he will break a law when he considers it unjust? Dare Governor Barnett, of Mississippi or Governor Wallace, of Alabama, make such a statement? Mr. Barnett is supposedly still being pursued by the Justice Department boys for disobeying a court order. Dr. King did likewise but it was not even criticized to our knowledge by one single member of the Justice Department.

The brazen attitude of Attorney General Katzenbach is really startling. Senator BYRD points out that the head of the Justice Department "has documented his own cynicism. He has proclaimed his impatience with judicial process and his lack of faith in it." Labeled by Columnist Ross Valentine as King Katzenbach's Konspiracy, the Attorney General admits he wrote the bill, that Virginia and five other States of the South and Alaska will be incriminated, but that Texas will (Johnson's home State) be exempt.

Never in our lifetime, and from whatever knowledge we have gained of the history of the United States, have we read or heard of as much unadulterated hypocrisy contained in one bill. Here in the limelight of the people of all 50 States, and viewed from afar (often with misunderstanding, thanks to the slanted reporting) by millions are the high-ranking leaders of this great Nation, pictured with tears (but they are crocodile tears) running down their cheeks at the injustices of voting, while they sit in their swivel chairs and luxury-filled offices and actually have the gall to say the bill is to eliminate discrimination. It requires no knowledge of law; it requires no college graduate, or even a high school graduate, for an average child in the upper grades of the Wytheville elementary school, who has read and has been given some directed study of the Constitution, to recognize it as despotic discrimination.

Outwardly today as in the many years past, Washington, when viewed by the eye for outward appearances is beautiful, inspiring, colorful, the Capital of the present greatest Nation in the known world. But look closely, and one does not have to wait long to smell the stench that comes from the smoke screen that rises from the centralization of power for every State and individual. It is nauseating, and we cannot possibly visualize or attempt to peer into the future, for we are today at the forks of the road. The so-called Voting Rights Act of 1965 has led the United States to that destination. Its passage can very easily place all Americans on the road that has only one ending—dictatorship, a police state.

The proposed bill drawn up by a man who in our book is saturated with prejudice and biased views has challenged an ex post facto law. It is forbidden by article I of the Constitution—that proposes to make a crime of

yesterday's violations (for 10 years back) of voting registration practices that are to be outlawed. And its provisions to deprive a few States of the South (a punishment obvious to all) of the power to establish a literacy test for all voters irrespective of race or color is in further violation of the Constitution. There is something dreadfully wrong as we stated in a previous paragraph, when one shouts about enforcing the Constitution, and 5 minutes later endorses and asks for passage at once of a law that is as filled with holes of an unconstitutional nature as a sifter.

The idea of depriving, and mind you, the South only (and only six States) of any voter qualification other than age and residence is a death sentence, but the punishment is meted out in stages. The torture chamber of medieval England would be a good comparison. While we do not agree or endorse all that Liberty Lobby says, we are in complete agreement with the description of that periodical below as the death is carried out in stages:

"First, the rise of a new class of Southern State politician—a breed of demagogs—coming into political power on a wave of pie-in-the-sky promises of free State money for everyone.

"Next, the futile attempts to carry out those promises by taxing the farms, business, and industry of the South at ever-increasing rates, even while failing to satisfy the demands of the poor for more * * * and more and more and more.

"Then the flight of business and industry from the unbearable demands of the welfare state, and the tragic streams of white refugees—following their jobs to the North and West.

"Finally, the necessary establishment of the all-black States as Federal reservations, populated only by Government bureaucrats and their Negro dependents, but—unlike their counterparts on the Indian reservations—represented in Washington by a powerful voting bloc of nearly 40 Congressmen and 8 Senators."

Unless every thoughtful American who dreads the dismemberment of his country as much as Abraham Lincoln did will write not only his Congressman and both Senators, but every Congressman of his State, and as many Senators as feasible, they are unlikely to be able to withstand the pressure for passage. The distinguished Senators BYRD and ROBERTSON deserve special praise, as does BILL TUCK.

And if this bill passes, it will be a greater victory for the Communists (whether or not they have had anything to do with it) than our defeat in Korea.

Upbeat Thinking by GOP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from Freedom in Education, entitled "Upbeat Thinking by GOP," referring to the Republican alternate education proposal:

UPBEAT THINKING BY GOP

The Republican education aid bill may very well prove, in the long view of history, to be of greater significance than the Johnson education program.

For the Democratic proposal labors under the author's own genius for compromise. Herbert Bayard Swope once put it this way: "I cannot give you a formula for success, but I can give you a formula for failure—which is: Try to please everybody." Which might suggest that the Johnson bill, though apparently assured of passage, may contain the seeds of its own future difficulties.

The Republicans have come up with an aid bill that neatly sidesteps the church-state controversy and provides complete equality of treatment for every taxpayer and schoolchild. The GOP in Congress is surely to be commended for performing with ability the classic role of the minority. The concept of grants of up to $200 to parents of schoolchildren, tied in with a college tax-credit proposal, as advocated by the Republicans, is certainly bold and imaginative; it is worthy of a more serious response from the Democratic opposition than being labeled as mere warmed over Goldwaterism. Indeed, it resembles more closely the classic junior GI bill of rights in calling for direct grants to parents, and its college tax-credit features are modeled directly on Democratic Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF's bill which came within two votes of passage in 1964.

If it is conceded that the chief drawback of the GOP proposal is that it does not guarantee assistance to education (the aid being in the form of cash and credits to individuals), a correction can be found in the original GI bill itself, which the Republican spokesman referred to when introducing their proposal. Grants under the GI bill did indeed go to the individual, as with the Republican bill, but they were negotiable only for education expenses at an accredited school.

It may well be that the GOP proposal could cause both parties to pause from the argument long enough to review the issue in the light of the GI bill. Surely the Democratic leadership should stop long enough to consider how much could be gained if they would disengage themselves from the clutches of Madam Compromise and try aiding the individual. How much indeed would be gained if future aid programs of both parties were designed to meet the needs of the ultimate object of our concern in education: the student.

In any event it must be acknowledged that the Republican proposal has advanced the day when America can put aside the discussion of the religious faiths of her children and concern herself with the educational needs of these children, not their creeds. CEF applauds this advance and wishes it well.

A Teenager's Thoughts on Negotiations Over Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, in the light of the President's speech last night at Johns Hopkins University in which he reversed his prior position of negotiation only from strength and committed us to another Korean truce talk marathon, I submit to my colleagues what one American teenager is thinking:

HUNTINGTON, N.Y.,
April 7, 1965.

Representative GROVER,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I read in the New York Times that mail is mostly in favor of negotiations on Vietnam. I am opposed to it. Whenever we negotiate with the Communists we bargain and compromise our rights, not theirs. These negotiations would be no different.

I am in support of any measures needed to win the war in Asia. We cannot keep allowing communism to grow and still expect to have a free world. People who say we have no business in Vietnam (Is WAYNE MORSE serious or does he just like to debate?) are wrong. Even if we weren't concerned about the independence of Vietnam (I say independence because we refuse to guarantee a free government) it is a vital link in the geographical containment of communism. We must protect our form of government using whatever means are necessary. In international affairs the end justifies the means, to a reasonable degree. My only question is why weren't effective tactics used months ago? All Americans must remember that if the North Vietnamese and Red China wanted peace, all they would have to do is stop their aggression and subversion. It seems some people want the United States to be a real big brother, never hurting or striking back, never getting angry, never going on the offensive itself. We are at war in Asia, yet our governmental policy is to achieve stalemate. Why not attempt to beat North Vietnam? If we are sucessful, then it is free. If we are half successful, we have a compromise (with the south free). Now, if we are only half successful, we have lost.

I do not want war. I would be crazy if I did, for I am still in high school and will probably have to go into the service within the next decade. But we must protect ourselves and our beliefs.

Sincerely,

BOB DIETZ.

Farmer and the Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial, entitled "Farmer and the Market" from the April 7 issue of the Washington Daily News:

FARMER AND THE MARKET

One of the featured points in the argument the Johnson administration has offered for the catchall farm bill just sent to Congress is that it would save the Treasury an estimated $200 million. And still increase income to farmers.

A taxpayer saving of $200 million in less Federal subsidy to farmers and an additional $100 million assigned to raising crop prices would both come from hiking the prices of what the consumer buys.

It adds up to this: In exchange for the iffy prospect that as a taxpayer he may be stuck for less to prop up farm prices, the consumer would pay more for the food he buys—another penny a loaf for bread, for instance.

By stretching hard, we can dimly see a possible virtue in this. It could be interpreted as the first feeble step toward restoring the marketplace, instead of the Government, as the controlling factor in farm prices. This is, or ought to be, the ultimate purpose of any farm program.

But his bill, if anything, tightens Federal controls over farming—at least in feed grains, rice, wheat, wool, and land use. (The cotton scheme will come later.)

Agriculture Secretary Freeman says the farmer ought to look more to the market for

his income than to the Government. But how can he do this when the Government goes as far as it does in telling him how much he can plant, outbidding the market for his products, and otherwise entrapping him in redtape?

In sum, the new bill is mostly a rehash of the type of farm legislation which has been in effect the last 30 years. The result of that legislation is an enormous Government hoard of farm products, a drop in farm exports, a decline in farm income and higher prices for consumers. Not to mention a huge cost to the taxpayers.

President Johnson is said to be planning a blue-ribbon commission to review the whole monstrous farm program. We need another Government commission like a cotton farmer needs another boll weevil. But if this is a sign that the administration at last recognizes that somehow the Government has got to get at least most of the way out of the farm business, it may be a hopeful sign.

So far, progress to that end has been nil.

A Man Named William and "The Good Old Days"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CATHERINE MAY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, Mr. Erich Klossner, of Pullman, Wash., recently made an excellent speech at the annual speech contest of the toastmasters. His speech is entitled "A Man Named William and 'The Good Old Days' " and I was so impressed with his articulate and well-expressed remarks that I wanted my colleagues to have an opportunity to read Mr. Klossner's speech. Therefore, under unanimous consent, I include the speech in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

A MAN NAMED WILLIAM AND "THE GOOD OLD DAYS"

(By Erich Klossner)

Mr. Chairman, fellow toastmasters, and guests; at a time when the world seems to be preoccupied by so many cross-purposes of mankind, let us reflect a little while on what a man named William so often referred to as "The good old days." Some of you may recognize in William a likeness to some individual you have known. Who William was is not important. But what William was, and the things he stood for, could be of interest.

William was a member of a past Midwest generation, who, if asked to make an icebreaker speech in toastmasters, would decline on the grounds that he had had no education. As the oldest in a family of 10 children he soon became aware of the meaning of responsibility, which allowed him only one 3-month period of formal classroom education. But in the practical school of hard knocks he absorbed the impact of clearing 160 acres of scrub oak, hickory, and maple, not with power machinery, but by hand with ax and saw; with pick and shovel. Too many times he saw this land he had cleared, washed over by the adjacent river before the crops of wheat and corn could be harvested. So, after 40 years of such hand-to-mouth existence, having learned the carpentry trade through intermittent periods of apprenticeship, it was quite by chance that he became interested in a brochure featuring the advantages of a small northwest town of 1,100 inhabitants, which was bound to grow because a State agricultural college had been established there just 12 years before. It looked like a real opportunity for a carpenter.

So, at the age of 41, with his life savings of $250 in his pocket, and a family of six for whom to establish a future, William headed westward to this promised land. Today there are scores of buildings still sturdy and habitable because of his skill with the tools of his trade. Sixty years ago, when an exceptional construction plan called for a circular stairway, the contractor consulted the college manual arts department for a procedural technique on how to lay out a circular stairway. The head of the department advised him to turn his problem over to William—he was the logical choice for such an assignment. In later years one of William's most treasured possessions was a textbook on manual arts, published by this same head of the manual arts department. It was inscribed: "To William, a master of his craft."

This was the uneducated man who would be amused by such later-day slogans as: "A chicken in every pot"; "the New Deal"; "the Fair Deal"; "the New Frontier"; the "Great Society." Because he was uneducated he could not follow the logic of killing off little pigs and plowing under growing crops as a means toward better times. Because he was uneducated he felt that Government tampering with the currency and devaluing the dollar was just another way of adding water to the soup. Because he was uneducated he frowned on the practice of cash price supports and subsidies for idle lands. As an uneducated individual he never shared the advantages of a minimum wage law, sick leave with pay, unemployment compensation, nor old-age public assistance programs. In his uneducated way he argued that wealth and prosperity could not be legislated, but had to be achieved through the mechanics of productive enterprise, motivated by the individual's faith in his own potential.

Thus in his later years, because of the bureaucratic takeover of much that was once the individual's responsibility, he often pondered "the good old days." The good old days when it was deemed safer to hide a few savings dollars in a baking powder can stashed away in the rear of the kitchen cupboard, rather than trust it to a bank whose deposits were uninsured. The good old days when summer dust on the highways and winter mud on Main Street was ankle deep. The good old days when the fire department consisted of one hose cart, drawn by whatever dray outfit was first on the scene, perhaps in time to wet down the smoldering ashes. The good old days when the leg-weary farmer followed behind a team of horses pulling a single-blade plow; when it required a harvest crew of 32 hands to accomplish what 3 men and a combine can do today. The good old days when scarlet fever, diphtheria, typhoid and consumption cut the span of life expectancy to 20 years less than it is today. The good old days of which the contemporary Joaquin Miller wrote: "Oh, these battles, they last so long, from babyhood to the grave."

But for William they would always be the good old days because he was on his own. Every barrier of economic frustration provided a challenge and incentive to the end of his 95 years. By the time of his final exit he long had known the lateness of the hour; the shadows falling from the cross of age, on narrowing trails that vex and circumvent. Now we enshrine him and "the good old days" in memory, like a flower, its blooming done—reverently preserved between the gently folded pages of sacrifice, diligent application and honest intent. The good old days? Did they ever exist? Of course that answer must depend upon your viewpoint. But a man named William—he did exist; he was a reality; he was my dad.

A Newspaper Success Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the Copley newspapers have rendered distinguished service from Illinois to California. Many of us in Washington are familiar with their work through the articles by Herbert Klein, editor of the San Diego News. The St. Louis Globe Democrat, December 26–27, 1964, printed a book review by Louis La Cross, editor emeritus of the Globe Democrat, reviewing the personal history of the newspaper Copleys, entitled "The Thin Gold Watch."

Mr. La Cross, who is a distinguished St. Louis editor, made comments which are of interest and which I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues:

THE COPLEYS—ILLINOIS TO CALIFORNIA: A NEWSPAPER SUCCESS STORY—"THE THIN GOLD WATCH," A PERSONAL HISTORY OF THE NEWSPAPER COPLEYS

(By Walter S. J. Swanson (Macmillan) reviewed by Louis La Coss)

This story of the Copleys and the Copley chain has its roots in Illinois, but the Copleys really struck it rich in the newspaper business in California and the chain now has been extended to Hawaii.

The founder, Col. Ira Clifton Copley, bought his first newspaper in Aurora, Ill., in 1905 and before his death in 1947 had acquired 24, though when he turned over the command to his adopted son, Jim, in the symbolic, thin gold watch ceremony, the total had been reduced to 14. Jim remains the head man with papers in Illinois at Springfield, Elgin, Aurora and Joliet; in California at San Diego and other cities.

Ira Copley's family was in the utility business and this is where he got his start. The parents moved from New York to Aurora to establish a gas-light company. Ira, who was born in 1864, went to Yale. He returned from school to find his family in dire circumstances due to competition from the development of electricity. The Yale-educated son had to earn a living by turning to manual labor including ditch digging, until the family's gas firm made a comeback. Ira's career became many sided: soldier, utility magnate, newspaper owner and politician. Politics really got him into the newspaper business—he bought the Aurora paper to bolster his political career. It did—he served 12 years in Congress.

A member of the Illinois National Guard, the "colonel" title was acquired during his service in the Spanish American war.

The thin gold watch tradition was established when the citizens of Elgin, where Copley had a paper, decided to give him a testimonial dinner and to present an Elgin gold watch with I. C. Copley enscribed across the front. The citizens' thoughtfulness did not extend to remembering to pay for the gift. So Copley footed the bill and the watch became his most highly regarded possession, which he passed on to his adopted son, Jim, as the symbol of management.

The selection of Jim to direct the newspapers caused another adopted son, Bill (from different parentage) long a resident of Paris, to file suit for an accounting of the $26,000,000 estate. A court order settled the claim and Jim was assured full command.

The story includes wealthy publishers who crossed the Copley path in California: E. W.

Scripps, William Randolph Hearst, F. W. Kellogg and John D. Spreckels, Scripps and Spreckels both once lived in San Diego and had papers there. They were purchased by Colonel Copley. The Copley Press now has a newspaper monopoly in San Diego, sixteenth largest city in the Nation, with a metropolitan area of more than 1,000,000 population.

While the colonel was a Republican congressman, he classified his newspapers as politically independent.

The endurance of the Copley chain may be regarded as the realization of the colonel's dream of a father and son successful association. The author of this book is a Copley editorial executive.

Scare Talk Hits at Coal's Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial, entitled "Scare Talk Hits At Coal's Future," which appeared in the April 3, 1965 issue of the Messenger of Madisonville, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

SCARE TALK HITS AT COAL'S FUTURE

As if coal didn't have enough problems—competing with Government-subsidized nuclear energy, a flood of cheap residual oil from Latin America and its fair competition from oil and gas—a Purdue University professor of nuclear engineering is sounding a doom warning in a bid for a stepup in atomic-energy developments.

Dr. Lew Kowarski says that the United States will have used up its entire reserves of coal, gas and oil by the year 2020—a comparatively short 55 years from now.

Dr. Kowarski, a visiting Frenchman, says our civilization is doomed—or at least faces a definite end "of industrial civilization if no replacement is found." What Dr. Kowarski is pushing for is rapid establishment of atomic breeder reactors which would literally make possible the burning of rocks, whereby the U.S. soil would yield enough energy to last for millions of years.

Nobody ever got anything for nothing—not really—so we have to offer some unscientific skepticism about the whole business. The truth is that these breeder reactors are terribly costly to build. A pilot model of one is currently being built near Fayetteville, Ark., in an international cooperation of Government and business.

Such facilities would eventually produce energy at a cheaper cost than today's conventional fuels, but at a comparatively huge initial cost.

Granted that our fossil fuels—coal, gas, and oil—will some day be depleted, we still deplore scare talk like that of Dr. Kowarski. We have good reasons, we think, to doubt his 2020 projection. New reserves of fossil fuels are being discovered—and more efficient methods of extracting them from the earth are being developed—at a more rapid rate than they are being used, unless our information is false.

The day will come—though not in the lifetimes of more than a fraction of today's population—when nuclear energy, solar energy and perhaps something even better will furnish our chief fuel and power supplies.

Scare talk now shouldn't be needed. And haste in pouring vast sums of public moneys into competition with industries that furnish a livelihood for hundreds of thousands of people is just not wise or even proper.

Fighting Crime With Statistics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALLEN SMITH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, perhaps some of my colleagues missed the following article which appeared in the April 2, 1965, Washington Daily News and I would like to bring it to their attention at this time. It requires the thoughtful consideration of each of us.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Daily News, Apr. 2, 1965]

FIGHTING CRIME WITH STATISTICS

(By Richard Starnes)

In the plaintive lingua franca with which organs of doctrinaire liberalism communicate, the signal has been passed that the way to cope with the Nation's crime problem is to question its existence.

A rash of stories has appeared in New York, Washington, and elsewhere containing the same wistful theme: What appears to be a grave increase in crime is nothing more than statistical legerdemain authored by that sly old sleight-of-hand artist who runs the FBI.

It is not stated quite that baldly, to be sure, but that is the line anyway, and we are certain to hear a great deal more of it. J. Edgar Hoover has always been fair game to the handwringers, and the new there-ain't-anybody-here-but-us-chickens approach to the Nation's crime problem is part and parcel of this old hostility.

But an important new element has been added. Gradual awareness had developed that there is one crime statistic that transcends all the others. This is simply the sad, monumentally discouraging fact that nearly 8 out of 10 serious crimes that take place in the United States are committed by repeaters—by parolees, unregenerate beneficiaries of wrist-slap sentences, scornful backsliders whom penologists call by the unpronounceable term "recidivists."

This shocking, and generally ignored, statistic means a number of things, all of them profoundly distasteful to the sort of mind that coined that classic bit of sentimental rubbish about there being no such thing as a bad boy. If 80 percent of serious crime is committed by old lags who repeatedly have been thru the revolving-door courts, jails, and parole boards, it is clear evidence that there is serious failure in our system of dealing with criminals after their arrest.

What is wrong—and what the people who are zeroing-in on the FBI's statistical picture of crime dare not admit—is that the philosophy of probation, parole, indeterminate sentence, and unduly light terms for serious offenses is a proven failure. It is not important whether the criminal is categorized as sick or wicked, but it is important if he is turned loose when the odds are 4 to 1 he'll quickly revert to type and prey on me and mine.

J. Edgar has done a thing rare in the annals of Government. He has run a powerful national investigative agency without permitting it to become an instrument for the oppression of the people. But even this is not enough for the ordained liberal messiahs; he has earned their enmity by his patient campaign to bring sanity into the treatment of criminals. With a characteristically oblique approach they now seek to palliate the Nation's failure to deal realistically with crime by attacking—not crime or criminal—but the FBI's statistical picture of same.

The same species of nonthink has taken place in the United Kingdom, which has also been plagued by an epidemic increase in crime. Again in England the statistics were blamed, and there they have succeeded in wiping out one large category of crime with the stroke of a pen. Auto theft, it was ruled, would no longer be classified as theft until the car has been missing for 28 days. That sharply reduced the statistical incidence of auto theft, to be sure, but it did nothing to reduce the disgraceful frequency with which Great Britain's criminals pinch other chap's motors.

A Great and Historic Landmark

SPEECH
OF
HON. KEN HECHLER
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, we in this Congress are leaving more than footprints on the sands of time. We are passing legislation which raises great new standards whose effect will be felt for generation after generation yet unborn.

As a former teacher, I feel very deeply about the need for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. When this bill is signed by the President, it will constitute a great and historic landmark. Men and women with vision, imagination and determination in and out of the Congress have fought unceasingly for this legislation. As a result, we are now on the threshold of a new era in education.

HELP FOR STUDENTS IN NEED

Mr. Speaker, when I first had the good fortune to come to this great Congress, it appeared to me that the over-riding priority in this Nation should be legislation of this nature. Before voting for tanks, planes, and guns, and before voting funds for the space program, I felt it was necessary to place first things first and bolster our education system. That is why, on several occasions, I voted against huge defense and space appropriations because I felt that education aid was the first priority and the very basis for a strong defense and space program. When the House passed the aid to education bill in 1960, and the clerk called my name in the rollcall, I was tempted to shout "Hallelujah," instead of "Aye." Although the bill passed in 1960, it did not successfully negotiate all the legislative shoals. Like many education bills since, it failed. There followed several years of fruitless controversy over the church-state issue and other sources of deadlock. But we have now overcome these obstacles.

There are about 105,000 children from low-income families in West Virginia who will benefit from this legislation

under title I, which provides $15.7 million for the State of West Virginia. I am pleased that local school administrators will decide the projects for which these title I funds will be made available.

BOOKS AND LIBRARY MATERIALS

Some $900,000 will be provided to West Virginia schools for books and library materials. In the last school year, the average schoolchild in West Virginia shared in only about $2.19 worth of school library resources. The West Virginia school libraries contained an average of only eight books per pupil. Title II will furnish means for more closely approximating the standard figures of $4 to $6 annual per pupil library expenditures, and the 10-volume-per-pupil library content recommended by the American Library Association.

SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL CENTERS

The remaining titles of the bill allocate funds for establishing supplemental educational centers and services in areas where educational opportunities in the regular schools are limited; for broadening current and establishing new programs of educational research and implementing the findings of such programs; and for the improvement of State education departments throughout the Nation. The results to be expected from these measures are meritorious in themselves, and they will also influence the accomplishment of the purpose of title I: the provision of high quality education in low-income areas.

ALLOCATION FORMULA

During our debate on this bill, attention was called to the disparity among States in the amounts of money the schools in the various States would receive, especially under title I. Such disparities are bound to exist under a formula which takes under consideration the varying population figures of the States, and more so if the amount of money per pupil spent by a State is added as a factor in the allocation formula. This, of course, was the case in the formula of H.R. 2362.

Under the formula, the amount of the grant to each State is determined by multiplying the number of school-age children from families with annual income of less than $2,000—including children from families whose income is more than $2,000 only because they receive aid to families with dependent children relief—by one-half the average per pupil school expenditure within that State. Since some States have many eligible children and some only a few, and since there is a wide range among the States in the average per pupil expenditure, disparities are the result.

A look at the nature of these disparities should prove useful.

The grants to New York under this bill will equal about 4 percent of that State's total educational outlay before this measure. For West Virginia, the figure would amount to 12.2 percent. So while New York may receive a larger total of money than West Virginia, it is equally clear that the grant to West Virginia represents a larger proportionate addition to the funds to be expended in education than does the grant to New York.

AN EDUCATOR COMMENTS

Dr. Grant Venn, Wood County superintendent of schools, recently wrote me:

The children of this country simply cannot be educated based on the present tax system which makes local funds so scarce for this purpose, even though the local and State efforts have far exceeded local moneys in this area. This bill literally provides general education aid to each school district based on the number of low-income children in the schools. To me, this seems to be as good a criterion for judging where the money should go as any I know. However, I would be the first to recognize that it is not the only one, but it does seem to me that it would then leave within the hands of the local board of education the decision as to how this money should be spent in most cases.

OUR GREATEST RESOURCE

The young people of West Virginia are the greatest resource we possess—greater even than our coal, our rivers, or the natural God-given beauties of our mountains and our valleys—and we must invest to give our young people the very best in education. In 1965, the West Virginia State Legislature enacted a far-reaching program for the improvement of education. In his inspiring inaugural address on January 18, 1965—delivered in the snow, just as another great inaugural address was delivered in the snow by President John F. Kennedy 4 years ago—Gov. Hulett Smith pledged for West Virginia an administration of excellence. He added:

First, I am determined that excellence in education will be our No. 1 goal. A great educational system is a prerequisite to a great state.

We must continue to press forward to improve our school system in West Virginia and Nation. I salute the teachers and school administrators in West Virginia who are working diligently toward that end, and pledge my personal efforts to help every step along the way.

Railroad Retirement Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation to provide benefits under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 for children of deceased railroad employees who are over the age of 18 and below the age af 22 and are attending an educational institution as full-time students.

I strongly urge the Congress to make it possible for children of deceased railroad workers to go on to college by providing these benefits. It may well be that these benefits can make the difference between a family's being able to afford or not being able to afford to send a child to college. This being the case, I do not think that the Congress can, in keeping with its commitment to higher education, ignore this chance to rectify an obvious shortcoming of the Railroad Retirement Act.

It is certainly no innovation for us to acknowledge that dependency can, in case of students, legitimately extend well beyond age 18. The Internal Revenue Service, for example, acknowledges that for tax purpose, a student can be a dependent well beyond the age of 18.

I commend this bill as a much needed humanization of the Railroad Retirement Act.

Putting Congress to the Test

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the real process of study analysis and decision-making, which I think is the role of Congress, is being sorely tested these days. A number of thoughtful editorials appearing in very diverse publications which point out the fact that in view of the very far reaching and important legislation which Congress is acting on, some of the procedures involved are open to question.

Walter H. Annenberg, the independent and outspoken editor and publisher of the Philadelphia Inquirer, has rather bluntly discussed this matter in an editorial which appeared on April 6, 1965. I wish to call it to the attention of my colleagues and the editorial follows:

PUTTING CONGRESS TO THE TEST

These are days of crucial decisions in Congress. Rarely in history have so many bills of critical importance, with so great potential impact upon such large numbers of people, converged upon Capitol Hill and advanced simultaneously to the threshold of incisive action.

The House of Representatives is to begin debate Wednesday on a bill to provide medical care for millions of aged Americans of our time and for generations to come—an issue that has aroused heated controversy for years.

On the same day, the Senate is to take up an aid-to-education bill, already passed by the House, which would set new precedents on several counts—in channeling Federal funds into public schools at the elementary and secondary levels, in providing funds for library books and other services for nonpublic schools, and in linking education aid to the war on poverty with a formula for disbursement of funds that has stirred much argument over its effectiveness.

Before the week is ended a voting rights bill is due on the House floor, a measure that has generated not only enormous emotion but substantial disagreement over constitutional issues.

President Johnson's farm message, submitted Monday, calls upon Congress to grapple in depth with some of the most complex and frustrating economic problems of the mid-20th century. His proposals will get close scrutiny amid growing demand from the farmers themselves for policy changes.

In the wings of the House and Senate Chambers are other pieces of legislation that would have profound and far-reaching effect on American life—including public housing and urban development, recreation, and conservation, to mention only a few.

It seems to us that the real test of Congress in this landmark session is not so much the quantity of legislation passed but the quality of it. In the key issues—health care, school aid, and voting rights, for example—enactment of bills of some kind is almost a certainty. Will they be the best bills obtainable? That is the question.

A school aid formula supposedly geared to the fight on poverty—but which would make New York, Texas, and California the principal beneficiaries—is open to improvement. The same is true of a health care plan that uses one set of rules and procedures to pay hospital bills and an entirely different set for doctor bills.

Statesmanship and proficiency in writing laws above the level of mediocrity—these are the needs of Congress now.

The Independent Inventor's Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, in my continuing effort to bring to the attention of the Congress the often unheard plight of the independent inventor, under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD a speech by Mr. A. J. Hayes, international president of the International Association of Machinists, at a symposium today celebrating the 175th anniversary of the U.S. patent system.

Mr. Hayes' remarks were as follows:

REMARKS BY A. J. HAYES, INTERNATIONAL PRESIDENT, INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS, AT SYMPOSIUM CELEBRATING THE 175TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE U.S. PATENT SYSTEM, WASHINGTON, D. C., APRIL 8, 1965

I am most appreciative of this opportunity to join this distinguished company for the purpose of commemorating and saluting the 175th anniversary of the founding of the patent system of the United States.

Specifically, I have been asked to discuss and present the views of organized labor with respect to the policies that govern our patent system. Therefore, let me forewarn you that I feel that this time will be best spent if I use it to call attention to certain policies and practices which, in the view of the labor movement need correction—rather than to elaborate upon those aspects of our patent system upon which there is universal agreement.

Lest there by any misunderstanding, I assure you that though I may appear critical of certain patent policies and practices, I have the highest regard for the dedicated corps of public servants who strive—though short-handed and overworked—to keep up with the flood of patent applications that flow into Washington on a constant and never-ending stream.

I want to say, also, that in the opinion of organized labor, our patent system has served our Nation well. So well, in fact, that I doubt if we could find another Federal program more wirely accepted and approved by the average man on the street than our patent system.

We are not only a practical people—a nation of menders, fixers, tinkerers and troubleshooters, but we are also—as Gunnar Myrdal concluded in his epic study entitled "An American Dilemma"—a highly idealistic people.

And one of our most cherished ideals—an ideal that is dear to the heart of every American—is that of the lone inventor, working night after night in his workshop—seeking the better mousetrap that will bring the world beating a path to his door.

That is the dream—the dream of the little man who makes good—who converts a bare idea into a working model of fame and fortune. To paraphrase Sir Walter Scott's famous lines—Breathes there a man with soul so dead who hasn't at some time had an idea and said, "I think I'll try to get a patent on that."

I have no statistics to back me up, but on the basis of my knowledge and experience with those who work at the machinists' trade, I wouldn't be surprised if a very high proportion of the more than 3 million patents issued since 1790 have gone to machinists. Having worked as a machinist—both as an apprentice and a journeyman—I can tell you that the average machinist has a lazy streak—in that if a job needs to be done, he'll figure out a way for a machine to do it.

Accordingly, one of the many tasks we find ourselves performing—at our machinists' headquarters, is answering letters from the membership that usually start out, "Dear sir and brother—can you tell me how to go about getting a patent?"

Well, of course, we are always glad to give our members advice and counsel even though we know that in this case their chances of breaking their heart are much better than their chances of breaking into the market with a product—no matter how patentable.

For the fact is that despite isolated success stories, the legend of the lonely inventor, sweating away in his workshop—is more fiction than fact.

Like so many other things in modern America, invention has become big business. Seventy percent of all patents today are issued to corporations. About 75 percent of all research and development is financed by Federal funds—and 60 percent of these funds go to no more than 10 giant concerns.

As a result of the institutionalization of invention, even the concepts and terms by which we describe the processes of technological pioneering have changed. The rugged, individualistic inventor has been largely replaced by a team engaged in a group process known as research and development—or, in the shorthand of modern speech—simply R. & D.

Since most research and development is done on public tax dollars—under Federal contracts—and since most of the corporations that perform this research are entitled to keep the patents that result, we also have the strange situation in which the public pays twice for the same product. This is one of the major areas of dispute and disagreement in our present patent system. One of the chief critics—Senator LONG—of Louisiana has pointed out that it is a system which accentuates and encourages monopoly. And, as a professor of law, commenting on the giveaway of patents developed at public expense, stated before a Senate Small Business Committee hearing recently, "Never has so much money been spent by Government with so little regard for the economic and social consequences."

Of course, no one knows how many millions of dollars have been generously channeled to corporations because of this opportunity to combine public subsidies with private profits. But this is not the only way in which many corporations receive what in my view are undue or unjustified rewards under the present patent system.

These are the corporations that receive millions of dollars from patents that are based on the inventions of their employees. In nearly every corporation, workers must sign a preemployment patent agreement assigning to the employer all rights in any invention which might prove patentable during the tenure of his employment.

Of course there are justifications by which corporate managers rationalize their expropriation of employee inventions. Management claims that not only do they pay the researcher for his time, intelligence, and skill, but also furnish the costly facilities and materials which make invention possible in a technology as sophisticated as ours. In saying this, they are, of course, saying that equipment and facilities are more important in the process of invention than human skill, intelligence, and inspiration. And we, of course, do not agree.

Moreover, the purpose of our patent system as stated in article I, section 8 of the Constitution is "to promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors, the exclusive right to their respective writings and inventions."

And corporations do not invent. People invent. Some authorities, much closer to this field than I, point out that corporate expropriation of employee patents is not only inequitable but contravenes the constitutional purpose in that it actually discourages rather than promotes the progress of science and the useful arts.

They point out that when an employee realizes that his inventions automatically become the property of the company, he not only loses his incentive to invent, but is even sometimes tempted to suppress an invention which might be of great public benefit.

There are even those who say that this accounts for the fact that our annual rate of patent issuance has remained relatively static at around 65,000 a year—despite astronomically increased expenditures for research and development as well as tremendous increases in technically qualified personnel.

Though, in the United States, management has been able to enforce its claim to the right to receive the full benefit of employee patents, some other countries have enacted laws which limit this right by specifically protecting the employee's interest in his invention. For example, in West Germany, under the so-called law on workpeoples inventions, an employer can claim the right to use an employee's invention, but he must make a reasonable payment to the worker in addition to his normal wages.

The amount of this payment depends on the economic value of the invention, the position of the employee, and the contribution which the company itself has made to the development of the invention.

A few American companies have made a start in this direction by establishing—sometimes in negotiations with the union, but more often unilaterally—plans by which employees are granted a certain scale of monetary rewards for patents that the company uses.

Congressman GEORGE BROWN, of California, is trying to establish such a legislative protection for employee inventions in the United States through H.R. 5918 which he has introduced in this session of Congress. This bill, if enacted, would prohibit preemployment agreements which require employees to waive their rights to inventions.

Another area which affects the rights of individual inventors involves the cost of obtaining a patent. We, in the labor movement, believe that the fees charged and the procedures followed should be as few and simple as possible. It is my understanding that even the simplest and most straightforward patent will cost anywhere from $200 to $500 to obtain.

Perhaps this isn't considered a significant amount in some circles, but to the average worker—who makes between $2 and $3 an hour—$200 or $500 represents a lot of saving and a lot of sacrifice. To effectuate the true purposes of our patent system, I think we must keep filing fees as low and procedures as simple as possible. The Federal Govern-

ment is not adverse to subsidizing all kinds of activities that are considered to be socially desirable.

Therefore, in the interest of encouraging the progress of science and the useful arts I think we must resist those who now wish to raise patient filing fees even further beyond the reach of a goodly proportion of the American people.

Finally, I believe that a consideration of our patent system would be incomplete without some note of the impact of technology progress upon people.

Through changes in technology—changes that are coming with increasing rapidity today—we are drastically altering the traditional relationships between men and their jobs, between work and income, and between labor and leisure.

For example, to a larger extent than is generally realized the processes of production are being dehumanized by the technology of automation. Not only have millions of men and women been replaced—or threatened with replacement—by the so-called little black box but a large portion of those that remain are losing all sense of accomplishment because the jobs they do are so narrow, so repetitive, and so remote from the final result.

Human beings are simply being overwhelmed by technology—technology so far-reaching and so fast-spreading that the minds and emotions of men are unable to adjust.

Though we cannot stop—nor do we wish to stop—the flood of American technological inventiveness—I suggest that the patent we need most right now is one on a method to restore human satisfaction and fulfillment to the workplace.

Well, I could philosophize at some length on the human implications of technological change, but in the interests of time, let me summarize my remarks as a whole by saying that though we all agree that our patent system is worthy of the general public approval which it receives, it could—and should—be strengthened by:

First, putting into the public domain all patents developed at public expense;

Second, enlarging the rights of inventors in relation to their employers; and

Third, by keeping the system of patent issuance within the reach of as many people as possible by making it as inexpensive and simple as possible.

The Army That Never Kills Marks Its 100th Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled, "The Army That Never Kills Marks Its 100th Birthday," which appeared in the April 4, 1965, issue of the Messenger and Inquirer, of Owensboro, Ky.

The editorial is as follows:

THE ARMY THAT NEVER KILLS MARKS ITS 100TH BIRTHDAY

If any institution is respected and respectable today the world over it is the Salvation Army. Yet its founding 100 years ago scandalized and shocked Victorian England.

The hypocritical, tea-sipping society, where even piano legs were referred to as "limbs," was scandalized that anyone should dare to point to the vice and crime and degradation that festered behind its facade of polite gentility.

It was shocked that anyone could consider thieves and drunkards and beggars as victims of circumstance and not willful sinners, and actually go among them and attempt to elevate their lives and their aspirations.

The "anyone" was William Booth, a dedicated young minister working with the impoverished masses of London's slums. He soon learned that nothing could be accomplished by preaching to people with empty stomachs. No one could be led to God, he found, if he were rejected by society.

As a result, he set up soup kitchens, provided shelter for homeless men and, later, rescue homes for "fallen women." His object was not handouts but the physical and moral means to enable these people to achieve self-respect and independence.

The Salvation Army was born. The year was 1865.

Booth was an advanced social thinker who attacked all the injustices of the political and economic system of his day. He advocated a program of reform that included rehabilitation homes for alcoholics, nursery care for children of working mothers, schools for poor children, low-income housing, probation for first offenders, and a missing persons bureau.

He even went so far as to assert that the Government owed every man the food necessary to keep him alive while he searched for work.

Inevitably, Booth was considered a dangerous radical. Early Salvationists were scorned by the "better" classes, even attacked by mobs and sent to jail.

Today, in its centennial year, 1 million Salvation Army workers operate in 71 geographic areas and 147 languages. The army's hospitals, nurseries, camps, settlements, community centers, casework, counseling, disaster aid and much more continue into a second century the great work begun by Gen. William Booth.

Silver Platter to the Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I insert the following article from the Indianapolis Star of April 4, 1965:

SILVER PLATTER TO THE REDS

Under Secretary of State George Ball's recent remarks about economic and military "interdependence" signaled a new gush of hope from the one-worlders.

It's the same old story. The idea is that we disarm and hope the Russians and the Red Chinese will be good little fellows and disarm, too. We would turn over our constitutional rights to a world supergovernment run by officials who know little about the United States and American life, and care less. We would also share our food and consumer products with other nations. Gunnar Mydral, the Swedish Socialist, appearing recently on the platform with Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY, suggested that the United States, under an internationalized program arranged by the United Nations, feed the world.

The one-world nonsense has been kicking around for a long time. Now its principal ingredients and chief gimmick is U.S. disarmament. Bring home and dismantle the B-58's with their nuclear weapons that are flying on alert 24 hours a day. Abandon nuclear research. Get rid of the mighty missiles that put the muscle in U.S. talks with Communist powers—the missiles the Reds know are there, which put the temper in their tone and make them listen.

Would the Reds then quit sending missiles and military advisers to Cuba, infiltrating Latin America and Africa, subverting and invading southeastern Asia? Would Mao-Tse-tung quit beating his war drums and fabricating nuclear weapons? Would his goons quit worming their way into American left-wing union and student movements, deluging the "emerging nations" and their own people with hate propaganda, getting ready for World War III?

The one-worlders apparently think they would. We don't.

The Communists would go right on being Communists, using the weapons of subversion and infiltration which they employ with such skill and success. They would commandeer the supergovernment and its "international peace force" and we would, to be sure, have one world—a Red world.

Iowa Arms & Ammunition Plant To Build Shillelagh Missile

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to call to the attention of my fellow Members of the House of Representatives, the fine contribution that the residents of the First Congressional District of Iowa are making to our defense efforts. The Iowa Arms & Ammunition Plant at Burlington, Iowa, is participating in production of Shillelagh guided missile systems. The highly skilled and dedicated workers in the Burlington, Iowa, Arms & Ammunition Plant justly deserve the recognition and appreciation of all Americans for their highly important role in helping to defend our Nation.

I include for the RECORD a recent news story which appeared in the April 5 edition of the Burlington Hawkeye newspaper which describes this contribution by the workers at the Iowa Arms & Ammunition Plant:

IOWA ARMS & AMMUNITION PLANT TO BUILD SHILLELAGH MISSILE

A $200,000 modification project is scheduled to start at the Iowa Arms & Ammunition Plant about May 1, paving the way for Mason & Hanger-Silas Mason Co. participation in production of Shillelagh guided missile systems. Actual production should be underway by the end of the year, it was reported over the weekend by the Eye, Iowa Arms & Ammunition Plant newspaper.

The Shillelagh is a highly accurate guided missile designed to provide troops with close support against stationary or moving targets. Field tests have proved it equally effective against tanks, opposing troops and field fortifications.

Designed for use with Sheridan lightweight armored reconnaissance vehicle, the Shillelagh can also be fired from a helicopter.

The work here will be carried on by the company under subcontract with the Aeronautics Division of the Philco Corp., prime contractor to the U.S. Army Missile Command for production of the Shillelagh system.

ASSEMBLY AT IOWA ARMS & AMMUNITION PLANT

Final assembly of the weapon will be accomplished here. Aeronautic's Lawndale, Calif., facility will manufacture components and produce certain nonexplosive subassemblies.

Sherman Smith & Associates of Burlington has been selected by the Corps of Engineers as architect-engineers on the Line IV–B modification project. Contractors to perform the modification work will be selected and announced later.

Negotiations to bring the Shillelagh contract here began more than a year ago. While the first production schedule will be small, company officials hope that followup work will lead to sizable production activity.

According to the Army Times, the Shillelagh will give troops a weapon that achieves a number of firsts. The Times said:

"Capabe of firing a missile or a conventional round through the same tube, the Shillelagh will use combustible conventional ammunition, in which the entire casing is consumed. The Shillelagh conventional round, a 152-milimeter shell, will be multipurpose with the same round effective against personnel, field fortification and armor."

ARMORED VEHICLE

Development of the Shillelagh system has paralleled development of the General Sheridan armored vehicle.

"It is planned that the General Sheridan, with the Shillelagh as its main armament, will be used as a reconnaissance vehicle for armor and infantry elements, as well as an antitank weapons carrier for airborne and combined arms operations," the Army newspaper said.

Weighing only 16 tons, the Sheridan was made possible through Army development of specially treated aluminum armor. The result is an armored vehicle small enough for airborne operations.

Accuracy of the Shillelagh was demonstrated last fall during test firing operations at the White Sands, N. Mex., Missile Range. Working with missiles that had just undergone 4 months of rugged environment testing, soldiers from Fort Knox, Ky., fired the weapon accurately against both stationary and moving targets. The soldiers had no previous experience firing the missiles.

The Author—Mark Van Doren

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, seldom has a nation produced such a gifted individual as the United States has in the person of Mark Van Doren, a resident of Cornwall, Conn., which I represent.

Mr. William Claire, former assistant to Congressman ST. ONGE, has written a biographical article on the life and works of Mr. Doren and I now ask permission that this article, "The Author—Mark Van Doren" which appeared in "The Booklover's Answer," be inserted in the RECORD.

THE AUTHOR—MARK VAN DOREN

(By William F. Claire)

In his celebrated autobiography, Mark Van Doren has said that his birthplace (Hope, Ill., June 13, 1894) would be "hard to find on any atlas, though it still exists as Faith and Charity, its sister villages named a century ago, do not."

The son of a rugged country doctor, he moved at the age of 6 to Urbana, where he attended the University of Illinois and began a writing career that has spanned a half-century of excellence in poetry, fiction, and criticism.

At the university, he studied under Stuart Sherman and wrote the first of his many books, a critical study of Thoreau. Commenting some 46 years later on a reissue of the book, Stanley Edgar Hyman called it a brilliant, even staggering, accomplishment by a student.

He served in the Army during World War I and later joined his brother Carl Van Doren on the Columbia University faculty. His Ph. D. study of John Dryden became his second book and one of the first to appear under the imprint of Alfred Harcourt, Donald Brace and Will D. Howe.

While his earliest published poem had been accepted by H. L. Mencken for the smart set during his college days, it was not until 1924 that his first volume, "Spring Thunder," was printed. T. S. Eliot, whose review in England of the Dryden book had much to do with establishing its permanent fame, also wrote favorably of the new poetry.

From 1924–28, he set a productive pace that has been unmatched by any other major writer. He brought out two new volumes of verse, wrote a critical study of Edwin Arlington Robinson, served as literary editor of the Nation, collaborated with Carl on a study of British and American literature, compiled his famous "Anthology of World Poetry" and continued teaching at Columbia. During this period he and his wife, the former Dorothy Graffe, also produced two children.

An epic poem, "Jonathan Gentry," came out in 1931, and after a winter spent on his Cornwall, Conn., farm, he wrote another narrative poem, "A Winter Diary." In this 1935 book, he also included 33 sonnets, which Allen Tate in a recent review said amounted to the "finest work in its genre of this century." This book, still another collection and a series of new poems entitled "America's Mythology" were undoubtedly strong factors in his Pulitzer Prize Award for collected poems (1939).

Important critical works were also written during the thirties, the most prominent of which was "Shakespeare." Writing in 1942, however, in a preface to his "Private Reader," he announced his farewell to formal criticism by stating that he "no longer felt at home, even—or especially—in its finest rooms." The publication of the "Happy Critic" recently indicates that his announcement was somewhat premature. The demand for his comments on literature continues and while his approach is appreciative rather than critical in the academic sense, the essays are masterpieces of penetration and insight. Writers examined include Hardy, Herrick, Mann, Cervantes, and Whitman among others.

A legendary teacher at Columbia for 39 years, Van Doren retired in 1959. He has served since as Bolyston professor of rhetoric at Harvard sharing that chair during an academic year with Robert Lowell. He is the present chancellor of the American Academy of Arts and Letters.

At Columbia he taught such diverse people as Lionel Trilling, Allen Ginsburg, Thomas Merton (perhaps the best description of Van Doren the teacher can be found in Merton's spiritual autobiography, "The Seven Story Mountain"), Clifton Fadiman, John Berryman and the recent Pulitzer Prize winning poet, Louis Simpson.

The late James Thurber has described his impact when he said, "Mark Van Doren is so many men that I have to open my front door and my windows when he visits me in order to let all of him in."

Needless to say, Van Doren's accomplishments stagger the imagination. To his poetry and criticism can be added three novels, innumerable short stories, a play ("The Last Days of Lincoln," widely read but as yet unproduced by a major company) and books such as Liberal Education, Invitation to Learning (after the CBS radio show), children's books, mystery stories and a series of illuminating introductions ranging from the Limited Editions club volumes to recent paperbacks.

Each generation seems to discover Van Doren in its own special way. While it is impossible to estimate the number of readers he has had during his career, his influence has been considerable. Not surprisingly, the autobiography represents the best view of Van Doren's total commitment to life and literature.

Matters have been somewhat complicated (if, as many people assume, a writer has to be placed) by the fact that Van Doren has never joined a particular school of poetry. Like Conrad Aiken, he has assidiously avoided the limelight, although it has often been thrust upon him. Critics have compared him to Frost, Hardy, and Robinson but most have been in agreement that he has forged a body of poetry unique in this century.

In recent years, Van Doren has been collecting his work in a series of books, and his next is expected to contain all of the longer poems he wishes to preserve. At the same time, he continues to write new material that demonstrates his absolute mastery of form and ever-increasing awareness of the mystery and beauty of the world.

His is the sure touch of genius. It may be an eon or two before we produce another inspired writer in this country with quite the same grasp of life in all of its particular and universal aspects. Meanwhile, he gives us some hint of the music he hears in "Undersong," a majestic poem he wrote recently which begins:

"In wonderment I walk to music pouring
Out of so dark a source it makes no sound"—

And ends, after more than 80 remarkable lines—

"Evenly, unevenly as rhymes
Rival the pure chimes
Of never ending truth that for so long
Has sung to such as me this undersong."

Through Difficulty to the Stars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, we have in our day and time no lack of consideration and comment addressed to the imaginative appeal of the new space age. The age of exploration and intrusion into the mysteries of the outer space of the universe and the inner space of the oceans. One aspect of this new era and a practical realization of the great promise and challenge it presents is the accommodation of the human physiology to the conditions of the new and often hostile characteristics of space environment.

In an articulate and imaginative presentation, our colleague from Texas,

HENRY B. GONZALEZ, treats this theme. His forum was a most appropriate one, Brooks Air Force Base in his native State. Not only is Brooks one of the outstanding bases for the training of aerospace pilots and technicians, it also has the first and most complete medical facility dealing with aerospace medicine. I commend to the House the reading of the remarks of Mr. GONZALEZ which are incorporated herein below:

PER ASPERA AD ASTRA

(Address of Congressman HENRY B. GONZALEZ at Brooks Air Force Base, Apr. 2, 1965)

I cannot conceive of a more appropriate theme for a dining in at Brooks than this one—through difficulty to the stars—which is similar to the motto of the Royal Air Force.

It was here that John Kennedy, on the eve of his death, his untimely voyage to the great beyond—said:

"And in the new frontiers of outer space, while headlines may be made by others in other places, history is being made every day by the men and women of the Aerospace Medical Center, without whom there could be no history."

Mankind has always been held in a state of fascination by mysteries, and men have ever tried to understand and conquer those things which have been beyond their comprehension. It has been this persistent curiosity that has brought us to our present state of scientific knowledge and technical understanding. Yet the deepest mysteries remain unsolved, and you are engaged in probing some of these secrets, to help solve the dark secrets of universe itself.

Men are drawn to the shores of oceans because they cannot understand or comprehend the awesome powers and strange beauty of what Queen Isabella of Spain called the ocean sea, that fearsome water that covers most of our earth. We have learned to sail on the surface of the sea and even to dive and cruise in the borderlands of its depths, but man has yet to discover how to survive in the greatest depths of the sea, and so its deepest mysteries remain undiscovered, its awesome powers a secret yet to be opened to the mind of man. Just as men have stood on lonely beaches and pondered the awesome powers of the sea, so they have stood transfixed, gazing at the depth and mystery of the heavens, always wondering what secrets the stars held and whether there were other worlds like or own in that infinite distance of the universe.

If the secrets of the sea remain unknown, it is because men have yet to learn how to survive in the vast depths of the hostile ocean. And if the mysteries of the universe are still unknown to our inquiring minds, it is because we cannot live yet in the void of space. Only if man can live in space can he conquer it, and he can survive in space only through the efforts of men like you. If one day we do journey to the moon and beyond, and if one day the darkness of space is understood by men, it will be in no small part due to your diligence, your persistence, your energy, and your unflagging curiosity.

And what of man and the moon, what of man and the stars?

No one can truly say when a man first gazed at the stars, or what he thought because this surely happened long before history was recorded.

Ancient men worshipped the stars as gods. Thousands of years ago men believed that the stars held the keys to man's fate, that the stars could be read as signs to say whether a man would have a good or bad day, or whether his life would be happy or marred with misfortune. Astrology was popular with the Egyptians and with the Romans, and it is still a favorite practice of people all over the world. Even today, you can read your fortune in the newspapers, your fate foretold by readers of the stars. We all know that the position of the stars and the conjunctions of the planets have nothing to do with our fate and fortune, but men do not understand the stars yet, and so their mystery lends itself to the foretelling of time, through that most ancient of arts, astrology.

The Egyptians, the Babylonians, the Indians of Central America all observed the stars. They were able to see that the heavens moved in an orderly fashion, were able to construct calendars based on the movements of the universe itself. Their observations were by no means crude, for who today can match the Aztec calendar for accuracy, though the Aztecs left no key to their language, though they themselves disappeared as a civilization.

Even more astounding to us in the 20th century than the accuracy of the Aztec astronomers, is that of the men who built the circle of stones in England, at Stonehenge, perhaps as an observatory, perhaps as a temple, but perhaps as a giant calculator by which the eclipses of the sun and moon and the phases of the sun could be accurately forecast.

No one truly knows the mystery of Stonehenge today, though generations of scientists have speculated on its purposes.

But by far the most interesting theory about Stonehenge is that it was in fact an enormous calculator, a computer by which men could gage the actions of the heavens and foretell with great accuracy the phenomena of eclipses of the sun and moon.

No one can ever know absolutely why Stonehenge was built, nor what it was used for. But if the theory that Stonehenge was a calculator is true—and it is hard to disprove it—then that huge and mute circle of stones on England's lonely moor stands as a monument to the power of the stars over man's imagination, as a monument to skill and daring and curiosity.

The intensity of the power that the search for knowledge of the stars and the determination of conquest of space holds over men's minds can be attested to by the manned space flights. Every time a man is launched into space, millions of people gather quietly before their television sets, watching the great rockets thrusting men into that ultimate ocean, infinite space itself. And though we cannot see the space capsules as they cruise on the edge of space, we follow their progress through illuminated maps and count the seconds from the mission clocks, always praying that that lonely man or men will return safely from his brief dive into that vast void.

And so today, perhaps more than ever in the history of man, we have our eyes on the heavens, determined to solve the deepest mysteries of the infinite universe. And if those mysteries are solved it will be because men could go into space and live long enough to learn the secrets that are locked in that void. In the final analysis, the success or failure of manned space flight depends on people like you, because on your shoulders is the burden of devising systems that will permit men to live in space, that most hostile of all environments. The conquest of the vastness of space depends heavily on life support systems, and when that conquest is done, you will be able to take just pride in a near-impossible task well done.

II

Sometimes we seem obsessed in this country by the drive for space, and indeed the quest for knowledge is as pervasive as anything else in our lives.

There are a few central facts governing our lives, and one of these is the explosion of knowledge in this century.

In this century knowledge has advanced so far and so quickly that few men can conceive of it or grasp it. Sir Francis Bacon, the great Elizabethan scholar and philosopher, once set out to learn all he could of the world's fund of knowledge. No man today however brilliant, would dare attempt to learn everything about a single discipline, let alone all of them!

One of the aspects of the advance of knowledge is the age-old question of whether man is master over his creations, or whether he himself will be mastered by the products of his own genius. If this Pandora's box question was important a hundred or a thousand years ago, it is of supreme importance today, when our very survival depends on it. These momentous questions remain unresolved today—perhaps we may never solve them—but it seems to me that we must.

Will the atom—whose secrets were unlocked to form the deadliest of all engines of destruction almost exactly twenty years ago—become our servant or our master; will it be a great, inexaustible genie, or will it destroy us all?

What will outer space be, when we have conquered it? Will it be a battleground or will it offer a peaceful area of exploration or even commerce? Will the life support systems we are building be used to insure man's survival in space or only insure the ability to use space to destroy life here on earth?

I do not propose to answer these questions here tonight, for no man could. What I am saying is that if our knowledge is greater, then so is our responsibility; and if our power is greater, so also is the burden on us to use that power responsibly.

As a politician I cannot avoid these issues. As scientists, neither can you. For a scientist does not work in a vacuum. His work is related to the world outside his laboratory; his experiments have an impact far beyond the confines of his test tube.

Like the chain reaction under the stadium at the University of Chicago, the discoveries of science can pose grave new problems for the world outside. But while the scientist holds some responsibility to direct the uses of his discoveries, he is not and cannot be alone in this responsibility; he and his fellow man must bear the burden together.

I believe that the scientific community has done admirably well in helping direct the new-found powers and knowledge of our time, and this is an achievement of which we can all be proud. I, for one, am grateful for the leadership of the scientific community.

But why should a scientist help direct the uses of knowledge and power? I have said that it is because he does not work in a vacuum; and his work affects the community at large. No man could give a better reason for a scientist to take up his social responsibilities than did John Donne, who wrote his immortal essays in the early 1600's. In his devotions, Donne said that "No man is an island, entire of itself." And, "Any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind." If Donne was involved in mankind, so are we today, for we literally hold the fate of all mankind in our hands. And if anyone is unconvinced of his responsibilities to mankind, let him remember Donne's words: "But I do nothing upon myself, and yet I am mine own executioner." If we fail to take up our responsibilities, if we do nothing, we may very well be acting as our own executioners.

But we have not failed, thus far. We have dealt with the great problems caused by our scientific advances, and if we have not yet solved all our problems, we have at least not taken the easy way out by refusing to think about them at all.

Thus it is that we have determined not to use space as a mere area in which to race, but have instead taken the more difficult road of a systematic, carefully planned and deliberate exploration of space. But lest any man be tempted to forget our determination to remain a free and powerful nation, we are also exploring the possible military applications of space technology. So in space, as with the atom before, we are hoping for the best by making peaceful use of our power and knowledge, and at the same time preparing for the worst by keeping our military technology strong.

As scientists, you are meeting your responsibilities to mankind by helping to meet our dual goals in space—peace, but with a strong guard up.

III

As a politician, I deal with every aspect of public policy; I decide on and cast votes dealing in issues great and small, and deal with every condition found in a city and county of 700,000 people.

I am constantly made aware that most people are not really very concerned with affairs outside of their immediate concern. That is, even though there are a great many people who are concerned about—say civil rights in Mississippi and poverty in West Virginia, most of us are not concerned at all, beyond reading the headlines and perhaps developing an opinion, one way or another.

I wonder whether we can afford this attitude of noninvolvement. As scientists and as politicians—can we limit ourselves to our test tubes and offices? I think not.

It was here in San Antonio that a great example was set * * * men dedicated to the discipline of scientific inquiry and truth met * * * several Russian scientists joined * * * no fear or reprisal * * * no taint, etc. Perhaps only in this environment may we find mankind's salvation.

I think that we must be involved in society and in the world around us. If we are not really involved, if we stand aside, we are abandoning the field to others, risking that nothing at all be done to correct blight and injustice, and risking that what is done is wrong. These are risks that, as citizens in a free society, we cannot afford to take. A free society is a thing of great passions—that is the difference between a free country and an enclosed one. For in a totalitarian country you will find indifference—noninvolvement—a dependence on decisions rendered from above. A totalitarian society is a dispassionate one, if you will; it is cold and indifferent.

Aristotle wrote that, by definition "Man is a political animal." We are indeed political animals. In our politics there are great passions, because great passions are the stuff of which freedom is made. That is why, I believe, we cannot afford to be aloof, uninvolved, and dispassionate; we cannot afford to let others suffer or be subjected to degradation and injustice. James Baldwin wrote in a fine essay not long ago that "whoever debases others is debasing himself." And this is true. We can neither afford to debase others nor stand aside while others are being debased. The essence of our free society is involvement, concern, participation. No man, no matter what his calling, can afford to abandon the political field to others. As a freeman, he is obliged to make his own decisions and to play his own role, not leave it to others.

I think that we would prefer to have a neater society. Freedom and democracy are not really very neat. Decisions are hard to arrive at in a free country, and there is always dissent. It is noisy and sometimes it is confusing; but it is good. A free, healthy society is a noisy thing, not a neat one. It has no quick and easy solution to anything, it is stubborn, hard to manage, raucous, passionate—but it is a healthy and invigorating thing. As scientists, as military men, as citizens—we are obligated to keep it that way. So our responsibility to society extends beyond the laboratory. You must help direct the uses made of your discoveries, to help insure that the knowledge is our servant rather than our master. But beyond even this awesome duty, you and I must be involved in all of the concern of our society and in all of the problems of our fellow men, because that is our responsibility as freemen in a free society.

Our challenges are great, for we live in a time of great discovery. If our problems in this world are great, so are our opportunities.

I am optimistic about our future, precisely because we do have great responsibilities, great challenges and great opportunities.

In our age, we can, by the proper use of our knowledge and power make all men free. And we will.

Per ardua ad astra.

Crime and the Constitution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the increase in crime in our Nation is a problem of great concern to us all. Perhaps in desperation, many proposed solutions to this problem have involved the limitation or suspension of the constitutional rights of arrested persons.

Two articles which have come to my attention recently suggest that more policemen and more police activity offer a better solution than the infringement of constitutional liberties.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert the texts of a March 27 editorial in the Minneapolis Star, and an article from the March issue of Civil Liberties:

[From the Minneapolis (Minn.) Star, Mar. 27, 1965]

MORE POLICE PATROLS PAY OFF

Minneapolis' decline in major crimes for the first 2 months of 1965 is good news for the city and a credit to its police department.

Along with a 9.1-percent decrease from January and February of 1964, Police Chief Cal Hawkinson says the number of cases solved was up 3.3 percent from last year. That, at least, is what the statistics show, even though they ignore such pertinent factors as the weather and economic and age trends in a city's population.

If the statistics have some validity, however, so also does Hawkinson's observation that the greatest crime drop came in areas where police patrolling has been increased. He suggests that the addition of four squad cars and eight sergeants is paying off in a safer city.

But the police chief also warns that a 2-month improvement is hardly sufficient to conclude that the local crime splurge has been reversed. The fact that the Minneapolis crime rate increased 136 percent in 10 years, although the city's population showed a slight decline, stacks the odds against that hope.

Yet, at a time when many police and legal experts are grasping every chance to blame the Nation's crime increase on judicial demands that basic rights of suspects be respected, it is worth while to note that Minneapolis has recorded at least a temporary statistical cutback in crime. It is a healthy bit of evidence that increased police activity—and not criticism of the courts—is one step in the right direction.

THE SUPREME COURT AND POLICE AUTHORITY

(By Nanette Dembitz, general counsel, New York Civil Liberties Union)

(NOTE.—Critics of the Supreme Court in Congress, in the legal profession, and in the press were joined recently by Lewis F. Powell, Jr., head of the American Bar Association. He charged that some of its decisions have "swung too far in affording rights which are abused and misused by criminals." "The Criminal Gets the Breaks" was the succinct title of a recent New York Times magazine article on the same theme. The Supreme Court's critics are especially bitter about its decision that a defendant's confession, made while he is held in the police station, cannot be used to convict him. The Whitmore case in New York has recently headlined this issue. George Whitmore had confessed, while in the custody of the police, to the notorious murder of Janice Wylie and Emily Hoffert; his conviction seemed certain until the District Attorney discovered that the confession was false—the result of police dictation. This analysis of the issue by Nanette Dembitz, general counsel to the ACLU's New York affiliate for the past 10 years, is part of a discussion of the Supreme Court's decisions on criminal procedure. A graduate of Columbia Law School where she was an editor of the Law Review, Miss Dembitz was formerly an attorney in the Department of Justice and now practices law in New York City. The Supreme Court's decisions on police station confessions have had their main impact in Washington, D.C., where the courts enforce Federal rather than State law.)

Under Federal law, like the law of most States, a policeman may arrest an individual on the basis of probable cause to believe he has committed a crime. Then, after booking him at the police station, the policeman must proceed with the accused to a judge or a judicial commissioner for his arraignment—for a determination, made with greater objectivity than the arresting officer's, as to whether there is indeed probable cause to hold him. The policeman "must with reasonable promptness show legal cause for detaining arrested persons," as the U.S. Supreme Court said in the McNabb case.

The pivotal requirement throughout criminal procedure of probable cause strikes a compromise between liberty and security. Something more than mere suspicion is required but something far less than certainty. Thus, there was probable cause for the recent arrest in New York City of a person with the same build, race, and clothing as a reported robber but who in fact had no connection with him—a complete, but reasonable, case of mistaken identity.

POLICE STATION DETENTION

Prompt arraignment of the accused before a judicial officer is primarily necessary to prevent, as the Supreme Court says, an "intensive interrogation, easily gliding into the evils of 'the third degree'" in the police station. Critics of Supreme Court decisions assert that they are of course opposed to the third degree; but they ignore the problem the Court must face—how to prevent it. Generally speaking, there is no witness to the third degree except the victim and several policemen. Without some extraordinary circumstance supporting the victim's testimony against the policemen, who corroborate each other's version, a lawyer knows a claim of police brutality in the station house is hopeless.

The effective means to limit the third degree is to prevent lengthy police station de-

tention. Prompt arraignment as the Supreme Court said, "checks resort to those reprehensible practices known as the 'third degree' which * * * still find their way into use. It aims to avoid all the evil implications of secret interrogation of persons accused of crime."

Even apart from brutality, the accused held in a back room of a police station necessarily feels himself a helpless victim of overwhelming force. He knows there is no time limit on his detention and that his contract with the outside world is at the mercy of his interrogators.

In one of the cases frequently criticized because the conviction was reversed, though no brutality was established, the accused was held upstairs in a police station for 26 hours. Do we want the accused, whether innocent or guilty, subject to this procedure for obtaining evidence? The statement "You are under arrest" should, we believe, signal the commencement of an orderly procedure, not a dread use of overwhelming authority against a helpless victim. The policeman is an administrator, not a secret inquisitor.

Interrogation of the accused can of course continue after his arraignment before a judge. The difference is not only that the judge has then informed him of the charge against him, and of his legal rights—including the right to obtain an attorney—but more important, the accused is lodged in a jail whose institutional arrangements preclude incommunicado detention and secret interrogation.

PROMPT ARRAIGNMENT AND OTHER RIGHTS

Prompt arraignment, as part of the structure of orderly criminal procedure, buttresses other important rights. A frequent purpose of police-station interrogation is to try to find probable cause for holding a person when he has been arrested on mere suspicion and hunch. If the police must obey the command of prompt arraignment, they will also have to obey the command to arrest only on probable cause.

Another basic of our criminal procedure is the constitutional privilege against self-incrimination, of which the judge informs the accused at his arraignment. The privilege is worthless if the accused believes, before the judge informs him otherwise, that he must reply to police-station interrogation. Surely the privilege should not be available at the will of the police or reserved for knowledgeable criminals who are expert enough to assert it before their arraignment.

The only method the Supreme Court has for enforcing the prompt arraignment rule is to reverse convictions when the accused confessed during his unlawful detention in the police station. When the police illegally hold a man but fail to obtain evidence of guilt, they release him. Thus virtually the only cases to come before the Supreme Court on appeal—and the only apportunity it has to consider and condemn illegal police station detention—are those in which the police succeed in finding evidence of guilt.

When the Court reverses a conviction because the confession was obtained during an illegal detention, it removes the police's incentive to disobey the prompt arraignment rule. The Court in effect pressures the police to obey the rule in dealing with all of us—to the benefit of the dignity and security of everyone arrested.

USEFULNESS OF POLICE STATION DETENTION IN CRIME DETECTION

What about the critics who say that admissions secured by police station detention are necessary to prosecute crime? A partial answer is that this interrogation would tend to be least successful when the need for proof would be greatest: against an experienced and practiced criminal. Further, though in a few glaring cases crucial evidence may consist of police station admissions, the available statistical data indicates that prolonged station house interrogation is of insubstantial value overall in obtaining convictions.

In Washington, D.C., for a number of years there was an established procedure of "arrests for investigation," which served largely the same purpose as police-station interrogation after arrest for a crime. Making a careful survey of the practice for 1960 and 1961, a committeee appointed by the District of Columbia Commissioners reported that in approximately 17 out of each 18 cases of arrests for investigation, the prisoners were eventually released. Thus, despite the fact that the police could hold these suspects indefinitely, and even though over half of those ultimately released were in fact held more than 4 hours, proportionately few convictions resulted from this unrestricted police station interrogation.

In candor, however, it must be recognized that the prohibition on police-station interrogation—like other protections of the individual—will preclude proof of guilt in some cases. Whether one accepts or rails at a degree of sacrifice in crime-detection depends in part on one's sense—for on this there can be no controlled experiment—of how rapidly and pervasively police control would spread if the Supreme Court let down its guard. I take it that police practices, like many social institutions, are mobile and develop and progress unless restrained or pushed back.

But the final answer to whether one applauds the Supreme Court depends on a personal emotional quotient. Part of my thanks to the Court is for a sense of security. I can feel that if I, whether guilty or innocent, were to be subjected to police authority, it would be a limited authority, and I would still be functioning within a prescribed order of rights and duties.

Key to Sane Voting Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the April 4, 1965, Cleveland, Ohio, Plain Dealer. It is from a very highly respected newspaper and worthy of our attention.

The editorial follows:

[From the Cleveland (Ohio) Plain Dealer, Apr. 4, 1965]

KEY TO SANE VOTING RIGHTS

As the House Judiciary Subcommittee prepares for the second stage of its work on the voting-rights bill, it becomes more and more obvious that the legislation as drawn by the administration is not wholly acceptable to either side of the controversy, nor to many constitutional authorities.

As presently drafted, the measure covers States or subdivisions having literacy tests and less than 50-percent voting participation.

Civil rights groups are protesting the limitations and indications are that, in this area, the legislation will be broadened.

Constitutional authorities are basing objection to the bill on grounds that it violates article I, section 2 of the Constitution, which provides that "electors (voters) in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature."

Invoking of the Federal registration apparatus in the bill would annul all State voting qualifications except those pertaining to age, length of residence, conviction of a felony and mental incompetence.

The administration holds that the 15th amendment supersedes article I. The amendment provides that the "right of citizens to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

Ohio has no literacy test. Ohio's revised code, section 3503.01, requires a registration applicant to be 21; to be eligible to vote he must have been a State resident for at least one year. Further requirements are that he must have resided in a particular county for 40 days and in a particular voting precinct for 40 days to be eligible to vote in those county and municipal elections.

State literacy tests loom as the key factor in preparing the legislation for floor action.

There should be no objection to such a test that is reasonable in the knowledge required, that is nondiscriminatory and is uniformly applied. The major protest by rights groups has been that the tests were too complicated and were directed at keeping the franchise from Negroes.

Congress should also take the greatest care that legislation drafted to protect the rights of a minority does not intrude on the rights of a whole community.

A strong Federal law is needed to end the tragic problem of Negro voter discrimination but it should be directed to the discriminatory application of unreasonable literacy tests, to registrant intimidation and limitation on availability of the registration process. It is pertinent that the validity of many literacy tests has already been upheld by the Supreme Court.

Forecast for Silver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 23, 1965

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared on the front page of Barron's, national business and financial weekly, on April 5. I believe it is an excellent analysis of the coinage and silver situation, and I commend it to my colleagues.

CROSS OF SILVER: NO NATION CAN LIVE OFF ITS CAPITAL FOREVER

While invariably rewarding, luncheon meetings of the New York Society of Security Analysts, like the menus, tend to be cut-and-dried. Last week, however, the society was treated to a discourse which, compared to the customary corporate fare, struck this member as a triumph of clarity and style. On the unlikely subject of "Coinage and Silver," Simon D. Strauss, vice president of the American Smelting & Refining Co., had some fascinating things to say. Alone among the great powers, Mr. Strauss observed, the United States has inherited a coinage that has survived unchanged since 1792. "In that year, when Alexander Hamilton, the first Secretary of the Treasury, asked Congress to authorize the minting of coins containing 90 percent silver and 10 percent copper, he hit upon a composition that has met all the tests of a satisfactory coinage. Silver coins

are attractive, durable, hard to counterfeit, and meet the psychological need of the public for a coin of real value that carries the ring of authenticity." To those who, despite the gleaming record, would abandon silver coins, the speaker addressed a thoughtful warning: "The lesson of history is that when currency of intrinsic value disappears completely from the monetary system, in due course the currency of that nation loses substantially all its value. This was true as far back as the ancient Greek city-states and the Roman Empire; it was true of Germany, Japan, and Italy as recently as World War II."

Those who refuse to learn from history, as the saying goes, are doomed to repeat it. Far from resting peacefully buried among the myths and shibboleths of the past, silver coinage today has become a critical issue of monetary policy. Congress lately has held extensive hearings at which producers, consumers and disinterested sources have testified at length. The U.S. Treasury, which has perhaps the greatest single stake in finding a solution, has been busy analyzing various points of view for months. Its recommendations, originally scheduled for February, are due to appear any day.

In the heated clash of interests which is likely to ensue, cool appraisal will be hard to come by. Hence now is a better time than most to press the search, through a wasteland of claim and counterclaim for the mother lode of truth. To begin with, the record reflects scant credit on the Treasury, which repeatedly failed either to recognize the gravity of the silver crisis or to take effective measures to relieve it. In belated alarm, officials in and out of the Department reportedly are weighing such coercive proposals as banning the export of the precious metal or the hoarding of coins. Silver always has been a durable commodity. Today it promises to become a premanent symbol of mismanaged money.

In the United States, as we have observed before, mismanagement of silver is a tradition which dates back at least to the heyday of William Jennings Bryan. Under former Secretary C. Douglas Dillon, however, the classic confusion was vastly compounded. During his first year in office, the Treasury persisted in selling the precious metal at 91 cents an ounce, thereby lavishing a $20 million windfall on speculators and running down the Nation's store of "free" silver. Subsequently, Mr. Dillon presided over a run on silver dollars (which his Department encouraged by providing buyers with bags full of cartwheels) and the subsequent ignominy of doling out packets of silver dust. Until the Feds cracked down, department stores and supermarket chains, in an effort to overcome the shortage of change, began "minting" wooden nickels. One way or another, during his tenure, Treasury holdings of silver plunged from nearly 2 billion ounces to 1.4 billion and, at the current rate of attrition, suffice for only a few more years. Hence the pressing need for altering the coinage.

The hard choices confronting Mr. Dillon's successor reflect a basic shift in the silver market. Overpriced by Government fiat for generations, and hence in excess supply, the precious metal at long last has come into its own. Silver, of course, yields only to gold in malleability and ductility; it also boasts the highest electrical and thermal conductivity, and the brightest color of any metal. As one admirer has said, "Its noble appearance and the ease with which it can be worked are responsible for its age-old use as tableware, jewelry, and in the decorative arts." Since World War II, moreover, industry has found it increasingly valuable in photographic film, surgical and dental equipment, storage batteries, and missiles. Even prior to the outbreak of hoarding, finally, the rise of silver in coinage, sparked by the proliferation of vending machines, was growing apace. A half decade ago, global demand outstripped current supply by nearly 70 million ounces; last year the shortfall soared to over 350 million.

So huge a deficit might have defied the best efforts of the first and greatest Secretary of the Treasury. The recent incumbent never had a chance. Mr. Dillon failed to grasp either the true dimensions of the silver scarcity or its implications for the coinage. Hence, from start to finish he pursued a policy of too little and too late. After belatedly halting the silver bargain sale, the Treasury let nearly 2 years elapse, until the price had climbed perilously close to $1.29 an ounce (the point at which holders would be tempted to redeem silver certificates), before pressing Congress for new legislation. The lawmakers responded by slashing the last link between paper money and the metal, a move which, by the Secretary's optimistic reckoning, would free silver enough to last for 15 years. Like other official forecasts, however, this one swiftly went awry. Spurred by the disappearance of silver dollars, the hoarding of newly minted Kennedy halves, and a mounting shortage of quarters and dimes, the drain on U.S. stocks accelerated. Last summer the Department cut its earlier estimate in half; now, with time growing uncomfortably short, it seeks to make the best of Douglas Dillon's sorry legacy.

While there is no easy way out, certain avenues look more promising than others. Some officials propose that the Treasury declare illegal both the export of silver and the melting down of coins. Repugnant in principle and unenforcible in practice, such bans merely would succeed in turning otherwise law-abiding citizens into hoarders and smugglers. By the same token, abandoning silver coinage, a suggestion pushed by users' groups, would be a shocking break with nearly two centuries of tradition and a fresh blow to shaky foreign confidence in U.S. ability to manage its finances. What the Treasury should do, we submit, is acknowledge the rising price of silver and, like any prudent consumer, seek to stretch the available supply. Thereby it would fall in line with other countries, notably Italy and France, which today mint acceptable coins with roughy one-third the U.S. silver content. It also would ease the transition to the higher values which the metal, sooner or later, seems likely to command.

Such a policy, to be sure, hazards running afoul of Gresham's law, which stipulates that bad coin drives out good. The risk is real. However, as Simon Strauss pointed out last week, "if the public is told that the new coins will contain no silver at all, hoarding will occur on an even larger scale. * * * We fear that some difficult days do lie ahead regardless of what the decision is." Even the richest country in the world, we conclude, cannot live off capital forever.

A War on Public Apathy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by the distinguished columnist, Roscoe Drummond, on the President's crime message.

The article appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of March 10, 1965, and follows:

JOHNSON'S CRIME MESSAGE—A WAR ON PUBLIC APATHY

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—President Johnson's message on the said state of law enforcement and law observance has many purposes, but its most important is this:

To create a massive, nationwide, public anticrime wave.

The President's appeal is that, while it is necessary to strengthen the means of enforcement, it is crucial to strengthen the will for law observance.

This is why Mr. Johnson put it as his foremost goal to "arrest and reverse the trend toward lawlessness."

This is why he put the role of the individual citizen as the first ingredient of progress.

"The starting point," he said, "is the individual citizen * * * the people will get observance of law and enforcement of the law if they want it, insist on it, and participate in it."

Obviously, the President seeks better law enforcement at every level of government. But those who are familiar with his thinking know that, above all, he hopes to generate an anticrime crusade by civic groups—chambers of commerce, Rotary, PTA, League of Women Voters, NAACP—in every community of the country.

The objective is individual awareness, individual alertness, and individual participation in a voluntary commitment to do something about it.

The rising rate of crime in the United States is ominous and dismaying. It is getting worse, not better.

The Federal Bureau of Investigation reports that more than 2¼ million serious crimes occurred last year, a 10-percent increase over the previous year.

The increase was 3 percent gerater in suburban areas than in the more heavily populated areas.

Crimes committed by juveniles are rising more rapidly than crimes committed by adults. More than 40 percent of all arrests for serious crimes involve people under 18.

The one statistic which sums it all up was used by President Johnson: Since 1940 the crime rate in the United States has doubled; it has increased five times as fast as the population increase since 1958.

The President does not overlook the need to attack the problem at its roots by combatting poverty and improving education, health, housing and recreation. But he rightly warns that "crime will not wait while we attempt to pull it up by its roots."

The president of the American Bar Association, Lewis F. Powell, Jr., of Richmond, Va., has been making the same point.

"We can't await the milleninium when crime will wither away because its underlying causes are removed," he said recently. "We must act now to protect decent citizens from criminal molestation of their persons and property."

To fail to do so is to invite a breakdown of the first duty of government.

The way crime has been increasing year after year suggests that we are much nearer to such a breakdown than many realize.

It is to avert such a calamity that President Johnson is seeking to strengthen the social instinct for law observance.

Public apathy and public unwillingness to become involved—these are actual deterrents to law enforcedent.

The President is acting to reverse this apathetic tide of public opinion and create in its place a kind of public anticrime wave which will nourish law observance and aid law enforcement.

What the President is asking is that every citizen, every civic leader, every civic group aid in making law observance the most compelling instinct of the Nation.

Remarks by Eugene P. Foley, Administrator of Small Business Administration, at Luncheon Sponsored by Mississippi Agricultural and Industrial Board, in Jackson, Miss., March 30, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the people in Mississippi were privileged to welcome Mr. Eugene P. Foley, Administrator of Small Business Administration last week. He spent several days in our State explaining the functions and scope of his agency.

It is heartening to know that Mr. Foley is familiar with our economy and its needs. As an able Administrator, he pledged cooperation in his agency's role of supplementing the economic progress we are making is Mississippi.

The people of Mississippi were delighted over his visit and we hope to have him with us again soon.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the speech Mr. Foley made in Jackson on March 30. It follows:

REMARKS BY EUGENE P. FOLEY, ADMINISTRATOR OF SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, JACKSON, MISS., MARCH 30, 1965

Time marches on in Washington and Mississippi.

As Shakespeare put it:

"All the world's a stage
And all the men and women merely players.
They have their exits and their entrances."

Here in Mississippi I believe the curtain is going up on a new era of progress. I do not mean to belittle progress made in the past. Progress begets progress. Progress builds progress. The broader the economic base becomes the greater the economic interaction, the greater the spinoff into new areas.

The Gemini project, for example, was executed with the assistance of a Mississippi firm. Its role was relatively small—but it points to the potential of the future, the potential for research and development in your economic development.

The giant Saturn rocket which will propel explorers to the moon is being tested at the 13,000-acre missile testing center in Hancock County in the southern part of the State. And not to far from it is a large $125 million (Standard) oil refinery recently added to Mississippi's rapidly growing economy.

You know the pattern of progress. You are seeing it unfold. You are in the heart of the world of tomorrow, the southern "space crescent," and the significance of this to the future of your economy is tremendous. You have a foothold in the multimillion dollar space program.

You know that since 1960 there has been an investment of $366 million in new industries and that these industries created more than 34,000 jobs.

And you know that expansion of existing industry has created another 15,000 jobs.

You know that last year Mississippi added 65 industries while 55 others expanded, providing more than 8,600 new jobs and representing a capital investment of $72 million.

You know that the 1964 legislature at Governor Johnson's request strengthened the economic development program and provided for concentrated, organized research and development to pay the way for what the Governor described as opportunities for the people of Mississippi.

Your Governor is showing the way.

Your Mississippi Agricultural and Industrial Board, your Mississippi Economic Council, your local chambers of commerce, the Mississippi Manufacturers Association, the Mississippi Bar Association, and many other groups are giving the Governor their enthusiastic and sustained support.

I am standing before you today to say simply that if you want our help we stand ready to help. We will dovetail our programs to your needs.

We are already helping to some extent—but we can do more and we will do more.

Our regular loan program for small businessmen resulted in 619 loans to Mississippi businesses during the past 4 years. They totaled more than $28 million. We were able to help 2,627 Mississippi firms obtain a share of the Government procurement totaling about $62 million.

But there is one of our programs that has not been utilized in Mississippi—perhaps because you have such an effective economic development program of your own.

I refer to our 502 program—our community development plan.

This is a program, as its name indicates, that is designed to develop the economies of individual communities. It is a community program, community planned, community initiated, community executed. We simply provide a loan if the proposal is sound.

It's not a handout.

It's not a something for nothing program.

It's a business proposition. It is a partnership of your community and your Government for the general economic improvement of your community and your State.

Under this program SBA puts up $8 for every $2 put up by a local community development corporation.

The development corporation makes specific proposals and SBA acts on each proposal. The maximum for each specific proposal is $350,000. This can be repaid over a 25-year period. The standard interest rate is 5½ percent. In areas of substantial unemployment this drops to 4 percent.

I am not offering this program as a substitute for your fine State economic development program. I am offering it as a supplemental program to be utilized along with your State program as a booster.

I understand that certain of your industrial bonds are issued against the full faith and credit of a municipality. It may well be that to avoid a heavy governmental indebtedness which would inhibit necessary public projects you will want to consider our community development program. It does not involve any pledge against the full faith and credit of a local government.

I understand also that your industrial development program does not finance commercial properties like shopping centers, and business buildings, transportation facilities like truck terminals, community facilities like hospitals and nursing homes, recreational facilities, and tourist development.

This can be done under our community development program. It offers a broader scope of development, an opportunity for a diversified economy in each community.

It includes the cost of land, of buildings, and of equipment.

It has a great flexibility. I want to emphasize that we do not lay down rigid architectural guidelines. We do not require conformance to any set pattern of development.

We adapt our programs to the needs of communities and regions.

We want communities to capitalize on their diversity, their unique features, their flair for the unusual because in this flexibility and diversity lies much of the strength and resilience of small business.

Our emphasis is on community action. President Johnson's basic policy is that communities provide the leadership for programs affecting their area and that the Federal Government, when necessary, will provide advice and resources.

Communities in 46 States have used our 502 program to broaden and deepen their economies. SBA has made 551 loans under this program totaling $81 million. A total of 28,600 jobs were created. The total value of projects involved was more than $110 million.

Other Southern States are using it to a greater or lesser degree. North Carolina, as a matter of fact, has used it more than any other State.

Lincoln County, N.C., provides an outstanding example. Business and civic leaders and Government officials have joined forces there to form a community development company program that has brought loans totaling $1.5 million to provide jobs for about 500 persons. These loans went to finance new textile plants, a shopping center, and a funeral home.

In Portsmouth, Va., a 1-man barbecue operation was expanded into a 32-man operation with an annual payroll of $200,000. The business now grosses $1.5 million a year. The expansion came with a $153,000 local development company loan.

In Chicago, Ill., there is a unique development. A group of 400 persons have joined in a development corporation to build a small business arts and craft center in an urban renewal area. The clearance project had wiped out the shops of that type clustered in the area. The unique small business center now being built will revitalize this distinctive feature of that community.

We have been working with the group and expect a loan application at the proper time.

The purpose of the Small Business Administration is to strengthen the national economy by helping to build a stronger small business sector. And this community development program is one of our major instruments for getting the job done, for discharging our responsibility to the small business community.

It has two important roles, just as your own economic development and "balancing industry with agriculture" programs have. The first is to help to modernize and expand and diversify existing business and industry; the second is to bring in new industry.

With it you can build motels and hotels and restaurants.

You can build manufacturing plants and buildings to house small business.

You can build transportation terminals and tourist attractions and processing plants.

You can build blast furnaces and steelworks and rolling mills.

You can build plants designed for research and development and tie your fortunes to the stars of the space age.

You can build rest homes and convalescent homes.

You can build warehouses.

You can build meatpacking plants and feed processing facilities.

You can finance lumberyards and firms to sell farm machinery and equipment.

You can finance electrical repair shops and production of aircraft parts.

You can build drugstores and grocery stores, doctors' and dentists' offices, hardware stores and meat markets.

You can build sports and recreation camps and bowling alleys and tourist resorts.

You can build parking facilities.

You can mill wet corn, make creamery butter and process sausage.

You can build facilities for new and used car dealers.

You can build vocational schools, beauty shops and flower shops, even airports and fields.

This gives you an idea of the flexibility and the versatility of this program.

I am not saying that this is your sole salvation in the area of economic development. One of our national political figures had a line to read in a speech which said in effect that a certain program was not a panacea for all problems. He read the line this way: "Now I want you to know that I am not saying that this is a pancreas for all your problems."

And I am not telling you this program is a panacea for all your problems.

I am saying simply that I think it can be of significant value in your economic development program because of the depth and diversity it will give your own programs.

We also have our regular loan program with loans for the smallest to the largest small businessman. We have our procurement assistance program to help small business get its share of Government contracts. We have our management assistance program and our small-business investment company program to assist in management training and in creation of equity capital.

We are also participating in the war on poverty and, under the Economic Opportunity Act, we are working with a number of Mississippi communities that have indicated an interest in helping to build stronger small-business sectors in deprived areas where jobs and opportunities are most desperately needed.

We are working, for example, at Corinth which has a community action program and intensified vocational training already underway.

We are hopeful that a small business development center will be set up here in Jackson as headquarters for this type of loan and management assistance program here.

The liberalized loans under this economic opportunity program range up to $25,000 and extend for terms of up to 15 years.

A community must have a small-business development center before being eligible for this program because it must be a broad-based effort. It requires the support of business and labor and government and universities.

At this center applicants for assistance are interviewed and their business problems analyzed. Those that make sound proposals are referred to the SBA office. If a loan is made the center follows through with guidance and counseling.

We have a national program called Score—the Service Corps of Retired Executives—which we have meshed with this program in some areas. Retired businessmen who have volunteered their services counsel and advise small businessmen with problems. More than 800 of these volunteers are at work on problem cases and individuals granted poverty loans.

The first poverty loan went to a fruitcake bakery in St. Charles, La., to increase its output and to add praline production and pecan sales to its activities. This enterprise began as an effort by a consumers cooperative with a membership of 800 rural families.

These loans to deprived areas not only build opportunities and create jobs. They have a healthy effect in other dimensions. They build community leadership and a sense of civic responsibility. Businessmen want a community that is healthy in all dimensions. Their interests and the best interests of the community are one and the same. And so they work for their community. They work to improve it and create a better environment.

And so the effect of poverty loans is sociological as well as economic. We are, as I said, working with a number of Mississippi communities on the application of this program in their areas. We feel that this program, coupled with community development, can add a new dimension to your great record of progress.

This is a way to give the free enterprise system an opportunity to create opportunities and expand the economy in a free, competitive market.

These programs provide keys to opportunities for thousands of Americans.

They give them their opportunity to achieve fulfillment in our democratic society through our economic system—not through handouts.

These loans fill a gap in private financing in areas that commercial institutions are reluctant to enter. We prefer that private financing make these loans and we even provide guarantees up to 90 percent to banks that will make them. It is only as a last resort that SBA steps in with a direct loan.

And so we feel that with our programs we are helping in some small way to build a better America of tomorrow.

We believe that we can be of assistance to you in building the Mississippi of tomorrow.

You are laying a firm foundation for growth.

You are expanding your economic development effort.

You are intensifying business and industrial research.

You are seeking out new industry—and you are searching for new world markets to channel trade out through your three ocean ports.

You are looking ahead into the unique opportunities offered by space exploration.

You are looking forward.

And when you look ahead you move ahead.

We at SBA are ready to work with you in any way that will help you.

A golden era of economic development is within your capability and capacity.

We wish you the very best in your efforts to reach this new dimension of progress.

Thank you.

Resolution by State of Hawaii Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the people of our fair State of Hawaii have deemed it a great honor to have this august body take time to commemorate the anniversary of Hawaiian statehood, as it did on March 18, last.

As an expression of appreciation the Hawaii State Legislature, in the name of the people of the 50th State, adopted a concurrent resolution thanking the Congress for remembering Hawaii statehood day.

Under unanimous consent I include the resolution in the RECORD:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION BY HAWAII LEGISLATURE

Whereas the Congress of the United States on March 18, 1965, generously gave of its invaluable time to commemorate the sixth anniversary of Hawaii's admission to the Union; and

Whereas Congressman CARL ALBERT led the tribute to Hawaii and magnanimously announced that the United States is a better place by virtue of Hawaii's admission to the Union; and

Whereas Congressman LEO W. O'BRIEN, extraordinary leader of the battle for the passage of the Hawaii statehood bill, truly praised the Congressmen of Hawaii, SPARK M. MATSUNAGA and PATSY T. MINK; and

Whereas Congresswoman PATSY T. MINK was bestowed the signal honor of presiding as acting Speaker on this memorable occasion; and

Whereas Congressman SPARK M. MATSUNAGA eloquently declared that the Hawaii Statehood Act was "the greatest civil rights legislation of the 1950's": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the Third Legislature of the State of Hawaii, general session of 1965, the senate concurring, that it does hereby extend its heartfelt thanks to the Congress of the United States for commemorating the sixth anniversary of Hawaii's admission to the Union; and be it further

Resolved, That duly authenticated copies of this concurrent resolution be transmitted to Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, Congressman LEO W. O'BRIEN, Congressman CARL ALBERT, Congressman SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, and Congresswoman PATSY T. MINK.

An Appeal to Our Elected Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, today I had a personal visit from Professor Bowers, of Bradley University, representing a number of professors at Bradley who conceived a statement of their views with respect to the situation in South Vietnam. I think it would be fair to point out that this statement was completed before the professors had any knowledge of the President's speech on this subject last night. Nevertheless, while I certainly do not agree or subscribe to the views expressed by these professors, but feel that they have the right to be heard and I am therefore at their request asking unanimous consent that the statement be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The statement follows:

AN APPEAL TO OUR ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES

We, the undersigned, members of the Bradley University faculty feel that the American policy of escalating the war in Vietnam, since February 7, 1965, is fraught with enormous dangers for the future of mankind.

A major war in Asia will not contribute to the solution of the cold war conflicts and problems between the Communist bloc and the Western Powers. With approximately one-third of the human race now living under Communist control, we cannot, we dare not, undertake to shoot them all off the planet. The problem is one of finding some way of living on the same planet with the Communist bloc, as we have begun to do with the Russians after some 40 years of effort. We believe the problem is not primarily a military one. After more than 10 years of military efforts in Vietnam it seems clear to us that a military solution has failed. Our bombing of military installations has not brought the Vietcong to reduce their activities in the south, nor has it brought Hanoi closer to negotiating a settlement. Rather, escalation of the war encourages greater unity and determination within the Communist camp. It has encouraged the

pro-China faction in Hanoi, and discredited the group in Moscow interested in peaceable coexistence and reducing tensions.

We urge our Government to take immediate steps to negotiate a cease-fire and to work for a political settlement in Vietnam before all of Asia is inflamed in a massive war.

We urge our Government to support the Mekong River valley project or the economic aid program for North and South Vietnam, which was recently suggested by President Johnson. We believe realistic bargaining can better proceed upon the basis of a constructive program, rather than from the multiplication of atrocities on both sides. In the nuclear age military victory is a concept use of bigger and bigger weapons leading toward the ultimate use of nuclear bombs a step toward the suicide of all mankind.

H. W. Bach (political science), James C. Ballowe (English), Steven Blume (English), William L. Bowers (history), Lester H. Brune (history), Margaret L. Carter (English), Edgar L. Chapman (English), Joy Dedman (English), Romeo Garrett (sociology), Arlen J. Hansen (English), John H. Harvey (foreign languages), Ernest Ising (physics), Myrtle Kent (English), B. P. Lathi (engineering), Brendan Liddell (philosophy), Robin Linstromberg (economics), James Morrison (sociology), Richard Oehling (history), Carleton Smith (sociology), Reed Smith (political science), Philip Weinberg (engineering).

A Forgotten Texas Hero: Col. Leonard Williams, 1800–1856

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Mr. George W. Winningham, of Mexia, Tex., has written an article concerning Col. Leonard Williams, in which he outlines the great contribution Colonel Williams made to the State of Texas during the period of its revolution and while it was a Republic. Colonel Williams is buried in Hill County near Mount Calm, Tex., and has relatives residing in that county. The article by Mr. Winningham follows:

A FORGOTTEN HERO—COL. LEONARD WILLIAMS, 1800–1856

(By George W. Winningham)

Historian Ray Walter has said that Col. Leonard Williams is a forgotten pioneer Texas hero. Texas historians have neglected to give the prominent place to him which his services during our Texas revolution, Republic of Texas, and the early years of statehood merited. His grave was neglected 102 years before a marker was erected in 1958. He is buried in the Pitts Cemetery 2 miles inside Limestone County, south of the Hill County town of Mount Calm.

From 1819 or 1820 when the Williams brothers, Leonard and William, appeared in Texas, in the Nacogdoches area, with their half-breed Cherokee wives, Leonard was prominently identified with the ebb and flow of the political events which resulted in Texas independence and annexation to the United States by treaty.

Soon after their arrival in Spanish Texas, the Williams brothers were captured by Comanche Indians and were held in captivity for 2 years. They were forced to do slave labor for the Comanches. They were frequently beaten by the squaws. In spite of long hours of grueling labor and cruel beatings at the hands of the squaws, Leonard mastered the Comanche dialect and talked their way to freedom. The 2 years in captivity was a sort of schooling which prepared the colonel for the role he was to play in the history of Texas under the leadership of Sam Houston.

After his return from captivity in 1822, Colonel Williams engaged in trading with Indian tribes, but history loses sight of him until 1835. He fought with Ben Milam at Bexar when General Cos, General Santa Anna's brother-in-law, was forced to surrender. In this battle, Williams lost an eye from gunshot wound.

Beyond a doubt his most important service to Texas was rendered during the Texas revolution. The Cherokees under Chief Bowls were restless and to counteract influence of Mexican agents, Sam Houston sent Colonel Williams as his agent to form a peace treaty with Chief Bowls and his restless Cherokee warriors. His Cherokee wife gave him a standing with the Indians as a blood brother and he was successful in preventing the Cherokees from entering the war on the side of the Mexicans or staging independent Indian raids on white settlements. By keeping the Cherokees peaceful, he contributed much to the success of the Texas revolution. It would have been impossible for Houston to have fought an Indian war and with the poor equipment and poorly trained army to have won a victory over Santa Anna.

The colonel could speak seven or eight Indian dialects and this enabled him, as Houston's Indian commissioner, to make a number of peace treaties with various Indian tribes. It is said the Indians never broke a treaty they made with Williams. Knowing their language and their wild ways, they opened their villages to him far and near on trading expeditions and missions of mercy to ransom white captives. He was on a trading expedition when he saw and tried to ransom Cynthia Ann Parker. There is no record of the number of white captives he ransomed from Indian captivity, but the number is impressive. His most important ransom case was the two children who were captured inside the city limits of Austin, Tex. He and an Indian companion remained on the trail of the Comanche raiding party 2 years before they located the children, ransomed and returned them to their relatives.

The colonel was loyal to his Indian friends. On one occasion he rode a long distance to apprehend and hang several white outlaws who had been robbing and murdering a friendly tribe of Indians.

In 1842, Houston appointed four commissioners, Colonel Williams among the number, to deal or "treat" with Indians on the frontier. The colonel played an important role in the council at Tehuacana Creek when a peace treaty was signed with a number of Indian tribes which ended a war against the whites and again Robertson County and adjacent area was opened to settlement.

The colonel was Indian agent at Torrey's Trading Post below Waco when Texas was annexed to the United States by treaty. He turned the agency over to Federal authorities.

The colonel finally retired to the land set aside for his services to Texas, and resided on it near the present town of Mount Calm until his death in 1856. He died of an old scalp wound inflicted by an Indian warrior. He is buried in Pitts Cemetery in Limestone County about 2 miles from Mount Calm where a number of his relatives still live.

The many heroic deeds of this man in the interest of Texas will never be known. His deeds were considered by Sam Houston as well worth preserving as a part of our history. When Williams was on his deathbed, Sam Houston sent two men to his home near Mount Calm to write the history of his life, but the colonel was too ill to be of any help. His life is glorified with service to Texas but most of the history of his life died with him. Suffice it to say that he performed heroic services for Texas which placed him in a class with his friends Sam Houston, Ben Milam, and other great heroes of Texas. The difference lies in the fact that history was not as kind in preserving his deeds of valor as it has been in preserving the deeds of other great Texans. He is one of the forgotten heroes of Texas history.

The New Spirit of Social Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, one of the great developments of our times is the new spirit of social action centered in our religious institutions. Exemplifying this spirit were three sermons delivered this past weekend in Washington, as reported in the Washington Post of April 5, 1965.

The article follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 5, 1965]

CALLING RIGHTS DRIVE "RED" SEEN AS TRICK

The Reverend James P. Archibald said yesterday that charges of Communist control over the civil rights movement represent "an old trick of those who have opposed social change."

In a sermon at St. Paul Methodist Church in Chevy Chase, Mr. Archibald said the leaders of the civil rights drive are persons of "high principles and sound moral integrity.

"Whenever there is an attempt to break a social pattern, there are beatnik groups and offcolor societies that move in to join the festivities," he said. "But let's not be deceived * * * this is an old trick * * * of putting a bad but familiar label on your opponent."

CUTS IN WELFARE CRITICIZED

The Reverend David G. Colwell of First Congregational United Church of Christ said yesterday that holding down the costs of welfare and retraining programs here "is not good economics, and is surely not good Christian service."

Mr. Colwell criticized "certain Members of the Senate" for not providing aid to dependent children of unemployed parents in the District although all 50 States receive this Federal aid.

"The result is that an unemployed father is faced with a cruel dilemma," Mr. Colwell said in his church newsletter. "Either he permits his children to go hungry * * * or he must leave home."

INDIAN THEOLOGIAN CALLS FOR UNITY

An Indian theologian sounded a call for Christian unity yesterday in a guest sermon at the Falls Church Episcopal Church.

The Reverend Isaiah Jesudason, 1 of 13 ecumenical fellows from around the world visiting this area as guests of the Council of Churches of Greater Washington, said there is now the "promise of a Christian faith which will be truly universal."

Mr. Jesudason, a member of the interdenominational church of South India and lecturerer at a Kerala seminary, said Christians of all races and cultures must join together in seeking world peace.

The Development of Our Nation's Water Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM STANTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 22, 1965

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, when Congress is in session, one of the most difficult tasks of a Member of Congress is keeping abreast of fast-moving events in and around Capitol Hill. Fortunately, to assist us we have available a number of worthwhile sources of information on matters involving Congress.

One of the most valuable and unique, in that it is the only news program devoted exclusively to congressional matters, is Joseph McCaffrey's report on "Today in Congress," broadcast at 6:50 p.m., Monday through Friday, over radio station WMAL here in Washington.

I always find Mr. McCaffrey's reports interesting and informative. Last week, there were several messages included in this program which I feel are of unusual and widespread interest and, therefore, worthy of the attention of all my colleagues. I am well aware that Mr. McCaffrey's program is "must" listening for Members of Congress. However, for those who may not have heard the messages broadcast last week which I refer to above, I place them in the RECORD at this point:

TODAY IN CONGRESS
(Broadcast on Mar. 29, 1965, WMAL radio, Washington, D.C.)

The people of America are restless. Past failures cry out for corrective solutions. As a nation, halting and isolated steps have been taken to develop our water resources. Only recently have the people in the Washington area become aware of the need to develop all of the water resources of the Potomac River Basin. River bank beautification, flood control in the upper river, navigation in the lower river, small boat harbors for recreation, improvements in river water quality to permit swimming and fishing are only some of the public benefits to be derived from a fully developed and improved Potomac River.

The Congressmen and Senators from the Potomac River area are anxious to improve their river. They realize that other rivers throughout the Nation also need to be improved. That is why they join with other Congressmen and Senators in support of the Corps of Army Engineers and the Department of Interior to build engineeringly sound and economically justified water resource projects throughout the Nation. Such a project is the Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal—a project destined to be one of the great interconnecting waterways hauling 81 million tons of traffic annually.

TODAY IN CONGRESS
(Broadcast on Mar. 30, 1965, WMAL radio, Washington, D.C.)

In the time period since World War II America appears to have been more concerned with the welfare of the world than with its own welfare. We have been quick to help improve the economy of other nations but slow to solve our own domestic problems.

The current Congress is aware of the need to increase the number of jobs available in our Nation to provide employment for a population increasing by 8,000 people each day. A bill to improve the depressed economy of Appalachia has been passed. Bills to train our disadvantaged youth and thus to provide them with a salable skill have been passed. The Congress has done a great deal to improve the human factor in our economy but it must also be aware of the need to improve the physical resources of the Nation. One such need is to interconnect the Ohio and Mississippi River navigation system with the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Seaway navigation system. Such an interconnection will benefit both systems and spread the benefits of low-cost water transportation throughout the Nation. By reducing the cost of transportation, jobs for the people are increased in number because 20 percent of the sale price of any product you buy is made up of transportation charges. Reduce these charges and more products can be sold and more people can be employed.

TODAY IN CONGRESS
(Broadcast on Mar. 31, 1965, WMAL radio, Washington, D.C.)

Half the fun of a vacation lies in the planning. Most people in the Washington area think in terms of salt water vacations. However, the State of Ohio—lying 6 hours by car to the west of Washington—is planning a vast improvement in its vacation facilities. Ohio is setting aside $60 million in State funds for use in developing camping sites, cabins, boat ramps, swimming areas, restoring historical sites so important in the development of the great western reserve territory, improving access to fishing streams, hatching fish and putting them in Ohio waters to improve fishing, buying land, and stocking it with game for public hunting and doing all things necessary to make visitors welcome to "the wonderful world of Ohio."

The Congress is also being asked to help Ohio become a more attractive vacation area for all of the people of the Nation to enjoy. A navigable waterway will be built between Lake Erie and the Ohio River. When it is completed families with boats can spend their vacations on waterway trips traveling anywhere on the Great Lakes—Saint Lawrence Seaway and on the Ohio-Mississippi River waterway systems. Our fresh water inland waterway systems will be interconnected for all to use and enjoy. When the Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal is built the Nation will have more than 28,000 miles of interconnected waterways. It is a low-cost transportation system bring pleasure to the people and economic strength to the Nation.

National Farmers Union President James G. Patton Urges Creation of an American Ombudsman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, I have proposed the establishment of an administrative counsel of the Congress, modeled after the Scandinavian ombudsman. This American ombudsman would help Congressmen help their constituents in the constituents' problems with the Federal bureaucracy, without interfering with traditional congressional-constituent relationships.

I am pleased that James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, has endorsed this proposal and urged the establishment of an American ombudsman in a recent article.

The article follows:

WE NEED AN AMERICAN OMBUDSMAN?
(By James G. Patton)

Some people—and I'm one—think we now have so many kinds of public officials, that we need at least one more.

We need someone to watch the watchers for us.

Governments seem increasingly unwilling to trust the common folk who support them, as they become increasingly more complex.

Reporters are now being discouraged in Vietnam, insofar as those in charge can accomplish it. The military always try to treat a war as their own private affair. But the same tendency is, regrettably, spreading through civilian government also.

Years ago the U.S. Supreme Court decreed division of offshore oil and other minerals as between the seaboard States and the Federal Government; that is, the rest of us.

Then the whole subject became thickly veiled in bureaucratic secrecy, and we do not yet even know whether that division has been accomplished, though billions of dollars of public money ride on the results.

This sort of thing is increasing both in our vast Federal bureaucracy and in our States, some of which are as complex as are many sovereign nations.

Further, bureaucrats seem depending more and more on the mindless machinations of computers—Government by cybernetics—which ought never to rule over human beings.

And, public officials seem increasingly reluctant to be bothered by or on behalf of the people to whom they are legally responsible.

The Swedes, whose Government and economy furnish the world, in many respects, a model of efficiency and peace, sensed this a long time ago. So they created a public office specifically to deal with it, that of ombudsman, which roughly means "watcher."

His office gets all complaints about governmental acts, and questions about public matters generally. If he doesn't know the answer or how to remedy the complaint, the law empowers him to find out, and to take action or to recommend it.

Representative HENRY REUSS, of Wisconsin, truly says that the great dilemma of democratic government is how to give officials enough power to run things "and at the same time protect civil liberties by giving citizens a practical means of correcting administrative errors and abuses."

He adds: "If there are no avenues for correcting maladministration, programs • • • such as social security, public housing, and veterans benefits, are full of possibilities for individual injustice."

Representative REUSS notes that our 535 Members of Congress act as unofficial ombudsmen. But this job plagues them so that they have too little time to think or to act about the great tasks of legislation and the great problems of administration. In some offices, nine-tenths of staff time and effort is taken up with the job of ombudsman alone.

He also notes that Congress long ago provided an Office of Legislative Counsel to help Members draft laws, and a reference office to help them with research.

Now, he says, Congress needs an Office of Legislative Counsel—of an ombudsman—to which questions and complaints would automatically flow, when they concern the vast and murky workings of administrative offices.

The Swedish office was created away back in 1809. Finland, Denmark, New Zealand, and Norway followed suit, and other nations are considering it.

Everyone who has ever been frustrated by a personal problem complicated by bureaucratic government, will be interested.

But perhaps we need an ombudsman to watch legislative bodies, too. What might such a peoples' lobbyist tell us about some bills regularly introduced and passed in our Congress, and our 50 State legislatures?

National Museum Act of 1965

SPEECH
OF
HON. FRANK T. BOW
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today legislation to enlarge the present activities of the Smithsonian Institution in national and international research, training, and publication in the museum field. The bill is known as the National Museum Act of 1965.

The recent growth in the number of museums, their collections, and activities, has far outstripped the ability of the museum profession to provide trained personnel for the study, planning, coordination, and staffing of the Nation's museums. The achievements of a few outstanding museums in investigating new techniques for display, cataloging, and conservation, new relationships between historic, scientific, and artistic objects, and new concepts of communication, reveal how much remains to be done to make effective the universal opportunities for education and cultural progress which these institutions could offer to the public.

The primary responsibility for the support of the individual museum should remain with the community which it serves. However, needs for a national and international program of cooperative research and training to assist museums large and small to make their maximum contribution require national recognition and leadership.

Much is already being done. The U.S. Office of Education has taken a constructive interest in the educational activities of museums, particularly with regard to the functions of the museum as a support facility for university and public school education. The National Science Foundation is considering the role of museums in furthering scientific research and raising the level of public scientific awareness. The Department of State has made a number of leader grants to foreign museum professionals to stimulate the international exchange of ideas and experience in the museum field. The Smithsonian Institution, in one of its primary roles as the National Museum, has long recognized its responsibilities to the national museum profession. It has recently undertaken to introduce a limited number of museology interns in its museums and has engaged in a joint program with the American Association of Museums in the complementary areas of museum training, education, publications, and a continuing survey of museum problems and resources.

It is proposed that the present activities of the Smithsonian Institution in museum research, training, and technology be recognized and strengthened by the passage of a National Museum Act which would establish within the National Museum a coordinated program of national and international research, training, and publication in the museum field. The program would be supervised by the Director of the National Museum under the direction of the Board of Regents and Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution.

Voting Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the time is long past to insure the voting rights of all Americans, no matter what their race, color, or religion. President Johnson should have the full support of this House for his plea that there be no delay, no hesitation, no compromise with our purpose on this issue. I am proud to say that the Young Men's Christian Association of Pittsburgh has recently adopted a statement of support for the President's stand. That statement follows:

STATEMENT OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE YOUNG MEN'S CHRISTIAN ASSOCIATION OF PITTSBURGH, MARCH 18, 1965

The Young Men's Christian Association of Pittsburgh has as one of its stated purposes the following:

"To unite persons in a worldwide fellowship by a common loyalty to Jesus Christ for the purpose of developing Christian personality and building a Christian society."

Having this objective, we are concerned with events and conditions both in our local community and elsewhere which tend to divide instead of unite, and which tend to tear down instead of build up a Christian society. So we are deeply concerned with the events in Alabama in recent days, where strife and bloodshed have marked the struggle of the Negro for equal rights under law.

We share the anguish of the various elements in conflict in Alabama in this struggle, realizing that equality has not yet been achieved in our own State, and that we ourselves are not blameless. But we must record our sympathy with all those who by nonviolent means are seeking the right to vote, and our condemnation of the excessive use of force to quell demonstrations to aid in this endeavor.

We commend the President of the United States for his statement to the Congress of March 15, 1965, in connection with this crisis in our national life, and we pledge continuing endeavor to achieve equality for all persons regardless of race as an essential ingredient in our association's purpose as above stated.

Voting Discrimination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excellent editorial from the April 4, 1965, Washington Sunday Star. I commend it to the membership.

The editorial follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, Apr. 4, 1965]

VOTING DISCRIMINATION

Our basic objections to the administration's voting rights bill have already been stated. We think there is need for a reasonable literacy test, provided there is no discrimination in its application to would-be voters. The administration's bill, in one aspect, outlaws any and all literacy tests, and is designed to permit total illiterates to vote. The educational voting level is low enough now without enacting a Federal law to push it down even further.

The second important aspect of this bill imposes its harsh and punitive provisions on any State which has a literacy test, and in which fewer than 50 percent of the residents over 21 are registered or actually voted in the 1964 election.

This bill contains other provisions which are reminiscent of the reconstruction era following the Civil War. But the two which we have mentioned, taken together, offend one's sense of fairness. If enacted, in its present form, this bill would result in a legislative discrimination as bad or worse than the evil the bill is supposed to remedy.

Let's take the case of Virginia, which is brought under this bill because it requires a literacy test and, though more than 50 percent of its eligibles are registered, fewer than 50 percent voted in 1964.

What is Virginia's literacy test? As spelled out by Senator HARRY BYRD in his recent statement, any person desiring to register must be able, without assistance, to give in writing the following information: His name. The date and place of his birth. His current residence. His occupation. And, if he has voted before, the county and precinct in which he voted. That is all.

Is this a test which opens the door to such obviously discriminatory requirements as being able to interpret to the satisfaction of some ignorant registrar sections of a State constitution? Is it a test which asks too much of a person who wants to vote on the important and complicated issues which face us today? We do not think so. Furthermore, the administration concedes that this is not an unreasonable literacy test, and that there is no evidence that it has been used in Virginia to discriminate against Negroes.

If this is so, why does the bill link a reasonable and nondiscriminatory literacy test to an arbitrary formula with respect to voting or registration percentages?

One explanation is that the statistics on registration are unreliable. But this is said to be true in West Virginia, which is not affected by the bill because it has no literacy test. What nonsense.

In addition to Virginia, the States covered by the bill are Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, and Alaska. We are puzzled by the inclusion of Alaska, in which Negroes certainly are not discriminated against. There are few if any there. As to the others,

we haven't enough information to pass judgment.

But it is our firm belief that this is a discriminatory bill. If its purpose is to protect Negro voting rights, it discriminates in favor of New York, which requires a rather strict literacy test but which has met the voting percentage standards. It also discriminates in the case of Texas, which did not meet the percentage-of-voting standard in 1964, but which does require a literacy test, although it is verbal in character and is called by some other name.

There have been reports that the administration's bill will be changed or modified in some unrevealed aspects. We hope this is true. We also hope that the bill, if modified, will be made applicable to Virginia (in which we have a special interest) on the basis of facts rather than fiction. And certainly not on the basis of some arbitrary formula dreamed up by someone who hasn't the faintest idea what the facts are. Or, if he knows, doesn't care.

The Urban Population of the United States Cannot Expect To Have a Great Society Borne on the Bowed Backs of American Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. CULVER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has this week received the administration's Food and Agriculture Act of 1965. As we begin our study of this vital legislation, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to a fine editorial analysis of the farm situation which was published in the Washington Post earlier this week.

In addition to its well-reasoned approach, I feel this editorial is of particular significance because it reflects the views of a large metropolitan newspaper which has for many years ably presented the problems of urban areas to its readers. An equally important service has now been performed in educating its urban readers to the problems facing rural America and in effectively emphasizing the overwhelming interdependency of these two segments of our society.

As Americans we have not only an indirect but a direct stake in the entire social and economic condition of our Nation. The truth is that there can be no lasting prosperity in the city without prosperity on the farm. We must therefore seek a broader realization that a sound and successful farm program serves not merely the interest of region or group, but the national interest.

In this spirit I wish to enter into the RECORD at this point the following editorial appearing in the Washington Post on April 7, 1965:

JOHNSON ON AGRICULTURE

The President's letter to Congress on farm legislation admirably states the objectives of national agricultural policy and appropriately acknowledges the obligation of the American people to pay the costs of producing their food.

No one can quarrel with the President's statement of purposes when he puts our goal at an abundance of food and fiber at stable prices, a workable balance between supply and demand at lower costs to Government, an opportunity for the efficient farmer to earn parity of income from farming operations, equal opportunity for rural people and effective use of farm resources abroad.

The city folk of the Nation needed to be reminded that they are spending a smaller part of the family income than ever before for a better diet than they ever have had before. And they needed to be told that farmers are getting 5 percent less for their products than they got 15 years ago and that many of them are earning less than the statutory minimum wage. The urban population of the United States cannot expect to have a Great Society borne on the bowed backs of American farmers. The predicament of agriculture is a reproach to a nation in which every other economic group is enjoying the greatest prosperity in history.

The changes in the farm program set forth in the President's letter are very complicated and difficult to analyze. In principle, there is a great deal to be said for the idea of deriving a larger percentage of the farmers' income from the marketplace and a smaller percentage of it from Government payments. There was a time when the two-price system involved, with its discrepancy in the domestic and export price levels, would have been objected to as an export subsidy. But there has been so much interference with the natural world price levels of farm exports already that the situation is not profoundly altered by the resort to the certificate plan proposed.

The wheat plan vests the Secretary of Agriculture with great discretion in the allocation of certificates among growers. The distribution on the basis of the respective shares of producers in the wheat market was not ideal but it limited the Government to some standard. Distribution on the basis of what is fair and equitable leaves almost unlimited discretion to the Secretary in fixing the shares of the individual farmer. No doubt it is desirable to have some standard other than that heretofore provided, but the new proposals involve a very sweeping delegation of authority.

The President's proposals make plain the enormous and complicated problems of dealing with agricultural surpluses. Difficult and complicated as they are, it is certain that they are not anywhere near as difficult as the problem of agricultural deficits. President Johnson's suggestions of this week make much more hopeful reading than the recommendations which Premier Brezhnev made last week for solving the agricultural shortages in the Soviet Union.

New York Journal-American's Subway Protection Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. MURPHY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the fact that the New York American, one of the outstanding evening newspapers in the United States, has been in the forefront of the effort to curb the horrendous crime running rampant through the New York City subway system.

The Journal American has suggested a program for action which would be aimed at providing safety for the millions of New York subway riders. This program includes the use of highly trained and skilled police dogs in the subway system as a major deterrent to the armed thug, the rapist, the mugger, and the young tough.

Our experience here in Washington and particularly on the Hill with these marvelous police dogs is evidence of the high regard in which they are held in many areas of the country.

Urban areas of Philadelphia as well have had great success in the use of these police dogs.

One of the highlights in the recent Police Show in Madison Square Garden was the effectiveness with which these dogs can be trained to attack criminals and thugs and subdue them at the command of the master.

The Journal-American is to be praised for its leadership in this field. Not only has it reported the news of crime and its devastating aftermath, but it has led the campaign to do something about this crime. With these dogs in our parks and subways New York will not be permitted to become "6 o'clock town" with people afraid to venture out at night.

Disfigured African Boy Finds Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, although Project Hope primarily is interested in educating doctors and nurses of developing nations in modern medical techniques, Hope, in the process, performs miraculous surgeries and treatments.

One such example is described in a recent article in the Miami, Fla., Herald. The news story tells the tale of a young Guinean whose face was maimed and distorted to such an extent that he could not close his eyes.

Mr. Speaker, following plastic surgery aboard the white hospital ship SS *Hope*, the African youth—Mommadu Dialo—was able to shut his eyes. The scars removed in the operation removed his ugliness and permitted him to live a normal life.

Through Hope's teaching-training program Guinean doctors obtain the skill to perform similar operations and treatments. Thus, Hope helps others help themselves.

The entire story is told in the following Miami Herald article:

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Feb. 18, 1965]

DISFIGURED AFRICAN BOY FINDS HOPE

(By Jean Wardlow)

Every day for 2 months the African boy came and waited.

He sat quietly on the U.S. medical mercy ship *Hope*, there in Conakry, Guinea.

His head was covered with a towel. He'd let no one see his face—a face full of scars

and ugliness; eyes that had never closed in 20 years because of disfiguration.

For 2 months Mommadu Dialo came and sat * * * and waited for the plastic surgeon—a Miamian—he was told would be there soon.

It had happened a long time ago—when he was 3 days old.

The night breeze which waved tall grasses of his village was cool. The lumbering and dancer-footed animals with high, curling horns already had sought their shelters. Only a hyena's cry protested the darkness.

The fire of the village burned bright.

Soon Mommadu's cry would join the hyena's. His mother would drop him into the fire. By the time they got him out, Mommadu's face was twisted wreckage.

Mommadu was never a part of his people after that. He was something apart—ugly, laughable, pitiful. It depended upon who looked at him.

That's why Mommadu waited every day for 2 months for Dr. Thomas Baker, who recently completed his fourth volunteer stint with the SS *Hope*, a floating hospital which brings not only medical help, but trains local doctors, nurses, and technicians in countries that need them.

"Mommadu's was the most dramatic case I've ever seen on these trips," Dr. Baker said. "The before and after pictures are amazing. But not only his appearance changed. It made a difference in his whole personality."

Skin grafts gave Mommadu eyelids. Further surgery changed the ugliness. He had been blind in one eye and Mommadu is due for a cornea transplant soon.

But it was only one case of the many hundreds which come aboard the *Hope* every week, the doctor said.

The ship, a former Navy vessel, is staffed by volunteer doctors and nurses. The doctors even pay their own transportation to and from the *Hope* for short stints.

Its financed by contributions to the People-to-People Health Foundation and industry's donations of drugs and equipment, and has been winning friends for America by treating the world's sick.

The *Hope* ("health opportunity for people everywhere") goes only to countries it's invited (60 are awaiting it) and has treated for 10-month stints since 1960 in Indonesia and South Vietnam; Peru; Ecuador, and, now, in Africa.

Dr. Baker, who lives at 5200 SW. 59th Avenue, and his associate, Dr. Howard Gordon, whose home is at 4408 Toledo, have split volunteer shifts of 6 weeks each to serve aboard the ship.

Two days after Dr. Baker returned home, Dr. Gordon was on his way. Their enthusiam for the project has spilled over to other associates in the Florida and Dade County Medical associations who also have volunteered for the *Hope*, and to local clubs and organizations where they give slide- and movies-assisted talks on the hospital ship.

A local south Florida Hope Committee, which will help raise funds and needed articles for the ship in this area—similar to those in other cities—is being formed. Mrs. Gordon is temporary chairman.

There are less than 100 doctors in the entire country of Guinea, with less than 4 million people, Dr. Baker said. There is only one dentist and no obstetricians. Babies are delivered by midwives "who have a high social standing in the community," he said.

There are two hospitals, one of them built by the Russians 5 years ago. The other was built by the French.

"It's a country just achieving independence," Dr. Baker said, "and they're afraid of everybody. The Russians, the Red Chinese and the Americans are all vying politically, economically and medically to influence this potentially wealthy country.

"When we first went in, doors were closed everywhere. This is gradually thawing. Now the people are accepting us. They know what we're trying to do.

"And the Reds are beginning to see—and be afraid of—how much the people think of what we're doing," he added.

Peace Corps members acted as translators for the many dialects and several languages used in the country, Dr. Baker said. And the *Hope's* medical staff took two things for granted: malaria, "everyone has had it" and superstition.

"You accept both facts and went on with your work," the doctor said.

"All the women wear strings tied about their waists, some knotted, some with beads. They believe they must wear these for fertility.

"And witch doctors still practice."

"We had no trouble with them," Dr. Baker said. "They sent us their tough cases."

Costs of Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, today, I want to call the House's attention to a fine letter from a constituent, Mrs. Robert C. Hunt, of Chattanooga, Tenn., who explains the sacrifices which she and her husband make to give their children the advantages of an advanced education. Mrs. Hunt cities the pressing need among low- and middle-income families for tax relief in order to meet their obligations to their children. In view of the fact that productive individuals such as the Hunts pay taxes to support educational opportunities for all children, I believe they should receive every possible encouragement to also seek greater opportunity for their own.

There is a need for positive action by Congress in the field of assistance to individuals seeking higher education. In the near future, I shall introduce legislation to provide realistic tax credits for those parents incurring the expense of sending sons and daughters through college.

Under unanimous consent, I include Mrs. Robert Hunt's letter of March 16, 1965, addressed to Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Stanley S. Surrey, in the Appendix of the RECORD:

LOOKOUT MOUNTAIN, TENN.,
March 16, 1965.

Assistant Secretary STANLEY S. SURREY,
U.S. Treasury Department,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: In the Chattanooga, Tenn., Times, on Monday, March 8, you are quoted as saying "that proposals to grant tax credits for college tuition payments would give benefits to those who have no real need for help." They go on further to say that you are "the ranking Government expert on taxes and his statements often reflect the pattern of administrative thinking in that field."

I would like to know just how many children you have and if you have had the burden of sending them to college as well as keeping the rest of the family going and paying the taxes we have to pay. It is possible that there might be a few who would receive benefit "that have no real need for it," but from my information, even that is not likely, for the wealthy set up trust funds for their children to offset this. It is a very wise thing for them to do and it is too bad the rest of us are unable to do it. There is by far and away many, many others of us, we middle-class group, who want to send our children to college and will work our heads off to that end, rather than to have to borrow money to do it or beg from the Government.

Yes, I know there are many scholarships offered but those are for only those young people with exceptionally high grades. We happen to have three children who have normal intelligence, have to work very hard for their grades and would not qualify for a scholarship. My husband is an outstanding attorney in Chattanooga but does have great integrity and will not overcharge any of his clients. So—when the time came for our oldest child to go to college, I went to work in order to supplement the income to make it possible. Then, 2 years later, our second child was in college. I think you can figure out what a terrific strain that would be on any middle-income family. This same one is now at Wheaton College working toward a masters in Christian education—she worked for a while in order to supplement and had to pay nearly $250 income tax out of the little amount she made. We now have a third coming along whom we very much want to send to college. What is the answer do you think? Should we all look to the Federal Government to decide who should go and to send our children to the college they deem to be the right one?

Wouldn't it be better for the many families in our category to get some relief on income tax for doing the job ourselves? Once we educate our children are they not in a position to make more income and in turn pay more income tax to the Government? Is the Federal Government trying to take every bit of initiative away from the people? I wonder. How could granting tax credits to those who would rather do it themselves "actually slow up progress in education" as you say? It would give families a chance to send their children to college without Government assistance and a drain on the Treasury.

I hope this does not sound bitter. But I am writing in disgust for after sending two to college and one to go, my husband and I have not been able to put away or save anything toward our old age, which we should have been able to do. Oh, yes. We have social security, but when that time comes we will then be in the President's own terms the "Poverty group" and in the meantime paying taxes to send other children to college when we received no relief on sending our own. Is that fair form to you, sir?

I would like very much to hear from you in answer to this.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ROBERT C. HUNT.

The President Opens the Door

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am inserting herewith the lead editorial in the New York Times for today, April 8, on the President's address last evening at Johns Hopkins University.

I was tremendously heartened by the President's proposal to bring about "unconditional discussions" on the Vietnam situation, and I am hopeful that from this serious peace offensive, we may soon reach our goal of world peace.

The editorial follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, April 8, 1965]

THE PRESIDENT OPENS THE DOOR

President Johnson last night projected an American policy on Vietnam in which the country can take pride. He indicated that the United States now may begin to apply as much determination and ingenuity to seeking peace as it has to waging war. He has wisely broken his long silence on American purposes. And, much as this newspaper and many Members of Congress have urged, he has restored the olive branch that balances the arrows in the eagle's claws.

The President's proposal to seek a Vietnam settlement through "unconditional discussions" with "the governments" concerned opens the door to peace explorations in a wide variety of forums with Hanoi, Moscow, even Peiping, although not with the Vietcong directly. He has broken new ground as well, in explicitly offering to North Vietnam American aided regional development, food-for-peace programs and—implying the possibility of increased recognition—"peaceful association with others."

In urging Secretary General Thant to initiate a plan immediately for increased development in southeast Asia to aid in the establishment of peace rather than merely to follow its restoration, he has given wings to long-pending, imaginative proposals by men such as Ambassador Chester Bowles and Canada's Prime Minister Lester Pearson.

The size of the proposed American contribution—$1 billion is half the estimated cost of the initial five-dam program of Mekong Valley development—is less important than the willingness to participate for the first time in a jointly financed aid program with the Soviet Union.

The President's speech has, in short, at last begun the essential process of changing the context of a problem that, as usually stated, appears insoluble. In proposing a South Vietnam tied to no alliance and containing no foreign military base, the President has accepted the concept of ultimate American military withdrawal and of an independent South Vietnam that would be neutral and yet free to seek outside assistance if threatened.

Most important, the President's speech nowhere repeats Secretary Rusk's vague and wornout homily about negotiations being inconceivable until the Communists "leave their neighbors alone." It recognizes that negotiations are not only conceivable but necessary if that desirable purpose is ever to be achieved.

President Johnson has now provided a bold answer to the appeal made to him last week by the chiefs of 17 nonaligned states and earlier by many of our allies. It would be too optimistic to expect a favorable reply from the Communist countries, at least at first. But they are provided with plenty of food for thought.

Neither they nor anyone else can dispute the fact that a serious peace offer has been made. It is now clearly up to them to make a reasonable response.

The Federal Student Loan Program Is a Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, one of the most brilliant successes of our Federal Government in the field of education has been the student loan program.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article describing that success which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of March 21, 1965:

STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM A SUCCESS

(By Terry Ferrer)

Six years ago, the Federal Government stepped into a new field of educational support: loans to college students.

The beginnings were modest in February of 1959. Some $6 million was sliced up among 1,227 colleges to make some 7,000 loans available. Each college had to put up $1 for every $9 it received from Washington. Each student could borrow up to $1,000 a year, with a loan ceiling of $5,000, and was expected to begin repayment 1 year after graduation, when a 3-percent interest rate begins, and to end repayment after 10 years.

At the time, skeptics declared that the program, part of the National Defense Education Act, simply wouldn't work. "There wasn't enough money," they said. "Since the colleges had to administer and collect the loans, they would be running all over the country for years, trying, at prohibitive cost, to find delinquent loanholders," they said. "Students wouldn't borrow," they said, "because families didn't borrow for higher education. And if they did, they wouldn't pay their debts."

Like most prophets of doom, the skeptics were partly right and partly wrong. More money was forthcoming from Congress. In fact, as the U.S. Office of Education testimony before the House and Senate Education Subcommittees has shown in the last 2 weeks, the $6 million has now ballooned into $443 million, loaned over the 6 years to 640,000 borrowers at 1,618 colleges.

Obviously, the students did borrow, in unprecedented numbers and amounts. In fact, the National Defense Education Act student loan program virtually changed the American family's thinking on borrowing for higher education and convinced both students and their parents that buying college on time payments was as logical as installment buying of a television set or a car.

By way of contrast, 10 years ago, only 83,000 students borrowed the total of a mere $13.5 million from their colleges. This academic year alone, the Federal Government is giving $145 million to colleges for student loans.

Have the students been repaying their debts? Yes and no. Peter P. Muirhead, Associate Commissioner for Higher Education in the Office of Education, said last week that $2.8 million has come in in "accelerated payments"—meaning that some students had paid their debts sooner than they needed to.

But more than offsetting this bonanza is $3 million past due. However, Mr. Muirhead said in a telephone interview, "of this $3 million, almost $2 million is overdue by only one payment. Some $1.1 million is overdue by two or more payments. Remember that a bank does not write off a bad debt until after six payments are missed."

Asked to compare the college delinquent payment rate with the 1.9 percent general public rate currently cited by the American Banking Association, Mr. Muirhead said: "There are about 275,000 borrowers now in collection status. About 8,000 are overdue by 1 payment. This gives us a rate of almost 3 percent."

But, Mr. Muirhead continued, of deep concern to the colleges involved is the cost of administering and collecting the Federal loans—as the skeptics predicted. According to a survey of 395 representative colleges in the loan program, Mr. Muirhead said, the average cost of processing and collecting a typical loan of $2,000 borrowed over 4 years is $135.42 per student. The study, conducted by the National Association of College and University Business Officers, estimated the total administrative costs to the colleges in the current fiscal year at between $5.6 and $6.6 million, a sizable sum.

Nearly 90 percent of the institutions surveyed felt that they should be reimbursed by the Government for this expense, in whole or in part.

Mr. Muirhead said that both the House and Senate education subcommittees are considering such reimbursement, perhaps on a matching basis. Further, he said, there is a possibility that the Government can help with payments which have been deferred because the borrowers were either in the armed services or the Peace Corps or they had gone on to graduate school. Such deferments totaled $3.7 million in the year ending last October.

Also under consideration, Mr. Muirhead said, are requiring the student to have a cosigner (not now necessary), cutting down the 10-year repayment period, requiring a minimum yearly repayment, and encouraging voluntary collection agencies set up by the colleges themselves. Mrs. EDITH GREEN, Democrat, of Oregon, chairman of the House subcommittee, feels that a possible answer is to have a Federal agency collect the loans after the colleges make them.

But Mr. Muirhead indicated that the Office of Education is considering "systematic application" of the voluntary cooperative programs, whereby associations of colleges and universities use a commercial bank or create a nonprofit agency to make collections. The commercial-bank approach is now being used by the Associated Colleges of the Midwest and the Associated Colleges of Illinois, both served by the American National Bank and Trust Co.

The 24 colleges of the State University of New York have a cooperative service center for collections, and the Association of Colleges and Universities of the State of New York is considering such a program. State colleges in Connecticut and Maryland are using the joint approach, and it is under consideration in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, North Carolina, and Ohio.

The voluntary approach seems preferable to collection by a Federal agency. But some tightening of repayment by the Federal Government and aid to the colleges for administrative costs do seem desirable.

Nevertheless, the Federal student-loan program has more than justified its original concept as a way of helping needy students through college. The need to strengthen and refine the program's operation should not detract from its overall resounding success.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Both Houses cleared tobacco bill for President.

Senate worked on school aid bill.

House passed medicare bill.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 7231–7262, 7341

Bills Introduced: Nine bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1744–1752; S.J. Res. 69; and S. Con. Res. 32. **Pages 7237–7238, 7341**

Bills Reported: Reports were made as follows:

S. 339, providing for the establishment of the Agate Fossil Beds National Monument, Nebr., with amendments (S. Rept. 150);

S. 1570, to increase the amounts authorized for Indian adult vocational education (S. Rept. 151);

S. 702, providing for the disposition of judgment funds on deposit to the credit of the Quinaielt Indians (S. Rept. 152);

S. 795, to permit assessing of Indian trusts and restricted lands within the Lummi Indian diking project, Washington, through a draining and diking district (S. Rept. 153);

S. 1135, to extend to June 1, 1967, the period during which the President may transmit reorganization plans to Congress, with amendments (S. Rept. 154); and

Report of Committee on Labor and Public Welfare entitled "The Migratory Farm Labor Problem in the United States," together with individual views (S. Rept. 155). **Pages 7237, 7341**

Tobacco: Senate adopted conference report on H.R. 5721, to provide for acreage-poundage marketing quotas for tobacco. **Pages 7288–7289**

Authority To Meet: Special Committee on Aging and the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency were authorized to meet on Friday, April 9, while Senate is in session. **Page 7341**

School Aid: Senate worked on H.R. 2362, to strengthen and improve the quality of the Nation's elementary and secondary school facilities, rejecting the following amendments:

By 39 yeas to 49 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Dominick amendment providing that applications for grants under title III (supplementary educational centers and services) must have been approved by the State educational agency concerned; by 38 yeas to 56 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Prouty amendment providing a substitute formula for fund apportionment ratio under title III of the bill; by 32 yeas to 59 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Pearson amendment to provide for more gradual reduction of payments in impacted areas as a result of termination of certain activities of the Defense Department; and by 38 yeas to 53 nays (motion to reconsider tabled), Dominick amendment to title II (financial assistance to local school agencies for education of children of low-income families), to provide a substitute for the aid-giving formula in the bill by adding funds based on the States "effort index" reflecting the amount spent by each State in relation to its ability to pay.

Pending at adjournment was Ervin amendment to require Commissioner of Education to give 30 days' notice in Federal Register of any proposed payment under this bill and to permit individual taxpayer suits to challlenge constitutionality of such payment. The yeas and nays were ordered on this amendment and by unanimous consent it was agreed that on Friday, April 9, after Senate convenes at 10 a.m. further debate on the Ervin amendment shall be limited to 10 minutes, equally divided. **Pages 7262–7277, 7280–7341**

Record Votes: Four record votes were taken today. **Pages 7277, 7287, 7291, 7305**

Quorum Call: One quorum call was taken today. **Page 7287**

Program for Friday: Senate met at 10 a.m. and recessed at 9:15 p.m. until 10 a.m. Friday, April 9, when after 10 minutes' further debate it will vote by yeas and nays on the pending Ervin amendment, to be followed by further consideration of the bill. S. 1564, voting rights bill, will be reported by Committee on the Judiciary. **Page 7341**

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

APPROPRIATIONS—SUPPLEMENTAL

Committee on Appropriations: Committee continued its hearings on H.R. 7091, second supplemental appro-

Appendix

South Dakota Teacher's One-Room School Described in Time Magazine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE McGOVERN
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 9, 1965

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the April 9, 1965, issue of Time magazine includes an article describing the activities of Mrs. Alice Lundberg and her students at Unityville, S. Dak.

All across South Dakota, dedicated teachers have performed a great public service in ministering to the needs of small communities in rural areas. That story is told in part in the article published in Time magazine. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PUBLIC SCHOOLS: SURVIVAL OF THE ONE-ROOM

In historical parks across the United States, tiny museum-piece schoolhouses, with belfry, potbellied stove, and initial-scarred benches, set city-bred youngsters to speculating about how cute the one-teacher, one-room school must have been. Yet for a surprising number of children, this kind of school is neither quaint nor historical: they attend one daily. Despite the big trend toward consolidation, some 10,000 one-room schools still function in rural America.

The number has been dropping steadily: from 196,037, or 70 percent of public grade schools, in 1918, to 13,330, about 20 percent, in 1960. To survive, a one-room school has to be firmly rooted in its isolated location far from population centers and in the fierce pride of rural residents who want their own school and fear the corrupting influence—and higher taxes—of the town school districts. The one-room school is most numerous in such Midwest States as Nebraska, Wisconsin, and the Dakotas, most hardy in the mountain regions of Montana, Colorado, and Nevada.

ROOF WATER

In Unityville, S. Dak., a 12-family hamlet 42 miles northwest of Sioux Falls, Mrs. Alice Lundberg, 36, drives her white 1959 Mercury 8 miles from her farmhouse each morning to reach the white wooden schoolhouse by 7:45 a.m. Alone in the 28- by 25-foot classroom, she spends 80 minutes plotting the day's 36 separate topics for her 17 pupils, who come from 7 nearby farm families. She teaches them on six grade levels, from first to eighth (she has no sixth and seventh graders). The 68-year-old school is surrounded by corn and barley fields; 48 silos filled with Government-owned surplus corn loom nearby.

The school has no running water, which explains 1 of the 10 commandments hung on the wall: "Stop and think before you drink." (Another one says: "Choose a date who would make a good mate.") Children drink from a canister containing rainwater drained off the schoolhouse roof. Prominent on a bookshelf near the door is a roll of toilet tissue, from which the children unself-consciously tear off a length as they leave for one of the two privies out back under a couple of evergreens.

At the 9:05 bell, the patient, methodical Mrs. Lundberg plunges into her multiple chores. For 15 minutes she flashes reading cards to her three first-grades, has them read a story, "George and the Cherry Tree." Some of the others stray from their individual assignments to follow the story. Next comes a second-grade language class for Keith Myren, 8, and Becky Koepsell, 7, interrupted by questions from the still reading first-graders. Then second-graders read aloud, while Mrs. Lundberg checks desk to desk on the work of others. An 8-minute science lesson for the fourth and fifth grades centers on such questions as, "Why is water often muddy?" Mrs. Lundberg deftly fields second-grade arithmetic questions while teaching eighth-grade biology, stops to help a boy identify a picture in his reading book. If a pupil cannot get her attention, he amiably asks an older pupil, who is happy to help.

So it goes throughout Mrs. Lundberg's day. The children remain cooperative and orderly, observing the rule that no more than two can leave their desks at once. Mrs. Lundberg, who has taught for 16 years in one-room schools, has altered her methods little during that time, and doubts the value of such trends as new math and language techniques. "We prefer the traditional methods," she says. "The only technique is good planning."

A PICKLED BAT

Elsewhere one-room teachers, more open to new methods, take advantage of their unique situation to create a modern ideal: the ungraded school. In a 5-year-old, electrically heated brick school amid the rolling hills of Acton, Mont., 20 miles from Billings, Mrs. Lorna McKenney, 40, lets her nine pupils ignore grade lines, develop at any pace they can. Lugene Ivie, in her second year, reads so fast she stumbles over the words. Based on State tests, six of the pupils rate above the national averages in reading, language and arithmetic.

When a child surpasses in arithmetic, his name goes on the blackboard in colored chalk. One day last week, five names were on the board and, explained Mrs. McKenney, "Connie's name should also be in color, but yellow is the only color left and she detests yellow." The school's prized science exhibit is a pickled bat; its biologically educational mascot is a live monkey.

Mrs. McKenney insists that her school compares favorably with most city schools. "We have a full day of teaching here. No breaks for announcements. No running in the halls. No stopping in the middle of a sentence when the bill rings. These kids here aren't underprivileged."

RATHER SORRY PLACES

Yet one-room schools are dying for sound and substantial reasons. Mrs. Lundberg may preserve good three-R education, and Mrs. McKenney may prove that a one-room school can adopt new trends. But the bulk of such schools, says Robert Isenberg of the NEA's rural education department, "tend to be rather sorry, ill-equipped place." Buildings are as much as 100 years old. Most of the teachers have had less than 4 years of college training.

The handicaps of having to teach all grades at once are ultimately insuperable, and the children often go into high schools unable to compete with pupils from bigger grade schools. Isenberg estimates that by 1970 there will be fewer than 5,000 one-room schools. The buildings will be torn down, sold as American Legion posts, or kept as reminders of the institution that first made possible the American ideal of universal education.

One Thousand Attend Community Protest Against Soviet Anti-Semitism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OGDEN R. REID
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, on April 4, I had the privilege of participating in a rally of over 1,000 persons from Port Chester, Rye, Harrison, and Greenwich at Congregation Kneses Tifereth on King Street in Port Chester to protest Soviet persecution of Jews, the closing of synagogues, schools, cemeteries, and the outlawing of Hebrew.

Mr. Speaker, it was a moving and solemn occasion, reflecting citizen concern and conscience. I hope the voices raised there and throughout the United States and the free world will be heard in Moscow.

It is my hope also, Mr. Speaker, that a sense of the Congress resolution condemning Soviet persecution will soon be passed and that its passage will have effect "to permit the free exercise of religion in the U.S.S.R. and the pursuit of culture by Jews and all others within its borders."

Mr. Speaker, I include the following article from the Port Chester Daily Item following my remarks:

DEFEND OUR BROTHERS—1,000 ATTEND COMMUNITY PROTEST AGAINST SOVIET ANTI-SEMITISM

(By David Ellingson)

Resolutions against the Soviet oppression of Jews will be introduced in Albany and Washington today.

A sense of Congress resolution will be introduced by Congressman OGDEN REID, Republican, of New York, while a joint resolution protesting Soviet oppression of Jews will be presented today in the State senate and assembly by Senator Max Berking, Democrat, of Rye, and Assemblyman Anthony Gioffre, Republican, of Port Chester. The resolution will urge President Johnson and the Congress to take action against such Soviet action as the closing of Jewish synagogues, schools and cemeteries in the U.S.S.R.

The 3 legislators announced their intention yesterday afternoon before over 1,000

persons from Port Chester, Rye, Harrison, and Greenwich who gathered at Congregation Kneses Tifereth Israel on King Street in Port Chester to protest Soviet anti-Semitism.

Congressman REID told the audience that religious persecution of Jews in the U.S.S.R. is a shocking violation of the United Nations Charter.

Today he will introduce a concurrent sense of Congress resolution in the House of Representatives, calling for the Soviet Government to "permit the free exercise of religion and the pursuit of culture by Jews and all others within its borders."

The Congressman hoped that protests voiced at the synagogue yesterday will be heard around the world, particularly in Moscow. He urged that the United Nations Commission on Human Rights be allowed to enter the Soviet Union to investigate allegations of religious intolerance and persecution.

A telegram from Congressman RICHARD L. OTTINGER was read to the group. He has introduced a resolution in Congress condemning the U.S.S.R. for persecuting Jews.

Meetings similar to that held in Port Chester yesterday will be sponsored by various Jewish organizations throughout the United States within the next several weeks, according to Ernest Adler, program chairman for the KTI assembly.

Guest speaker Rabbi Herschel Schacter, spiritual leader of the Moshou Jewish Center in the Bronx, received a standing ovation when he pressed the interfaith assembly to seek measures which would allow the faith of our fathers to remain the faith of our children in a world everywhere at peace.

He proposed that petitions against Jewish oppression in the Soviet Union be circulated everywhere in an area communities and through the Nation. "This must not be shelved aside as just another issue in the cold war," he declared.

Americans, the rabbi said, should avail themselves of their opportunity to pass such petitions in a free country.

Rabbi Schacter has traveled and observed conditions behind the Iron Curtain. He stated that matzo has become the symbol around which Soviet Jews are gathering; it represents "a nonsensical resistance" against religion on the part of the Government. (Matzo bakeries are among Jewish institutions which the Government has closed.)

Yesterday's rally was not called to protest the politics and philosophy of the Russian Government, the rabbi observed, but "earnestly and sincerely to give voice to our deep chagrin over the fact that over 3 million Jewish people are being deprived of elementary, basic freedom."

The KTI rabbi, Joseph Speiser, presented a message to the assembly before other speakers were introduced. Citing scripture, he noted that the cry to be raised at the meeting was "Open up unto us the gates of righteousness, and if you cannot, then let my people go."

The 2-hour gathering was followed by a parade from the synagogue to Lyons Park on Putnam Avenue, where Port Chester Mayor John L. Messina read a proclamation setting aside this week in the village for protests against Soviet anti-Semitism.

The line of marchers stretched in large bunches for three blocks. Children leading the parade carried signs reading "Down with Russian Hitlers," "Let our people live with freedom," and "Equal rights for Jews in Russia."

Before he read his proclamation, the mayor recalled witnessing Nazi anti-Semitism during World War II in Germany. "Words can't express what we saw 20 years ago," he said, "but words today might prevent a recurrence."

Other religious, political and civic leaders had addressed the assembly while it met at the synagogue:

The Reverend Wesley D. Osborne, minister of Summerfield Methodist Church in Port Chester, and president of the Port Chester Ministers' Association, took his text from a teabag which carried the slogan "Conscience gets a lot of credit for cold feet."

He urged that groups seek rights which were granted by God before constitutions were ever drawn. "I must never again be a victim of cold feet," he said, "nor must you. It is a matter of humanity."

The Reverend Peter Rinaldi, pastor of Corpus Christi Church in Port Chester: "We must stand united in defense of our most sacred principles and of our brothers."

The Reverend William V. Guy, minister of the Bethesda Baptist Church in Port Chester: "Men of good will must not remain silent in the face of injustice."

The Reverend George W. Swope, minister of North Baptist Church in Port Chester: "We ought to search our own hearts and souls here in Port Chester" to determine if discrimination exists among groups in the village. All faiths have discriminated against others at times; "there are no black sheep or white sheep."

M. Paul Redd, president of the Rye-Port Chester chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People: "One of the best things in the world to tell Soviet Russia is that the United States has cleaned up its own backyard." He called for solutions to discrimination against Negroes in this country.

Capt. Charles A. West of the Salvation Army: "We must carry each others' burdens." He wished for a "vaccine to stamp out the evils we find in our world today."

Anthony Posillipo, supervisor of the town of Rye: "This large turnout is no surprise to those who know this community. You can count on the prayers and all-out support of the citizens of our community."

Rabbi Moses J. Sharagowitz of KTI and Rabbi Aaron Singer of the Harrison Jewish Community Center offered the invocation. The benediction was presented by Rabbi Moses Davidowitz of Temple Sholom in Greenwich.

Voting Rights and Selma, Ala.—Resolutions From Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 9, 1965

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, one of the most direct and democratic expressions of government in this country is the traditional New England town meeting, which many Massachusetts communities have retained to this day. Within the past few weeks, town meetings in Concord, Natick, and Sudbury, Mass., have adopted resolutions expressing their deep concern over recent occurrences in Alabama and over the denial of voting rights to certain of our citizens.

Copies of these resolutions have been forwarded to me; and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, along with similar resolutions adopted by the city councils of Brockton and Cambridge, urging prompt enactment of legislation guaranteeing the right to vote for all citizens.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANNUAL TOWN MEETING MARCH 8 AND 15, 1965

Vote unanimously: That the citizens of the town of Concord adopt the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That we, the citizens of Concord, Mass., in town meeting assembled, express our deepest concern over the violation in the State of Alabama of the fundamental personal rights and liberties given to every American by the Constitution of the United States.

"Since 1775, when, at the Bridge in Concord, men first fought and died for the cause of human freedom in our country, we have made progress toward realizing this ideal for all of our citizens. We are also well aware that much more needs to be done in all the States of the Union.

"That nearly two centuries later, American citizens must suffer and die in seeking these constitutional rights and liberties seems to us a retreat from principles so dearly bought by so many. Let therefore all of us resolve to increase our efforts to the end that the rights and liberties guaranteed by our Constitution will be enjoyed by all. Further

Resolved, That the Selectmen of Concord be and hereby are authorized to send copies of the foregoing Resolution to such public authorities in this State and elsewhere as they may deem advisable."

CORNELIA LAWRENCE,
Town Clerk.

RESOLUTION BY TOWN MEETING MEMBERS OF NATICK, MASS.

Resolved, That the town meeting members of Natick, Mass., here assembled in their 1965 annual meeting, hereby instruct the moderator to convey the following sentiments to President Lyndon B. Johnson:

"We deplore the apparent brutality recently shown by Alabama State police and other law enforcement officers to our fellow Americans in Selma, Ala. As we meet here tonight under one of the oldest forms of representative government in America it seems only proper that the precious right to vote no longer be denied to any law-abiding citizen for any reason, quasi-legal or otherwise. I am sure you will agree with us that the time has come when we must stop merely talking brotherhood and see that some action is taken to really guarantee that every American is truly accorded those equal rights we hear so much about."

Unanimously adopted upon motion duly made and seconded at the opening session of the 1965 annual town meeting, Tuesday, March 9, 1965.

FRANCIS G. MCGEE,
Town Moderator.

RESOLUTION BY CITIZENS OF SUDBURY, MASS.

Be it resolved, That we, the citizens of Sudbury, Mass., in town meeting assembled, register our feelings of outrage concerning the brutality of those in Selma, Ala., who have deprived American citizens of their constitutional and human rights.

We, too, feel the pain which the Reverend Mr. Reeb felt when he was viciously struck down. We feel that if our society is to exist another 189 years, indeed, if it is to survive, it will do so only if we support the concepts of freedom, of human dignity, of equality, of justice, and of brotherhood which our ancestors nourished into reality on these very grounds.

We, therefore, urge those in authority to use their voices and their good offices as we are attempting to use ours, to speak out—to speak out unequivocally in support of the

demands of American citizens in Selma, Ala., for the free exercise of their constitutional and human rights; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution and a record of the vote of the town meeting thereon shall be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Attorney General of the United States, Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Senator EDWARD M. KENNEDY, and Representative HAROLD D. DONOHUE, immediately.

Unanimously voted at the annual town meeting of Sudbury, Mass., March 4, 1965.

LAWRENCE B. TIGHE,
Town Clerk.

CITY OF BROCKTON IN CITY COUNCIL,
MARCH 22, 1965

Whereas the 15th amendment to the Constitution guarantees to all citizens the right to vote; and

Whereas the National Congress has before it proposed legislation to implement the purpose of the 15th amendment to the Constitution; and

Whereas President Johnson has asked for speedy enactment of legislation and has further asked that Americans throughout the United States support the meaningful purpose of such legislation: It is hereby

Resolved, That the Brockton City Council commend the action of President Johnson to further enhance the guarantee of this right to vote for all citizens; and the Brockton City Council asks its representatives to the National Congress that deliberate speed should be given to the enactment of this legislation and that copies of this resolve be sent to Senators SALTONSTALL and KENNEDY and to Congressman BURKE.

Adopted.

MELVIN B. CLIFFORD,
Clerk.

Approved.

ALVIN JACK SIMS,
Mayor.

CITY OF CAMBRIDGE IN CITY COUNCIL,
MARCH 15, 1965

Whereas the recent events in Selma, Ala. have focused national as well as international attention on the plight of the American Negro in that godless city; and

Whereas the right to vote has long been recognized as one of the most sacred rights as well as an obligation on the part of every citizen throughout the entire country; and

Whereas certain insecure elements of the white community are making inhuman and unbelievably vicious attempts to preclude the Negro citizens of Alabama from exercising their voting rights; and

Whereas every citizen throughout the entire country must bear a portion of the guilt that necessarily results from the shame of Alabama; and

Whereas our Government can determine it to be feasible to send our troops to Vietnam to protect the people there fighting for their basic liberties: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Cambridge City Council go on record as being bitterly opposed to the events presently taking place in the State of Alabama as well as similar events in any other part of the country relating to the voting rights of the American Negro citizen and urging President Lyndon B. Johnson to immediately take the necessary corrective action indicated in those States as well as Alabama; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the members of our congressional delegations, to the Governor of the State of Alabama, and to the widow of the Reverend James J. Reeb who died in the fight to allow all men, regardless of race, creed, or color to be able to exercise their right to vote as provided by the Constitution of the United States of America; and be it further

Resolved, That his honor the mayor, Edward A. Crane, appoint a committee of the entire city council to draw up suitable resolutions on the death of this brave American, deploring the brutal murder of the Reverend James J. Reeb who made the supreme sacrifice so that all Americans might receive the rights to which they are entitled by the Constitution.

THOMAS M. MCNAMARA,
City Clerk.

American Versus Oversea Tourism: Idaho's Solution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 23, 1965

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, because of the great concern expressed recently over the outflow of dollars from this Nation that our tourists are spending abroad, I believe it is timely to point out that all 50 States, individually and in close harmony, can solve this problem. They simply need only stress to our adventurous citizens to "See America First."

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask all my colleagues to visit Idaho—either this summer to view its scenic beauty and to fish, in the fall for fine hunting or in the winter to enjoy the world's finest winter playground.

With due respect to the variety of tourist attractions the other 49 States offer, I wish to point out a few little-known but important features of my State.

Idaho, with vast forest and mountain areas, abounds with wildlife. The 10-year average of deer bagged is 66,000. Nearly 25,000 sage hens are taken each year by hunters from Idaho and by visitors. About 15,000 elk are taken annually by hunters and the State has the second largest elk herd in the world. There are special hunts for moose and a season for taking black bear. Limited hunts are held for mountain goats and bighorn sheep. Native and blue grouse abound in the forests of this 53-million-acre State and in a recent year 138,000 were bagged.

Idaho has 2,000 lakes and 35,000 miles of streams which yield more than 11 million trout and 4 million spinyrayed fish each year. Fish include rainbow, brook, brown, golden, mackinaw, and Dolly Varden trout; and chinook, sockeye, and kokanee salmon. Migratory salmon and steelhead runs are on the increase in the larger streams and rivers.

L-shaped Idaho covers 83,557 square miles and includes elevations varying from more than 12,655 feet to 710 feet. This geographic phenomena is an unequaled attraction for the student and lover of nature. Of Idaho's total area more than two-thirds is in Federal ownership. Much of this land is so rugged and primitive that man has not yet found means or stamina to explore it.

In a recent year, recreation vied with timber as the State's second most important industry, contributing about $150 million to the State's economy. More than 4 million out-of-State visitors vacation in Idaho. They were accommodated by Idaho's 15 national forests in the summer and 250,000 returned in the winter to ski and toboggan.

Briefly, this is what the tourist can find in Idaho, and I am sure that my colleagues are as deeply moved by the splendor and recreational opportunities of their own States.

It is logical, therefore, that if the citizens and leaders of every State in the Union would intensify a campaign to "See America First," our money would stay at home and the American tourist would more fully share in the heritage of our great land.

The Author—Mark Van Doren

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, seldom has a nation produced such a gifted individual as the United States has in the person of Mark Van Doren, a resident of Cornwall, Conn., which I represent.

Mr. William Claire, former assistant to Congressman CONTE, has written a biographical article on the life and works of Mr. Doren and I now ask permission that this article, "The Author—Mark Van Doren" which appeared in "The Booklover's Answer," be inserted in the RECORD.

THE AUTHOR—MARK VAN DOREN
(By William F. Claire)

In his celebrated autobiography, Mark Van Doren has said that his birthplace (Hope, Ill., June 13, 1894) would be "hard to find on any atlas, though it still exists as Faith and Charity, its sister villages named a century ago, do not."

The son of a rugged country doctor, he moved at the age of 6 to Urbana, where he attended the University of Illinois and began a writing career that has spanned a half-century of excellence in poetry, fiction, and criticism.

At the university, he studied under Stuart Sherman and wrote the first of his many books, a critical study of Thoreau. Commenting some 46 years later on a reissue of the book, Stanley Edgar Hyman called it a brilliant, even staggering, accomplishment by a student.

He served in the Army during World War I and later joined his brother Carl Van Doren on the Columbia University faculty. His Ph. D. study of John Dryden became his second book and one of the first to appear under the imprint of Alfred Harcourt, Donald Brace and Will D. Howe.

While his earliest published poem had been accepted by H. L. Mencken for the smart set during his college days, it was not until 1924 that his first volume, "Spring Thunder," was printed. T. S. Eliot, whose review in England of the Dryden book had much to do with establishing its permanent fame, also wrote favorably of the new poetry.

From 1924–28, he set a productive pace that has been unmatched by any other major

writer. He brought out two new volumes of verse, wrote a critical study of Edwin Arlington Robinson, served as literary editor of the Nation, collaborated with Carl on a study of British and American literature, compiled his famous "Anthology of World Poetry" and continued teaching at Columbia. During this period he and his wife, the former Dorothy Graffe, also produced two children.

An epic poem, "Jonathan Gentry," came out in 1931, and after a winter spent on his Cornwall, Conn., farm, he wrote another narrative poem, "A Winter Diary." In this 1935 book, he also included 33 sonnets, which Allen Tate in a recent review said amounted to the "finest work in its genre of this century." This book, still another collection and a series of new poems entitled "America's Mythology" were undoubtedly strong factors in his Pulitzer Prize Award for collected poems (1939).

Important critical works were also written during the thirties, the most prominent of which was "Shakespeare." Writing in 1942, however, in a preface to his "Private Reader," he announced his farewell to formal criticism by stating that he "no longer felt at home, even—or especially—in its finest rooms." The publication of the "Happy Critic" recently indicates that his announcement was somewhat premature. The demand for his comments on literature continues and while his approach is appreciative rather than critical in the academic sense, the essays are masterpieces of penetration and insight. Writers examined include Hardy, Herrick, Mann, Cervantes, and Whitman among others.

A legendary teacher at Columbia for 39 years, Van Doren retired in 1959. He has served since as Bolyston professor of rhetoric at Harvard sharing that chair during an academic year with Robert Lowell. He is the present chancellor of the American Academy of Arts and Letters.

At Columbia he taught such diverse people as Lionel Trilling, Allen Ginsburg, Thomas Merton (perhaps the best description of Van Doren the teacher can be found in Merton's spiritual autobiography, "The Seven Story Mountain"), Clifton Fadiman, John Berryman and the recent Pulitzer Prize winning poet, Louis Simpson.

The late James Thurber has described his impact when he said, "Mark Van Doren is so many men that I have to open my front door and my windows when he visits me in order to let all of him in."

Needless to say, Van Doren's accomplishments stagger the imagination. To his poetry and criticism can be added three novels, innumerable short stories, a play ("The Last Days of Lincoln," widely read but as yet unproduced by a major company) and books such as Liberal Education, Invitation to Learning (after the CBS radio show), children's books, mystery stories and a series of illuminating introductions ranging from the Limited Editions club volumes to recent paperbacks.

Each generation seems to discover Van Doren in its own special way. While it is impossible to estimate the number of readers he has had during his career, his influence has been considerable. Not surprisingly, the autobiography represents the best view of Van Doren's total commitment to life and literature.

Matters have been somewhat complicated (if, as many people assume, a writer has to be placed) by the fact that Van Doren has never joined a particular school of poetry. Like Conrad Aiken, he has assidiously avoided the limelight, although it has often been thrust upon him. Critics have compared him to Frost, Hardy, and Robinson but most have been in agreement that he has forged a body of poetry unique in this century.

In recent years, Van Doren has been collecting his work in a series of books, and his next is expected to contain all of the longer poems he wishes to preserve. At the same time, he continues to write new material that demonstrates his absolute mastery of form and ever-increasing awareness of the mystery and beauty of the world.

His is the sure touch of genius. It may be an eon or two before we produce another inspired writer in this country with quite the same grasp of life in all of its particular and universal aspects. Meanwhile, he gives us some hint of the music he hears in "Undersong," a majestic poem he wrote recently which begins:

"In wonderment I walk to music pouring
Out of so dark a source it makes no sound"—

And ends, after more than 80 remarkable lines—

"Evenly, unevenly as rhymes
Rival the pure chimes
Of never ending truth that for so long
Has sung to such as me this undersong."

The Rescue at Rowland Cave, at Mountain View, Ark.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. McINTYRE
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 9, 1965

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, this week we have read of the heroic rescue of four men from Rowland Cave, at Mountain View, Ark. These men had been trapped for 2 days by rising water that flooded almost 400 feet of the cave entrance.

The rescue was directed by William Karras, of Arlington, Va., who flew to the scene with four young men who made up the National Capital Grotto Rescue Squad.

They were accompanied by three Navy divers. One of these Navy divers, Chief Petty Officer Lyle E. Thomas, died from a heart seizure just after the last man had been brought out safely.

Also aiding these two teams, that were flown by the U.S. Air Force to Arkansas, were the Hondo rescue team, of Missouri, comprised of Conway Christensen, Chuck Rominger, and Jim Sparks; and two gulf coast divers from Morgan City, La.—Jim Springer and Tom Kleles.

My particular interest in this event centers around a young man from New Hampshire, Fred A. "Mickey" Forbes, Jr., of Wilton, N.H. This young man is a member of the grotto rescue squad, and is an Eagle Scout from troop 10, in Wilton. He developed his love for the outdoors and for adventure in the Granite State. He is the son of a member of my staff, Fred A. Forbes, Sr., my press secretary.

The fact that these young men—ages 16 to 18—devote their time to training for the strenuous sport of spelunking and rescue work, is commendable. These rescue teams are on 24-hour call, and of course, never receive much notice in these emergencies. This particular rescue started at 2 a.m., from Andrews Air Force Base, and was a continuous operation by these young men—who went without sleep for better than 48 hours.

My congratulations go to Mr. Karras, who trains and directs these youngsters, and who was participating in his third cave rescue.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article describing this operation, from the Washington Evening Star of April 6, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 6, 1965]

NAVY DIVER DIES AFTER AIDING IN RESCUE OF FOUR MEN IN CAVE

A veteran Navy diver assigned in Washington collapsed and died yesterday just after he had helped rescue four men from a flooded cave in Arkansas.

The victim was master diver, Lyle E. Thomas, 39 who lived at 6292 Marlboro Road, District Heights, Md. He was an instructor at the Navy's Deep Sea Diving School at the Washington Navy Yard.

Three divers from the school and a five-man team from the National Capital Grotto Rescue Squad here were flown early yesterday to Jacksonville Air Force Base at Little Rock, Ark., and then taken to Rowland Cave in nearby Mountain View.

In a 2-hour rescue operation, the divers guided the four trapped men—all Arkansas residents—through more than 200 feet of water that had risen to the roof of the bowl-shaped cavern and had trapped them for more than 24 hours in an elevated chamber.

COLLAPSES MINUTE LATER

According to William Karras, 39, of Arlington Towers, Arlington, Va., leader of the citizen diving crew, Thomas collapsed in the mouth of the cave only a minute after the rescue operation was completed about 4:50 p.m.

"He just pitched over and didn't get up," Karras said this morning.

Karras and his crew returned home about 3 a.m. today. The Navy divers remained at Jacksonville Naval Air Station, Tenn., pending an autopsy on Thomas today.

Karras said he tried mouth-to-mouth resuscitation on Thomas, then started 2 hours of heart massage, but was unable to revive the Navy man.

AUTOPSY PENDING

Pending the results of the autopsy, Stone County, Ark., Coroner Dr. T. J. Burton attributed Thomas' death to a heart attack.

In Washington, a spokesman at the diving school said Thomas had no history of a heart disease or weakness. If he had had, he would not have been permitted to dive, the spokesman said.

In addition to Thomas, the Navy sent Lt. Albert P. Festag, of Woodbridge, Va., and GM1c. Thomas A. Jenkins of 2227 Gaylord Street, Suitland, Md., to take part in the rescue.

With Karras in the citizen crew were John Thybony, 18, and his brother, Scott, 16, of 625 Woodland Circle, Falls Church, both students at J. E. B. Stuart High School; Michael Forbes, 17, of Bethesda and Henry Hoover, 19, of Cheverly, Md.

Karras said he was called by telephone Sunday evening by Arkansas police who had contacted a member of the National Speleogical Society, to which the cave explorers belong.

Karras in turn called the diving school, which supplied its three divers.

The eight rescue workers flew from Andrews Air Force Base about 1 a.m., yesterday and went immediately to the cave, a tourist attraction in the Ozark foothills.

The four they rescued are Hugh Shell, 40, of Batesville, Ark., and three college students—Hogan Bledsoe, 20, of Lake Village,

Ark.; Steve Wilson, 20, of Batesville, and Mike Hill, 19, of Batesville. Bledsoe and Wilson are students at Arkansas Tech and Hill is a student at Arkansas College.

A Call To Hate?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CHURCH
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 9, 1965

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the executive secretary of the Associated Baptist Conventions of Idaho and Utah recently wrote about "a growing sickness in our culture." He had been listening to a well-known "radio preacher" inveigh against the American and Southern Baptist Conventions for trying to maintain communication with Baptists from Russia; and he said:

Since that time, I have heard other voices, voices sometimes cloaked in tones of piety, righteous indignation, freedom, or patriotism, but close beneath the surface is this call to hate, to fear that which is different from ourselves, whether it be the color of skin, difference of religion, political differences, or a differing culture or philosophy of life.

The executive secretary is Robert J. Smith, of Twin Falls; and he went on to say that the divisive voices of extremists are sowing suspicion, fear, and distrust in the minds of our people. He concluded that the time has come to "test the voices that fill the air, to unsnarl the mazes of words and half truths."

This is wise counsel, Mr. President; and I think it entirely appropriate that it be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for all to read. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, entitled "A Call To Hate?" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Idaho-Utah Baptist Messenger, September 1964]

A CALL TO HATE?

(By Robert J. Smith)

Early this summer while driving across Idaho I heard the program of a well-known radio preacher. Nearly the entire time of this high-priced national broadcast was given to condemning and berating the American and Southern Baptist Conventions for allowing some Russian Baptist pastors to appear on the platforms of their national convention meetings. Why this should be so surprising I don't know. The strongest evangelical work being done in Russia today is being done by Baptists. As this man spoke, I was suddenly overwhelmed with the feeling, this man is asking me to hate these people. Because they are of a different culture, a different background, brought up under a political system with which we cannot agree, they are suspect, and even though they name the name of Christ as Savior, we are not to listen to them or to have fellowship with them. To do so is to make us suspect, and to banish us also from the select company of God's elect. If they had only come with a message of condemnation and hate of their own nation, if they had spoken against communism with the fervor and zeal of a patriotic American citizen, they might have been received. They might also have forever shut the door on any kind of evangelical witness among their own people. Is it so hard to understand why they would speak with restraint? Paul could speak glowingly of the saints in the very household of Caesar, as pagan a court as ever existed, but when we speak of the saints in the household of communism we are to show our Christian spirit by a response of rejection and hate.

This is only a minor illustration of a growing sickness in our culture. Since that time I have heard other voices, voices sometimes cloaked in tones of piety, righteous indignation, freedom, or patriotism, but close beneath the surface is this call to hate, to fear that which is different from ourselves whether it be the color of skin, difference of religion, political differences, or a differing culture or philosophy of life. The right to differ has been basic to our freedom, but not to hate, to ostracize, to twist and pervert the truth in order to throttle and shut out the voices of others. James, in his epistle says, "We use the tongue to bless our Father, God, and we use the same tongue to curse our fellowmen, the same mouth—surely, my brothers, this is the sort of thing that never ought to happen. Have you every known a spring to give sweet and bitter water simultaneously? Have you ever seen a fig tree with a crop of olives, or seen figs growing on a vine? It is just as impossible for a spring to give fresh and salt water at the same time." How much hate, fear, division, mistrust can be promoted under the cloak of the Gospel of Jesus Christ?

These divisive voices have done irreparable harm to the cause of Christ. Because suspicion, fear, and distrust are sown in the minds of our people, the result is withdrawn and fragmented stewardship. Those who suffer are the dedicated missionaries who have given the best of their lives to promote the cause of Christ. The work in our own States—work among our youth, our camping programs, our church extension efforts, aid to needy churches, all of this is throttled and slowed down. This is not the Spirit of Christ, it is the spirit of hate and division. Our convention has withstood vicious and unfair attacks without retaliation or recrimination. Herein lies strength not weakness. I believe the time has come, however, to test the voices that fill the air, to unsnarl the maze of words and half truths, to give our attention to those who have proven through their ministry they are ministers of the love of God in Christ. James closes the third chapter, "And the wise are peacemakers who go on quietly sowing for a harvest of righteousness—in other people and in themselves."

What Freedom in America Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following essays which won prizes in the Boyertown American Legion Essay Contest, "What Freedom in America Means to Me," by Charles Lessig, a 12th-grader at Boyertown area high school and "Terribly Proud," by Janet Adams, an 8th grader at the Boyertown area junior high school.

The essays follow:

WHAT FREEDOM IN AMERICA MEANS TO ME

(By Charles Lessig)

Freedom is my being able to write this essay and not having to fear that someone will condemn me for what I say here. My idea of freedom may be different from other peoples; it may be the same. This is not important. What is important is that they are my ideas. They come from a mind that does not have to fear to think what it wants to. They come from a person who does not have to fear to say what he thinks. Freedom of the individual to express his thoughts and abilities is the living heart of our country.

Rivers are in many ways similar to the freedoms of Americans. They travel their normal courses and give life to the creatures in them. If the water in the river becomes less, the creatures living in it can no longer live a normal life. Many will die. If there is an overabundance of water, there may be a flood and much destruction may result.

Similarly we, as Americans, depend upon our freedoms for living. If too many of our freedoms are taken away, we can't survive. Given too much freedom we may end up only destroying ourselves and others around us.

To check the flooding of a river we build dams. To check our freedoms we establish laws and governments. But, just as a dam does not make a river flow, neither do our laws nor governments make us live. We are free to do what we want. We may abuse our freedoms. Dams are not foolproof and neither are laws. But the American who chooses to abuse his freedoms cannot call himself a truly free American.

What are some of my freedoms?

Living in a country where I know I am master of my life is freedom. I may choose to better or to destroy my life. I may endeavor to succeed in any occupation. No one will make me succeed or fail. It is up to me.

Freedom is knowing that my rights will be protected. I must feel certain that no one is going to deny me what I am rightly entitled to. We cannot call ourselves completely free until we know that every American is able to enjoy equal freedom. Discrimination against just one person in my country detracts from my freedom because by being in my country that person is a part of me.

Freedom is having my own parents teach me what they think is right and to put certain restrictions on me. Freedom is knowing that my posterity will enjoy the freedoms that my country has offered me and my forefathers. Freedom is looking at the stars, or the ocean, or a tree, and feeling happy.

Freedom is helping other people. Freedom is being able to laugh or cry when I want to. Freedom is worshiping God in peace. Freedom is feeling secure. Freedom is playing a ball game.

Freedom is calling this country my country.

TERRIBLY PROUD

(By Janet Adams)

The freedom which I enjoy as an American citizen means very much to me. I don't believe there is another nation in the world I could love so well. A sharp pain shoots through my heart when I realize that not all are as safe and happy as I am with a land so free and rich.

I am terribly proud of my country; it's something I can call my own. No one can deny me the right to say: "I am an American."

The liberty I love means a chance to be what I want to be; the goal I choose can become reality. There is a great satisfaction in growing up and knowing that this Government I will someday support is on

my side. Someday I will mean something; be treated as somebody.

I can choose the education I want and—with adequate funds—develop my character into something worthwhile.

I want so much to learn, to answer the many questions in my mind, and I find the solutions are just waiting to be discovered.

One of the most important elements of our independence is truth. Being lied to, and having the truth leak out later to trusting ears, hurts. This is one reason why "we the people" of America can be glad. We know the truth and can trust.

My freedom in America also means the chance to be a Christian. I can believe in God and my Savior. No one can take either away from me—nor would they. I firmly believe that America is on God's side.

My freedom means that when I am older, with ideas of my own, I will not have to inhibit my deepest feelings and criticisms. I can find an equal ear in my fellow freemen. Because of great men like Thomas Jefferson and George Washington, I hold the privilege of speaking and writing at will.

Yet, I am protected from fools who would use every trick in the book toward slandering others because the very wise forefathers of America also provided a system in which they sought to insure domestic tranquillity.

Another freedom I will someday enjoy is the right to elect leaders of my country. Someday, on my shoulders will be placed this great honor. I must learn now to use this indulgence wisely, so my children and grandchildren will someday enjoy the liberty that is mine.

I believe that my freedom is the result of a strong, just government and in order to protect these liberties we must always maintain loyalty, knowledge, truth, trust, and a keen sense of right and wrong.

With these essential qualities planted firmly in our souls, I believe that our Government "of the people, by the people, and for the people" shall protect the great freedom of Americans now and yet to come—forever and ever.

Republican Position on Voting Rights—Address by Thomas H. Brigham, Alabama Republican State Chairman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, April 9, 1965

Mr. MORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by Mr. Thomas H. Brigham, who is the chairman of the Republican Party in the State of Alabama, in connection with the position that the Republican Party takes in the State on the matter of voting rights.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF AN ADDRESS BY THOMAS H. BRIGHAM, REPUBLICAN STATE CHAIRMAN, DELIVERED TO THE REPUBLICAN COUNTY ORGANIZATION OF WINSTON COUNTY, ALA.

Mr. Chairman, fellow Republicans, and guests, as you know, this is the first occasion that I have had the opportunity to speak in your county, and it is a distinct privilege for me to address you tonight. It is indeed a privilege because Winston County has been the bastion of Republican strength in Alabama over the years—and during the darker years, you have been a symbol to me and to other Republican leaders that there was hope—hope that we could make Alabama the two-party State she deserves to be.

That hope was fortunately transformed into a reality at the Federal level last year, when we elected five outstanding men to the U.S. Congress, including your own JIM MARTIN.

Now we must address ourselves to another difficult, but realistic task—the challenging task of creating two-party competitive government from the statehouse to the county level.

It is certainly our obligation—and, yes, perhaps it has become our destiny to lead Alabama out of the wilderness of confusion and away from the disruptive forces that plague our State today.

It is a monumental task but we must and we will offer superior candidates at the State and local levels who will be able to articulate the basic conservative Republican principles that this country was founded on, and that we believe are still sound and practical principles today.

And, in accomplishing our goals, we as a party must address ourselves to many important issues. One such current issue requires our comment now and concerns the so-called basis for the disruptive activities in Alabama the past few weeks and apparently in the weeks or even months to come.

I would like to read a position paper which has been developed over the past several months by the leadership of the Alabama Republican Party:

"Several important questions are now being directed toward the Alabama Republican State committee. These questions demand a public stand by our party, to define our present position and to establish our posture as we work toward the campaigns of 1966. Our position must be clear to our present office holders, the candidates we intend to recruit, our party members, workers and supporters.

"These questions and our proposed replies are as follows:

"Question. What is the position of Republicans in Alabama regarding equal voting rights; and, what do we propose in order to implement the Negro's right to vote?

"Answer. We believe all qualified Americans should register to vote and should exercise that privilege after registration. We are concerned for the rights of all Americans. We would point out that while great issue is made for Negro registration, there is little concern for whites and other minorities to exercise the right and duty to vote. The shameful record of white voters remains at less than half of those eligible to register, and a great number (35 percent of those registered do not bother to vote. With such apathetic participation in the election processes, we can ill afford to limit our attention to special groups.

"We do not concede that implementation of constitutional rights requires manipulation of the law, to give special favor or consideration to different groups and minorities. We do not believe that constitutional rights can be guaranteed by ignoring the Constitution. We believe that special consideration to any group of citizens clearly violates the intent of the Constitution and simply reverses alleged discrimination. We believe uniform application of the law is mandatory, if we are to avoid chaos and if our Republic is to be maintained.

"The 15th and 19th amendments are specific in the power of the Congress in protecting the right to vote and we find no provision for negating the role of the States in setting voter qualification requirements, so long as the law is applied uniformly within the State.

"We recognize the fact that our Constitution is being subjected to very liberal interpretation and it is the responsibility of the individual States to take steps to avoid further intervention by the courts and by the Congress.

"We feel that failure of Alabama Democrats to make this same recognition of fact has brought us to our present plight, and in fact, has accelerated the drive for Federal control over the States.

"We wish to emphasize that we in no degree support the minimal voter standards established by the Civil Rights Act of 1964. We believe that ever-increasing complexities of Government and the attendant issues demand that an informed electorate be maintained if we are to survive as a nation. This requires some qualifications other than age, or even simple literacy. While we do not hold with oppressive requirements, neither do we hold with no requirements. If simple literacy is to be the sole requisite one might ask why not reduce the age requirement to 13 years and allow the sixth-grade children to vote.

"We therefore think it necessary for our State legislature to consider legislation which will relieve the pressure for Federal control over our election processes insofar as is possible. We recommend uniform State election laws, with qualification examinations tailored in such a way as to test general aptitude and comprehension in lieu of of specific skills or achievements. Grading of these exams by electronic data processing or other mechanical devices would eliminate the human element and the probability of charges of discrimination against individual registrars.

"We believe such tests would withstand Federal challenge, maintain local and State control, and result in a competent electorate.

"We do this in recognition that the serious competent voter is disenfranchised when public responsibility is made a mockery by eliminating reasonable requirements for voter qualification.

"Question. Will the Alabama Republican Party assist Negroes to vote?

"Answer. As previously stated, we are concerned for the right of all qualified Americans to vote. Our party is established along lines of political philosophy and principle, and not along racial lines. We do assist all Republicans to register to whatever extent our resources permit. We are a political party, and are in existence to elect competent public officials who will administer our local, State, and Federal Government. According to the conservative and constitutional principles we espouse due to practical political demands, we therefore work with those voters who generally agree with these principles.

"We generally devote less time to areas where we might produce little favorable results or even adverse reaction. We have found that few Negroes support our philosophy of opposition to the welfare state or our positive programs for self-reliance—free enterprise—and local self-government.

"We believe if we are to remain a responsible party, we must pursue our concept of the proper role of the Federal Government, without regard to racial consideration. We charge that the Democrat Party has deliberately divided itself along racial lines in order to serve expedient ends, without regard to the principles incumbent upon a responsible political organization.

"Question. What does the future hold for the Republican Party in Alabama? Will we support the Republican National Committee, or will we become a mutation of a national party, such as the Alabama Democratic Party? Republican, or Alabama Republicans—which is it to be?

"Answer. We are the Republican Party of Alabama, not 'Alabama Republicans. We intend, and assure that this stand will continue.

"We understand that the very nature of the conservative American is that he must be an individual, not a conformist. We do not all agree on any occasion in Alabama, we do not expect to agree with all Republicans elsewhere. We occasionally believe the majority opinion of Republicans in Congress to be in error, but, we consistently believe that of Democrats to be in error on many important issues.

"We believe that the concept of government as intended by our forebears can be best administered by the Republican Party majority. The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD supports this belief. The Alabama delegation to the 1964 Republican convention voted in support of the party platform that will stand until it is altered or amended.

"Some acts in Congress by individual Republicans, or even occasionally by a majority of Republicans, do not alter the official party stand on the issues. Those few Congressmen and Senators who do not support the party platform, will have to face their constituents in the next election. This is the Republican way. We have not degenerated to arm-twisting, intimidation, bribery and pork barrel to force our elected officials to blindly support the party line. We repeat, the plight of our country, and of our southland is the result of ruthless blundering by ambitious, power-hungry Democrats. We find few faults in the overall record of the Republican Party as a whole. Most that we find can be rectified by a strong conservative Republican force from the South—and this is our intent.

"SUMMARY

"Question. What is our position regarding equal voting rights; and, what do we propose to do in order to implement the Negro's right to vote?

"Answer. (1) We believe all qualified Americans should register to vote and should exercise that privilege after registration.

"(2) We believe the Constitution leaves voter qualification to the States as long as the law is applied uniformly within the State.

"(3) We propose uniform and reasonable voter and election laws for Alabama drawn so as to avoid charges of discrimination, and the threat of Federal referees and registrars.

"Question. Will we assist Negroes to register?

"Answer. Only a prejudiced organization would deliberately give special attention to Negroes or any other racial minority. We are a political organization soliciting our support from all who generally believe in the Republican concepts of proper government. We attempt to assist all Republicans to register.

"Question. Will we continue to support the National GOP?

"Answer. (1) We are part and parcel of the National Republican Party. We disagree sometime with other Republicans, but our disagreement with Democrats is both basic and constant. It is the role of the South, our role, to improve and project the long standing conservative record of the GOP.

"(2) We support our 1964 GOP platform which is our guideline until amended."

Voting Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to add the name of the Manchester Neighborhood Council in my home city of Pittsburgh to the list of organizations in my congressional district which are in strong support, as I am, of the President's call for voting rights legislation.

A resolution adopted by the council recently follows:

RESOLUTION ON VOTING RIGHTS BY MANCHESTER NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL, PITTSBURGH, PA.

Whereas we as a society and individuals aspire to create wider participation in basic and inalienable rights; and

Whereas it is the intent of the Bill of Rights that there be universal suffrage; and

Whereas legislation has been passed including the 1964 Civil Rights Act to implement the intention of the Bill of Rights; and

Whereas Negro Americans in Selma, Ala., and other places still encounter difficulties in registering to vote;

We support President Johnson and call on the Congress to develop and pass new legislation that is aimed at meeting the practical problems that are still being encountered by Negro Americans who desire to become full first-class citizens by participation in the electoral process.

Social Security Inequities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, we have today passed H.R. 6675, the Social Security Amendments Act of 1965, and in so doing have accomplished much that is good. There are of course, portions of this bill with which I still strongly disagree, but, as we know only too well, under the rule under which this bill has been considered we have been forced to take "the bitter with the sweet."

I have previously introduced a bill (H.R. 6153) which would raise the income limitation for individuals receiving social security benefits, without penalty, from $1,200 to $2,400. The bill we passed today has taken a step in the right direction by expanding the "band" of $1 reduction in benefits for $2 in earnings, from $1,200 to $1,700, to $1,200 to $2,400; but I do not believe we have gone far enough.

In this vein, then, I commend to our colleagues an article by Mr. Gerald Burke, of Binghamton, N.Y., which appeared in the February 1965 issue of the Feed Bag:

BURKE ON BUSINESS: SOCIAL SECURITY INEQUITIES

A little over a quarter of a century ago, many Americans were up in arms over a radical change in their way of life. Payroll deductions for social security began in 1937 despite considerable opposition. Today, social security is accepted. Most Americans will agree it has filled a great need. People had to be educated to the aims of social security, they needed assistance, and most of all, understanding, especially when applying for the benefits provided by law.

But as with all laws, the people responsible for administration are limited by the laws they must administer. This is unfortunate in many respects. A great deal of unjust criticism has been leveled against the Social Security Administration. We forget too readily that Congress creates the laws that govern this great Nation.

The social security law should be overhauled in several important areas to keep pace with the progress we have made during the last quarter century. Social security is basically an old-age, survivors, and disability insurance plan. During working years, employees, their employers, and self-employed people pay social security taxes. The law originally was designed to take care of the participants when their earnings stopped. The purpose was to replace part of the earnings the family lost because of retirement, death, or disability.

LONGER LIFESPAN

Medical science has made it possible for man to live longer. These extra years now are possible through wonder drugs, new techniques learned through research, and tremendous expenditures by private enterprise in a never-ending search to provide us with the very best we've grown accustomed to expect. This is democracy in action and we wouldn't have it any other way, but there is a price tag on every step of progress made by mankind. Why lengthen man's life if we cannot make these extra years meaningful?

Here is the conflict. Our present social security laws have not provided adequately for today's living. Contributions to social security are compulsory but the beneficiaries are selected carefully. A large segment of our economy is discriminated against.

Why should we ask everyone to pay predetermined rates for benefits and then make it difficult, if not impossible, for a large majority to ever get more than a token return on their investment?

INCOME LIMITATIONS

Originally, a person getting social security benefits was penalized if he earned more than $1,200 per year from personal services. This penalty was abolished when he became 72 years of age. Then he could earn all he was able to and still collect full benefits. How did one manage in the meantime? Living costs had increased and medical bills were heavier. Why penalize him for working, when he was able to, in order to earn the additional money he needed to meet increased expenses?

Our lawmakers recognized how unfair this situation had become. In 1959, the law was changed. They ruled that no matter how much you earned in a year, you could get monthly benefit payments for any month in which you neither earned wages of more than $100 nor rendered substantial service in self-employment. This offered an opportunity to many people who felt they were entitled to benefits. Additional changes along these lines were made in 1961 and as late as May 1963.

CIRCUMVENTING LAW

Almost everyone wants everything he is entitled to get. We find many perfectly honest people sitting down and figuring every angle to earn as much as they can without losing a benefit check.

People resort to every subterfuge they can think of to arrange their affairs so they can claim maximum benefits. The man on salary tries to make a deal with his employer to get him to give him two, three, or four big checks for work he may do during the year; both conspire to make it appear the services are rendered during a short period of time. Morally, they both feel they are doing no wrong. Of course, their acts are illegal.

The self-employed man is told he does not lose his benefit checks for the months he does not perform substantial service, so he plans to take an extended vacation and arrange a work schedule so his earnings are concentrated in the shortest period of time. He, too, wants to enjoy maximum benefits.

We should not lose sight of the fact that income from interest, dividends, rental property, and capital gains does not hinder a person from drawing social security benefits. The more of this income a man has, the less his need for social security. Nevertheless, if he contributes, he is entitled to benefits. Both the employee and the self-employed man know earnings are subject to review, and they may have to return benefit checks illegally earned. The stakes are high, so many are willing to take the chance. The law is not realistic or democratic. It is morally wrong to encourage a person to degrade himself by conspiring to cheat or to refrain from honest labor in order to collect benefits he has paid for over the years.

CHANGES NEEDED

Why should this be necessary? We spend millions of dollars every year to raise the standards of living in other countries, thereby increasing purchasing power to insure prosperity. Then we turn right around and penalize our own people for attempting to make the most of their God-given abilities. It doesn't make sense. If our people earned more and had social security, too, they could spend more as well. Instead of writing off thousands upon thousands of taxpayers who receive social security benefits plus the little extra they are allowed to earn, we could turn many of these people into taxpayers with dignity, pride, and independence. America has grown because of the faith we've had in the future. Should we destroy this faith in the minds of our senior citizens?

Many of our senior citizens find it difficult to get by on social security alone and even more difficult to work out a plan to supplement their income without endangering the benefits they are entitled to without working.

TALENT IS LOST

Some of our best brains are "going to seed" because they refuse to be a part of this deception in trying to beat an impractical law. Many brilliant men start deteriorating when they reach retirement age because they have lost incentive.

A man between the ages of 62 and 65 is not old. He may feel old if he feels useless, but if he has a purpose in life he has many fruitful years ahead. Some of the most creative work has been produced by men over 62.

Why should Uncle Sam say to these people, "You'll have to cut down on your compensation or do some clever conniving; otherwise, you'll lose some of your benefit checks"?

Or, "Lay off until you are 72. Then you may earn all you can and be perfectly honest about it because you get full benefits regardless of your income?"

Which is more important—to determine man's potential on earth or get man to the moon?

Why not create a commission to conserve the greatest of our natural resources, the preservation of rugged individualism?

Many a man at present retirement age has some good contacts and actually is needed on the job. He may give these up to qualify for benefits and find out at 72 that he has drifted too far away to be of any real value. Then he really feels lost. How much time can you lose from your job or business without feeling you've lost contact? Why waste this precious time?

The good Lord does not set an age for death. Why should we by law set an age for enforced retirement by penalizing those who have much to contribute to our society? Wherever there has been a genuine need, we Americans have filled it. There is a genuine need now to make the most of man's maturity.

Increase in Domestic Farmworkers

SPEECH
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, in further response to the request for information made by the gentleman from California [Mr. Moss], I would like to provide additional data regarding the greencard workers in agriculture.

First, and this I believe is a very basic point, the green-card worker is now and always has been, for the purposes of employment statistics, counted as a domestic worker. Once a work record is established, he is entitled to unemployment compensation or whatever other benefits his type of work provides workers who are American citizens. As a result, the green-card worker is not counted separately and is considered available domestic labor.

Since July 1, 1963, every Mexican applying for a permanent visa to work in the United States has been required to prove that he has a bona fide job offer. The Department of Labor, through its affiliated State employment security agencies, must then check to insure that a labor shortage actually exists in that job classification and that the employment of this worker will not adversely effect U.S. workers similarly employed. On the basis of its findings, the Labor Department may either approve or disapprove admission.

As I reported earlier, between July 1, 1964, and March 24, 1963, there were only 387 Mexicans approved for agriculture work. This compared with 2,099 during the previous fiscal year.

The following chart shows the type of requests and the number approved from July 1, 1963, through March 24 of this year:

Type of request	July 1, 1963, to June 30, 1964	July 1, 1964, to Mar. 24, 1965
Total requests	17,461	20,373
Total approved	4,174	2,832
Nonagriculture requests	8,232	12,430
Nonagriculture approved	2,075	2,447
Agriculture requests	9,229	7,942
Agriculture approvals	2,099	387

Of the 2,099 agriculture approvals in fiscal year 1964, 1,738 were approved in the Dallas, Tex., office. Similarly, from July 1, 1964 to March 24, 1965, 328 of the 387 were approved in the Dallas office.

Furthermore, I have been advised by the U.S. Immigration Service, that the number of green-card workers commuting to the United States on a daily basis to work in agriculture is "negligible."

Mr. Speaker, when we consider the fact that the number of American workers employed in agriculture has increased by more than 23,000 over the figure of a year ago, and when we relate this figure to the very small number of green-card approvals during the last year, it is hard to escape the conclusion that Americans are willing to do farm labor and that more are doing it than ever before.

Fighting the Forces That Threaten Rural America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR CALLAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, I have expressed on several occasions on this floor my concern about the economic forces that threaten rural America. Our farmers and our rural communities are facing problems that can well devastate our farms in our smaller communities. I would like to commend to you and my colleagues a speech given by Harold Bertsch, Administrator, Farmers Home Administration, at a meeting of the USDA Club of Greater Kansas on March 17, 1965, in Kansas City, Mo., on the problems threatening rural America. I would especially like to point out solutions advanced for combatting these problems.

The speech follows:

FIGHTING THE FORCES THAT THREATEN RURAL AMERICA

(By Howard Bertsch)

There are more voices being raised today, about the problems facing the farmer, the rural community, and the rural poor than we have heard for many, many years.

This is good. This is very good.

I had the feeling about 5 years ago that a great blanket had been drawn over rural America and that all of its troubles were to be hidden by a perpetual winter snow. No spring would ever come again to reveal the ugliness, and the promise.

All this has changed.

I am impressed by the quantity and the quality of the words I am reading, and hearing, about rural problems.

I intend today to repeat these words.

They state the case well. They come from many sources.

First, what is it they say about the family farm?

Let me begin by reading you a few paragraphs written by a Wisconsin farm wife this past January in a Catholic magazine and made a part of the RECORD by Congressman CALLAN, of Nebraska:

"Within a radius of 2 to 3 miles of the family farmland, we can count eight deserted farmsteads. This is sad and a little frightening. Analyzed, it means that about a fourth of the rural people in our neighborhood have left the land. Multiply this by thousands of similar sections of the country and you have a very disheartening result indeed. These people have been forced to sell their land, or perhaps, have left it idle because they are weary of trying to continue the uphill climb toward a fair and just reward for their labors. The saddest part of the dilemma is that 9 out of 10 persons, thus inhibited, do not want to leave their homes and their land which may have been in their family for generations."

This is an emotional statement. Written by a person who cares very much and is not afraid to let her feelings show.

Senator LONG of Missouri recently inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from a farm woman in Missouri who was more restrained in her language, but equally effective in presenting the farmer's plight. I think the two statements go well together.

"DEAR SENATOR LONG: (The farm wife begins.) There has been published recently in our county a summary of farm records from a group of farmers who live in Audrain County.

"This summary shows up very vividly what a number of people know is happening and has been happening to the farmer's economic condition.

"The average farm and family earnings was $6,147. This figure includes $478 for the value of home-produced food. The average capital managed on these farms was $161,000. * * * The most simple arithmetic would show us that this capital would have produced a greater return just invested in Government bonds. * * * In every operation whose records were analyzed there was a negative return for labor. * * * We realize the stock and trite answer that supply and demand is the answer. We are aware of the very firm opinion that the law of supply and demand has not worked and will not work for agriculture unless its academic meaning is reversed—that is, the farmer supply his product and demand a price. If he doesn't lose his self-respect first, he just might do this."

Even this farm woman begins to get emotional toward the end of her letter. Who wouldn't when they know that they, year after year, literally give their labor away.

Now let me quote from a different source, from a recent statement by Congressman HAROLD COOLEY who for many years has been chairman of the Agriculture Committee of the House of Representatives.

Congressman COOLEY, irked by statements that indicated that a million farmers were all the farmers needed, had this to say:

"If a million farmers can produce food for all of us—why not a half million, a quarter of a million, a hundred thousand?

"Then, where will these few thousand large individual or cooperate operated farms get their supplies? From the local machinery dealers? The feed dealers? The seed dealer? Not on your life. You would see direct buying from wholesaler and manufacturer that would leave little room for the local farm supply dealer and little need for the other local retailer who would be depending on a dwindling hinterland.

"You would create poverty in rural America faster than you could lick it—even with the best intentions. It has been suggested that food production might eventually be concentrated in a few strong hands—which by that time might be able to exert sufficient control to manage their production as auto builders manage theirs. And this would avoid surpluses and then get the Government out of agriculture. But would this be a happy solution?

"Would the American public then be at the mercy of a few giant producers who would control their very sustenance? Or would the American people take it upon themselves to regulate food production publicly as they regulate any other public utility controlling the Nation's lifeline? Both of these have been suggested as serious possibilities. Am I overdramatizing? I do not believe so. We have already gone a long way down a road marked by abandoned farms and dying towns. And this is no time to run out on agriculture."

This is a rather dramatic statement, too, considering the fact that the chairman is usually rather restrained in his remarks.

Let me add one sentence from a Farmers Union publication that, in a way, sums it all up:

"There were 6.8 million farms 30 years ago. There are half that number today."

Now, as part and parcel of the current debate over what is happening to the American farm, there is a never-ending "numbers" game being played. Everyone recognizes that the number of farms had dropped down to 3.5 million by 1960. Too many people are spending their time trying to rationalize some ideal number of farmers. These people like to work out neat tables showing how incomes are divided among the 3.5 million. To this they add tables showing which income levels are producing most of the food.

The tables look neat. The conclusions drawn seem obvious.

But I say we must resist the pleasure that comes from playing the "numbers" game.

Behind those numbers are people. And you cannot fit people into the unreal world of statistics.

You just cannot do it.

The only reason we try to do it is that we have more figures on our agricultural economy than on any other section of our economy, and more people, with more time, to spend their efforts in arranging and rearranging those figures.

I say, forget figures.

Instead let us set ourselves a simple goal: To help as many people as we can to find in rural America a place in which to live and work and enjoy life.

We have support in this position.

President Johnson has said time and again that he did not intend to stand by and see the family farm plowed under.

And in his recent farm message he talked of helping all farmers, not just the favored few.

The President said our programs should:

"Provide efficient family farmers an opportunity to earn parity of income;

"Assist those small farmers who have little chance to enlarge their operations but whose age, physical handicap, or lack of education, prevent their shifting to other employment; and

"Assist those farm families who seek to enlarge their productive resources in order to obtain a decent living and have the opportunity and the capacity to do so."

It seems to me a careful reading of the President's message indicates he is not overly concerned with numbers.

In the Farmers Home Administration we are doing what we can with all the talent we possess to serve the full range of family farmers. There is no lower limit. If a man applies for our help and we can help him, we do so.

We do not ask him if he bears a magical number.

Now about the rural community. There is almost as much being said today about rural communities as about family farms.

There are those who say that the small rural community is a thing of the past. That a community has to be a certain size to survive.

Here too we refuse to play the "numbers" game.

The Farmers Home Administration is currently engaged in several methods of strengthening rural communities.

We are advancing funds for rural water systems. This phase of our endeavors gained its strength in Kansas and has recently demonstrated its appeal in Missouri.

We are advancing funds for the improvement of rural housing including special projects for senior citizens. Here too the Kansas City area is setting the pace with an outstanding example of a rural senior citizen housing project in nearby Oak Grove, Mo.

We are helping rural communities build recreation areas.

In all these endeavors we do not ask a rural community if it is on some magic numbers list. We ask only if it can repay our loan.

We have support for this approval in high quarters, too.

The President has said that he would not stand idly by and watch rural communities wither away.

And in his farm message he called for the economic development of smaller and medium-sized communities to insure a healthy economic base for rural America.

There has been an equal, if not greater amount of talk and discussion lately about the rural poor.

This is really encouraging. For even more than the family farmers, and the small rural communities, the rural poor were swept under the table during the blank, unseeing years of the fifties.

One of the best statements about poverty has been, not a new statement, but the recent frequent repetition of Mrs. Roosevelt's words:

"Only in the 20th century, perhaps, has anyone asked why people are poor. * * * Only today has it become a matter for everyman's conscience. And now—for poverty is like a giant infection which contaminates everything—we know that unless we can eradicate it by the use of all of our new scientific and economic materials, it can in time destroy us."

President Johnson's position in his war on poverty is well known. In his farm message he dwelt at length on the extent of rural poverty. There is no mistaking his meaning when he says "we can wage an unconditional war on poverty and win it."

In the Farmers Home Administration we find that this is one area where no one is playing the "numbers" game. For sure there are still those who wonder just how much can be accomplished. But no one is arguing that what this country needs is blank thousand poverty stricken families, no more, no less.

The number here is zero.

We take a great deal of satisfaction in knowing that within 2 months' time we have helped some 2,000 low-income rural families get a few of the resources they need for better living. We are making this the major phase of our endeavors.

I must confess that I, for one, am stimulated by the vast amount of discussion and debate that is taking place.

And by the clear green light we have received to drive ahead as hard as we can drive to strengthen the family farm, rebuild the rural community, and wipe poverty from the face of the land.

This is a great time and a great period in which to be a part of USDA.

We are coming alive again. We have a purpose. We have a mission.

We are involved with families, with people first, and with inanimate objects, second.

If we will but bring the resources to the people, they will solve their problems.

Let us get about the task that lies before us.

Medicare-Social Security: A Historic Milestone

SPEECH

OF

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6675) to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under the Social Security Act with a supplementary health benefits program and an expanded program of medical assistance, to increase benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to improve

the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Chairman, today is a historic occasion for the people of Los Angeles, the State of California, and, indeed, in the life of our Nation.

I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the leadership, as well as the individual Members of the House, on both sides of this debate, on the statesmanlike manner in which we have considered and now overwhelmingly approved, on a nearly 3-to-1 vote of 313 to 115, the landmark Medicare and Social Security Amendments of 1965.

As one of the bill's original sponsors, I am proud to have offered my full support and to have played some part in the passage of this progressive and forward-looking legislation.

The measure not only contains the most comprehensive medicare health insurance plan for America's senior citizens ever adopted by either House of Congress, but it also includes the largest increase in social security benefits approved since the program was started 30 years ago.

We owe a special debt of gratitude to both President Lyndon Johnson and former President John Kennedy for the outstanding national leadership they demonstrated in the long struggle to bring this urgent matter before the people of the country and before their elected representatives here in the Nation's Capital.

The historic action we have taken today is of particular benefit to California's 1½ million elderly citizens, as well as the 17 million other Americans over the age of 65, for it will enable them to prepay in their earlier, more productive working years, most of their own hospital and related health expenses during retirement.

In addition, the bill provides an optional supplementary health insurance plan available at minimum cost to all persons over 65 and designed to cover their major medical and doctor bills.

Finally, the measure includes a long-overdue 7-percent across-the-board cost-of-living increase in social security benefits for some 20 million Americans—a real help to them by raising the minimum level of their basic economic protection.

These three key provisions of the Medicare and Social Security Amendments of 1965, plus several other substantial improvements in current federally assisted health programs, make this bill the most significant piece of health and social welfare legislation in American history.

Mr. Chairman, I have always been convinced that the elderly are not asking for charity.

But they do want and deserve, and I believe this measure will help give them, a system offering an opportunity to plan for the future—to permit them to live their remaining years in earned dignity, secure in the knowledge that they have provided adequately for their own needs during retirement years.

Because of the tremendous importance of this legislation to every citizen, I will insert at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD information outlining its provisions.

The first statement, entitled "A Brief Overall Summary," is a short description of the bill, and the other article, entitled "A Summary Analysis of Major Provisions," contains a more detailed explanation of the Medicare and Social Security Amendments of 1965.

The statement and article follow:

BRIEF OVERALL SUMMARY

The bill establishes two coordinated health insurance programs for persons 65 or over under the Social Security Act: (1) a "basic" plan providing protection against the costs of hospital and related care, financed through a separate payroll tax and trust fund; and (2) a voluntary "supplementary" plan covering payments for physicians' and other medical and health services financed through small monthly premiums by individual participants matched equally by a Federal Government general revenue contribution.

Undergirding the two new insurance programs would be a greatly expanded medical care program for the needy and the medically needy. This program would combine all the vendor medical provisions for the aged, blind, disabled, and families with dependent children now in five titles of the Social Security Act under a uniform program and matching formula in a single new title. The Federal matching share for cash payments for these needy persons would also be increased; services for maternal and child health, crippled children, and the mentally retarded would be expanded; a 5-year program of "special project grants" to provide comprehensive health care and services for needy children of school age, or preschool, would be authorized; and present limitations on Federal participation in public assistance to aged individuals in tuberculosis or mental disease hospitals would be removed under certain conditions.

With respect to the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system the bill would increase benefits by 7 percent across the board with a $4 minimum increase for a worker, cover certain currently uncovered occupations and wages (doctors, and income from tips), continue benefits to age 22 for certain children in school, provide social security tax exemption of self-employment income of certain religious groups opposed to insurance, provide actuarially reduced benefits for widows at age 60, and pay benefits, on a transitional basis, to certain persons currently 72 or over now ineligible; liberalize the definition for disability insurance benefits, increase the amount an individual is permitted to earn without suffering full deductions from benefits, revise the tax schedule, and increase the earnings counted for benefit and tax purposes so as to fully finance the changes made, and make certain changes in allocations to the old-age and survivors insurance and disability insurance trust funds.

SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF MAJOR PROVISIONS—H.R. 6675—MEDICARE AND SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965 (HOUSE VERSION, APRIL 1965)

This analysis of the medicare and social security amendments of 1965 (H.R. 6675), as acted on by the House is in the three tables—(1) a description of the basic hospitalization program; (2) a description of the optional supplementary medical program; and (3) a description of amendments to the Social Security Act, the Kerr-Mills law, and other miscellaneous provisions.

TABLE 1—BASIC HOSPITALIZATION PROGRAM (UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM)

Eligibility: All persons aged 65 years or over who are now, or will in the future, be entitled to monthly social security or railroad retirement benefits (except Federal employees who retired after 1959).

All persons aged 65 years or over, or who will reach age 65 before 1968, who are not eligible for monthly social security or railroad retirement benefits. This part of the program to be paid for from general revenues of the Federal Government, not paid for out of social security trust funds.

Effective date: July 1, 1966, except for services in extended care facilities, which will be effective January 1, 1967.

Enrollment: No enrollment necessary. Coverage is automatic to those eligible.

Cost to the individual: Benefits extended to eligible persons without cost as a matter of right; no "needs test" required.

Benefits:

1. Inpatient hospital charges for up to 60 days of hospitalization in each spell of illness, subject to a $40 deductible amount.

2. Twenty days of nursing home care in each spell of illness, after transfer from hospital; 2 additional days of nursing home care (if needed) can be added for each day that the patient's hospital stay was less than 60 days, to a maximum total of 100 days.

3. Outpatient hospital diagnostic services, subject to a $20 deductible amount for such services furnished by the same hospital during a 20-day period.

4. Posthospital home health services for up to 100 visits after discharge from hospital or nursing home (when patient is under care of physician).

Financing: Through the social security system—payroll taxes from employee, employer, and by self-employed persons. Taxes paid into separate hospital insurance trust fund to assure that actuarial soundness of trust funds and the entire social security system is safeguarded. Tax rates for employee (matched by employer) will be: 1966, 0.35 percent; 1967–72, 0.50 percent; 1973–75, 0.55 percent; 1976–79, 0.60 percent; 1980–86, 0.70 percent; 1987 on, 0.80 percent.

These amounts would be automatically deducted from payroll check (as at present) on first $5,600 earnings a year during 1966–70 period. Thereafter, they would be based on first $6,600 of annual earnings. Program will cost each employee, employer only 38 cents a week, rising to about 54 cents a week for each during 1967–72 period.

TABLE 2—OPTIONAL SUPPLEMENTARY MEDICAL PROGRAM (UNDER PRIVATE INSURANCE CARRIERS)

Eligibility: All persons age 65 or over, on an optional, voluntary basis, regardless of whether or not they are eligible for social security, railroad retirement, or other benefits.

Effective date: July 1, 1966.

Enrollment: Enrollment for persons age 65 years or over before January 1, 1966, will begin 2 months after enactment of bill and continue to March 31, 1966. Regular enrolling periods thereafter.

Cost to the individual: If person chooses to participate in this program, it will cost him $3 per month. Amount would be automatically deducted from monthly benefit check of those persons receiving social security or railroad retirement benefits. Others would pay their contribution into special trust fund directly.

Benefits: In addition to the benefits listed in table 1, those choosing to participate in the supplementary medical program would be entitled to:

1. Physicians' and surgical services furnished in a hospital, clinic, office, or in the home.

2. Hospital care for 60 days in a spell of illness in a mental hospital (180-day lifetime maximum).

3. Home health services (without regard to hospitalization) for up to 100 visits during each calendar year.

4. Additional medical and health services, provided in or out of a medical institution, including diagnostic X-ray and laboratory tests, electrocardiograms, basal metabolism readings, and other diagnostic tests; X-ray,

radium, and radioactive isotype therapy; ambulance services (under limited conditions); surgical dressings, splints, casts, iron lungs, oxygen tents, artificial limbs, eyes, etc.

Benefits under this program are subject to an annual deductible amount of $50. Then the program will pay 80 percent of the patient's bills (above the $50 deductible).

Financing: Persons participating in this program will pay $3 a month ($36 a year).—An additional $3 per person per month will be paid into fund by Federal Government out of general revenues.

TABLE 3—OTHER PROVISIONS

Social security benefits: Increases by 7 percent (with a minimum increase of $4 a month) all old-age, survivors, and disability insurance benefits. Increases would be retroactive to January 1, 1965. Now minimum benefit raised from $40 to $44 a month. Will benefit an estimate 20 million persons.

Child's insurance benefits: A child's insurance benefits would continue to be paid until the person reaches age 22 (instead of age 18) if child is attending accredited school or college as a full-time student after he reaches age 18. Will be effective as of January 1, 1965, and benefit estimated 295,000 young people.

Optional benefits for widows at age 60: Widows may have option of receiving social security benefits at age 60, with actuarial reduction of benefits they would otherwise receive at age 62. Effective for second month after enactment of bill, benefiting estimated 185,000 widows.

Disability insurance amendments: Liberalizes eligibility requirements and waiting period for persons covered by disability insurance provisions of Social Security Act. Will benefit estimated 155,000 disabled workers.

Benefits to persons at age 72 or over: Liberalizes eligibility requirements by providing a basic benefit of $35 a month at age 72 or over to certain persons with a minimum of three quarters of coverage under the Social Security Act, acquired at any time since the beginning of the program in 1937. Will benefit an estimated 355,000 persons.

Retirement test: Liberalizes the social security earned income limitation. Beginning in the 1966 tax year, a person receiving benefits will be able to earn $1,200 a year without having his benefits reduced; earnings between $1,200 and $2,400 a year would be subject to a $1 reduction in benefits for each $2 of earnings up to $2,400; a $1 reduction in benefits for each $1 of earnings above $2,400 would take place. Existing law limits this provision to $1,700 instead of $2,400.

Miscellaneous amendments: Other amendments to the Social Security Act authorize benefits to certain divorced women, coverage of self-employed physicians and interns, amendments affecting annual gross earnings of farmers, coverage of cash tips received by an employee after 1965, and an exemption from social security taxes of self-employed persons of the Amish and other religious sects.

Improvement of Kerr-Mills program: Extends the provisions of expanded State medical assistance programs not only to the indigent aged, but also to needy persons who are part of the dependent children, blind, and permanently and totally disabled programs. Establishes a single and separate medical care program to replace the differing provisions for the needy in other parts of the Social Security Act. Provides a level of redical services States must offer to receive Federal payments. Requires States to provide a flexible income test for eligibility.

Other provisions

Public assistance amendments: Increases the Federal share of payments under all State public assistance programs, effective January 1, 1966. Contains other amendments providing Federal incentive to States to benefit aged persons in tubercular and mental institutions.

Child health program amendments: Increases Federal authorization for maternal and child health services and for crippled children services. Authorizes grants to higher education institutions to train professional personnel for health and related care of crippled children, particularly mentally retarded children with multiple handicaps. Authorizes a new 5-year program of special project grants to provide health care and services for children from needy areas. Authorizes grants to help States, to implement mental retardation plans.

Financing improved social security benefits: Improvements in the regular social security program and increased benefits provided in the bill would be financed through a revised payroll tax schedule. Taxes on employees, employers, and self-employed persons are paid into social security trust fund as in the past 30 years. Rates of tax are designed to guarantee the actuarial soundness of the social security system.

The revised tax schedule and the rates under existing law are:

[In percent]

Years	Employee and employer tax rate (each)		Self-employed tax rate	
	Existing law	Proposed in bill	Existing law	Proposed in bill
1965	3.625	3.625	5.4	5.4
1966–67	4.125	4.0	6.2	6.0
1968	4.625	4.0	6.9	6.0
1969–72	4.625	4.4	6.9	6.6
1973 on	4.625	4.8	6.9	7.0

As in the past, these amounts would be automatically deducted from payroll check. Tax would be paid on first $5,600 (instead of present $4,800) during the 1966–70 period. Thereafter, they would be paid on first $6,600 of annual earnings.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

REPRESENTATIVES WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Speaker: John W. McCormack

Abbitt, Watkins M., *Va.*
Abernethy, Thomas G., *Miss.* — 6278 29th St.
Adair, E. Ross, *Ind.* — 4000 Mass. Ave.
Adams, Brock, *Wash.*
Addabbo, Joseph P., *N.Y.*
Albert, Carl, *Okla.* — 4614 Reno Rd.
Anderson, John B., *Ill.*
Anderson, William R., *Tenn.* — 3006 P St.
Andrews, George W., *Ala.* — 3108 Cathedral Ave.
Andrews, Glenn, *Ala.*
Andrews, Mark, *N. Dak.*
Annunzio, Frank, *Ill.*
Arends, Leslie C., *Ill.* — 4815 Dexter St.
Ashbrook, John M., *Ohio.*
Ashley, Thomas L., *Ohio.*
Ashmore, Robert T., *S.C.*
Aspinall, Wayne N., *Colo.* — The Towers Apts., 4201 Cathedral Ave.
Ayres, William H., *Ohio.*
Baldwin, John F., Jr., *Calif.*
Bandstra, Bert, *Iowa.*
Baring, Walter S., *Nev.*
Barrett, William A., *Pa.*
Bates, William H., *Mass.*
Battin, James F., *Mont.*
Beckworth, Lindley, *Tex.*
Belcher, Page, *Okla.*
Bell, Alphonzo, *Calif.*
Bennett, Charles E., *Fla.* — 1314 Rusticway Lane, Falls Church, Va.
Berry, E. Y., *S. Dak.* — 118 Schotts Court NE.
Betts, Jackson E., *Ohio.*
Bingham, Jonathan B., *N.Y.*
Blatnik, John A., *Minn.*
Boggs, Hale, *La.*
Boland, Edward P., *Mass.*
Bolling, Richard, *Mo.* — 307 Warrenton Dr., Silver Spring, Md.
Bolton, Frances P. (Mrs.), *Ohio.* — 2301 Wyo. Ave.
Bonner, Herbert C., *N.C.* — Calvert-Woodley
Bow, Frank T., *Ohio.* — 4301 Mass. Ave.
Brademas, John, *Ind.*
Bray, William G., *Ind.*
Brock, W. E. (Bill), *Tenn.*
Brooks, Jack, *Tex.*
Broomfield, William S., *Mich.*
Brown, Clarence J., *Ohio.*
Brown, George E., Jr., *Calif.*
Broyhill, James T., *N.C.*
Broyhill, Joel T., *Va.*
Buchanan, John, *Ala.*
Burke, James A., *Mass.*
Burleson, Omar, *Tex.* — 2737 Devonshire Pl.
Burton, Laurence J., *Utah.*
Burton, Phillip, *Calif.*
Byrne, James A., *Pa.*
Byrnes, John W., *Wis.* — 1215 25th St. S., Arlington, Va.
Cabell, Earle, *Tex.*
Cahill, William T., *N.J.*
Callan, Clair, *Nebr.*
Callaway, Howard H., *Ga.*
Cameron, Ronald Brooks, *Calif.*
Carey, Hugh L., *N.Y.*
Carter, Tim Lee, *Ky.*
Casey, Bob, *Tex.*
Cederberg, Elford A., *Mich.*
Celler, Emanuel, *N.Y.* — The Mayflower
Chamberlain, Charles E., *Mich.*
Chelf, Frank, *Ky.*
Clancy, Donald D., *Ohio.*
Clark, Frank M., *Pa.* — 220 C St. SE.
Clausen, Don H., *Calif.*
Clawson, Del, *Calif.*
Cleveland, James C., *N.H.*
Clevenger, Raymond F., *Mich.*
Cohelan, Jeffery, *Calif.* — 1028 New House Office Building
Collier, Harold R., *Ill.*
Colmer, William M., *Miss.*
Conable, Barber B., Jr., *N.Y.*
Conte, Silvio O., *Mass.* — 5619 Lamar Rd., Washington 16, D.C.
Conyers, John, Jr., *Mich.*
Cooley, Harold D., *N.C.* — 2601 Woodley Pl.
Corbett, Robert J., *Pa.*
Corman, James C., *Calif.*
Craley, N. Neiman, Jr., *Pa.*
Cramer, William C., *Fla.* — 6714 Joallen Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Culver, John C., *Iowa.*
Cunningham, Glenn, *Nebr.* — 4920 Yorktown Blvd., Arlington, Va.
Curtin, Willard S., *Pa.*
Curtis, Thomas B., *Mo.*
Daddario, Emilio Q., *Conn.*
Dague, Paul B., *Pa.*
Daniels, Dominick V., *N.J.*
Davis, Glenn R., *Wis.*
Davis, John W., *Ga.*
Dawson, William L., *Ill.*
de la Garza, Eligio, *Tex.*
Delaney, James J., *N.Y.*
Dent, John H., *Pa.*
Denton, Winfield K., *Ind.*
Derwinski, Edward J., *Ill.*
Devine, Samuel L., *Ohio.*
Dickinson, William L., *Ala.*
Diggs, Charles C., Jr., *Mich.*
Dingell, John D., *Mich.*
Dole, Robert, *Kans.* — 6136 Beachway Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Donohue, Harold D., *Mass.*
Dorn, W. J. Bryan, *S.C.* — 2030 Laburnum St., McLean, Va.
Dow, John G., *N.Y.*
Dowdy, John, *Tex.*
Downing, Thomas N., *Va.*
Dulski, Thaddeus J., *N.Y.* — 1719 New House Office Building
Duncan, John J., *Tenn.*
Duncan, Robert B., *Oreg.* — 914 Lakeview Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Dwyer, Florence P. (Mrs.), *N.J.*
Dyal, Ken W., *Calif.*
Edmondson, Ed, *Okla.*
Edwards, Don, *Calif.*
Edwards, Jack, *Ala.*
Ellsworth, Robert F., *Kans.*
Erlenborn, John N., *Ill.*
Evans, Frank E., *Colo.*
Everett, Robert A., *Tenn.*
Evins, Joe L., *Tenn.* — 5044 Klingle St.
Fallon, George H., *Md.*
Farbstein, Leonard, *N.Y.*
Farnsley, Charles P., *Ky.*
Farnum, Billie S., *Mich.*
Fascell, Dante B., *Fla.*
Feighan, Michael A., *Ohio.*
Findley, Paul, *Ill.*
Fino, Paul A., *N.Y.*
Fisher, O. C., *Tex.* — Calvert-Woodley
Flood, Daniel J., *Pa.* — The Congressional
Flynt, John J., Jr., *Ga.*
Fogarty, John E., *R.I.* — 1235 New House Office Building
Foley, Thomas S., *Wash.*
Ford, Gerald R., *Mich.* — 514 Crown View Dr., Alexandria, Va.
Ford, William D., *Mich.*
Fountain, L. H., *N.C.* — The Westchester
Fraser, Donald M., *Minn.*
Frelinghuysen, Peter H. B., *N.J.* — 3014 N St.
Friedel, Samuel N., *Md.*
Fulton, James G., *Pa.*
Fulton, Richard, *Tenn.*
Fuqua, Don, *Fla.*
Gallagher, Cornelius E., *N.J.*
Garmatz, Edward A., *Md.*
Gathings, E. C., *Ark.*
Gettys, Tom S., *S.C.*
Giaimo, Robert N., *Conn.*
Gibbons, Sam, *Fla.*
Gilbert, Jacob H., *N.Y.*
Gilligan, John J., *Ohio.*
Gonzalez, Henry B., *Tex.* — 200 C St. SE.
Goodell, Charles E., *N.Y.* — 3842 Macomb St.
Grabowski, Bernard F., *Conn.*
Gray, Kenneth J., *Ill.*
Green, Edith (Mrs.), *Oreg.*
Green, William J., *Pa.*
Greigg, Stanley L., *Iowa.*
Grider, George W., *Tenn.*
Griffin, Robert P., *Mich.*
Griffiths, Martha W. (Mrs.), *Mich.*
Gross, H. R., *Iowa.*
Grover, James R., Jr., *N.Y.*
Gubser, Charles S., *Calif.*
Gurney, Edward J., *Fla.*
Hagan, G. Elliott, *Ga.*
Hagen, Harlan, *Calif.*
Haley, James A., *Fla.*
Hall, Durward G., *Mo.*
Halleck, Charles A., *Ind.* — 4926 Upton St.
Halpern, Seymour, *N.Y.*
Hamilton, Lee H., *Ind.*
Hanley, James M., *N.Y.*
Hanna, Richard T., *Calif.*
Hansen, George, *Idaho.*
Hansen, John R., *Iowa.* — 800 4th St. SW., Apt. S-701
Hansen, Julia Butler (Mrs.), *Wash.*
Hardy, Porter, Jr., *Va.*
Harris, Oren, *Ark.* — 1627 Myrtle St.
Harsha, William H., *Ohio.*
Harvey, James, *Mich.*
Harvey, Ralph, *Ind.*
Hathaway, William D., *Maine.*
Hawkins, Augustus F., *Calif.*
Hays, Wayne L., *Ohio.* — 1323 Barger Dr., Falls Church, Va.
Hébert, F. Edward, *La.* — 26 Cockrell St., Alexandria, Va.
Hechler, Ken, *W. Va.*
Helstoski, Henry, *N.J.*
Henderson, David N., *N.C.*
Herlong, A. S., Jr., *Fla.*
Hicks, Floyd V., *Wash.*
Holifield, Chet, *Calif.*
Holland, Elmer J., *Pa.*
Horton, Frank J., *N.Y.*
Hosmer, Craig, *Calif.*
Howard, James J., *N.J.*
Hull, W. R., Jr., *Mo.*
Hungate, William L., *Mo.*
Huot, J. Oliva, *N.H.*
Hutchinson, Edward, *Mich.*
Ichord, Richard (Dick), *Mo.*
Irwin, Donald J., *Conn.*
Jacobs, Andrew, Jr., *Ind.*
Jarman, John, *Okla.*
Jennings, W. Pat, *Va.*
Joelson, Charles S., *N.J.*
Johnson, Albert W., *Pa.*
Johnson, Harold T., *Calif.*
Johnson, Jed, Jr., *Okla.*
Jonas, Charles Raper, *N.C.*
Jones, Paul C., *Mo.* — 1111 Army-Navy Dr., Arlington, Va.
Jones, Robert E., *Ala.*
Karsten, Frank M., *Mo.*
Karth, Joseph E., *Minn.*
Kastenmeier, Robert W., *Wis.*
Kee, James, *W. Va.* — 5441 16th Ave., Hyattsville, Md.
Keith, Hastings, *Mass.* — 5906 Harwick Rd.,
Kelly, Edna F. (Mrs.), *N.Y.*
Keogh, Eugene J., *N.Y.* — The Mayflower
King, Carleton J., *N.Y.*
King, Cecil R., *Calif.*
King, David S., *Utah.*
Kirwan, Michael J., *Ohio.*
Kluczynski, John C., *Ill.*
Kornegay, Horace R., *N.C.*
Krebs, Paul J., *N.J.*
Kunkel, John C., *Pa.*
Laird, Melvin R., *Wis.*
Landrum, Phil M., *Ga.*
Langen, Odin, *Minn.*
Latta, Delbert L., *Ohio.*
Leggett, Robert L., *Calif.*
Lennon, Alton, *N.C.*
Lindsay, John V., *N.Y.*
Lipscomb, Glenard P., *Calif.*

Appendix

A Thoughtful Gift to Marquette University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the attention of my colleagues the recent donation of $2,250,000 to Marquette University of Milwaukee by Mr. C. Frederic Wehr, retired chairman of the Wehr Steel Co.

This gift, the largest in the history of the university and, indeed, of the city of Milwaukee, will make possible the construction of a new chemistry building on the campus.

Another part of the money will be used to endow distinguished professorships in chemistry and physics and the remainder will be used to create a science endowment fund.

This gift has sparked a renewed effort in our community to provide the contributions—both by industry and individual donors—needed to complete Marquette's current $15 million fund drive. The funds are greatly needed to maintain the university's role as an important educational center in the Midwest.

Through his gift, Mr. Wehr has assisted not only Marquette, but also the people of Milwaukee and Wisconsin who will benefit from the enhanced science programs which the funds will make possible.

In order to acquaint my colleagues further with this outstanding example of civic-minded giving, I am inserting at this point an article from the Milwaukee Journal of February 11, and an editorial which the same paper ran on the following day:

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Feb. 11, 1965]

MU GETS $2,250,000 FROM STEEL EXECUTIVE—BIGGEST GIFT IN HISTORY OF JESUIT SCHOOL; UNIVERSITY WILL USE DONATIONS BY WEHR FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF SCIENCE CENTER

Marquette University has been given $2,250,000, the largest gift in the school's 84-year history, to be applied to establishment of a science center.

The donor is C. Frederic (Todd) Wehr, retired chairman of the Wehr Steel Co., of Milwaukee, who now lives in Libertyville, Ill.

The gift was announced Thursday after the 75-year-old industrialist and Father William F. Kelley, president of the Jesuit university, signed three sets of documents transferring the funds in ceremonies at the university.

The chancellor of the university, signed the agreement along with Wehr and Father Kelley.

The gift will be divided into three parts.

One, of $500,000, will go toward a new chemistry building which will bear Wehr's name. It is to be erected within 3 years on a plot east of the new life sciences building, 530 North 15th Street.

Another part, $750,000, will be used to endow a distinguished professorship in chemistry and one in physics.

The remaining million dollars will establish the Wehr Science Center endowment, to be used as a special board of trustees sees fit.

Marquette has agreed to provide at least 4 million from its own resources for the new chemistry building and a companion structure for physics.

Those two buildings, with the existing life sciences building, will constitute the Wehr Science Center, named for Henry and Barbara Wehr, the donor's parents, who died in 1924 and 1926, respectively.

The new chemistry building will include a reception room built as a memorial to the parents of the donor.

Wehr's gift raised the total pledged in the greater Marquette fund drive to $9,578,721, the university said. In all, 3,936 donors have contributed or pledged.

Father Kelley said the Wehrs had made large gifts to the university in the past, principally for medical education.

Wehr said that he had been talking with university officials about the grant for roughly 2 years.

WEHR SPEAKS QUIETLY

The signing itself was a matter of fact procedure. When Wehr spoke at all, he spoke quietly. He penned his signature as emotionlessly as though he were signing a luncheon check.

He stands more than 6 feet tall. Except for a diamond ring on his left hand, he was conservatively garbed. His suit, which included a vest, was oxford gray. His shirt and tie were blue.

He arrived at the university in a white, chauffeur-driven Cadillac.

The life sciences building, completed in 1962, will be named for the Wehrs in recognition of their aid.

START BUILDING IN SPRING

Plans for the new chemistry building are virtually complete. Construction is to begin this spring. The site is in the Marquette urban renewal area approved January 26 by the common council.

The physics building is to be completed in 5 years.

Marquette University agreed to seek outstanding scholars for the professorships within 18 months.

It also agreed that after major projects of the science center were completed it would "use its best efforts to establish and endow other professorships * * * to promote the growth of science education and research in the allied fields of mathematics, biochemistry, biomedical engineering, and computer technology; to obtain funds to provide science scholarships for superior students and to erect such additional facilities as may be required."

The agreement said that Marquette would now be able to "proceed promptly to integrate the proposed center with the MU urban renewal area, promptly apply for matching funds for research from the Federal Government and for other assistance, and provide laboratories and equipment which will improve the opportunities for professors to acquire assistance from various national philanthropic sources."

WEHR MAKES STATEMENT

After the papers were signed, Wehr said: "I have given a great deal of thought to this thing over the years.

"My father came here in 1856. The family always has been proud of Marquette, has always looked up to Marquette.

"I thought that with Marquette we could keep our name in the State of Wisconsin for many, many years to come."

Wehr is himself a graduate of Cornell University in Ithaca, N.Y. He attended West Division High School.

Marquette's current fund drive goal it $15 million. It plans to seek another $15 million between 1966 and 1971. In the present campaign the school has been given 21 gifts of $100,000 or more.

MRS. CRAMER GAVE $929,470

Its largest previous individual gift was the estate of Mrs. William E. Cramer, widow of the editor of the Evening Wisconsin, a Milwaukee daily newspaper which has passed out of existence. She died in 1922, leaving a will which, when settled in 1934, provided $929,470 for the medical school.

The present medical school building is named for her.

The Ford Foundation granted Marquette $1,180,000 in 1956 and another $1,796,000 in 1957.

The Wehr family included four sons and three daughters, of whom the only survivor is Todd.

The others were Henry, Edward R., William, Mrs. Louise Falk, Mrs. August Grau, and Miss Louise Wehr.

The steel company was founded in 1910 by their father. It is a large electrical steel casting firm.

PRESIDENT UNTIL 1958

Wehr was president until 1958, when the steel firm acquired the Dings Magnetic Separator Co. At that time he became board chairman and Robert L. Manegold became president.

Wehr moved to Libertyville in 1963 and sold his interest in the company in 1964. Now known as the Wehr Corp., it has plants in Verona (Dane County) and Chicago as well as in Milwaukee.

There was no connection between the announcement and another fact mentioned at the university. Thursday was Father Kelley's 51st birthday.

[From the Milwaukee Journal, Feb. 12, 1965]

THOUGHTFUL GIFT

The $2,250,000 gift to Marquette University from C. Frederic Wehr, retired steel company executive, is not only handsomely generous but also constitutes thoughtful giving.

Only part is earmarked for a specific "brick and mortar" project—the $500,000 that will go toward a new chemistry building. Marquette will also use other funds for this structure and a physics building which, with the existing life sciences building, will make up the Wehr Science Center.

Another $750,000 will endow distinguished professorships in chemistry and physics, and the remaining $1 million will set up an endowment to be used as a special board of trustees sees fit. The arrangement thus permits flexibility and assures a core of talent around which a strong scientific faculty may be molded.

The gift, which is the largest in Marquette's history, may serve a further purpose. It may inspire other donors to provide the gifts, large and small, that Marquette needs to meet its current $15 million fund drive.

Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co. Opens Microfilm Systems Laboratory for Government and Industry in Washington, D.C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, the programing of information storage and retrieval systems for Government and industry has become an increasingly significant function of the microfilm industry in light of the growing demand for methods of streamlining recordkeeping and related activities in our automated and computerized business society.

To accommodate this need, the 3M Co.—Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing—recently opened a microfilm systems development laboratory in Washington. I attended the news conference held in connection with the opening, at which Internal Revenue Commissioner Sheldon S. Cohen explained the new nationwide microfilm system recently set up to place the massive legal records of the Service on a uniform basis

Mr. Cohen described the reports and information retrieval activity—RIRA—a magnetic tape-computer-based system that utilizes microfilm and high-speed microfilm reader-printers.

The system is being used by the Revenue Service to streamline legal information services needed to assure fair and consistent interpretation of the law for the Nation's taxpayers.

The RIRA program analyzes legal data collected from 32 field offices and national office divisions in Washington and disseminates the data on rolls of microfilm stored in cartridges to information centers.

The focal point of the system is the Counsel Legal Information Center—CLIC—where the film can be viewed and printed automatically. There are four of these centers in Washington, and one each in New York, Philadelphia, Cincinnati, Chicago, Atlanta, Dallas, San Francisco, and Los Angeles.

The objective of the new system, Mr. Cohen explained, is to solve three major information problems: caseload coordination, legal research, and compilation of legal statistics. He said:

Before we began using our microfilm system, coordinating pending cases among field offices and between the litigation and technical functions of the chief counsel's office was one of our most acute legal management problems.

That office handles more than 28,000 tax matters, annually, in addition to working on long-range tax legislation and regulation programs. This work is handled by some 650 attorneys assigned to 32 field offices and the office in Washington.

Mr. Cohen said:

Decentralization, volume of work, and the complexities of Federal tax laws make it difficult for the chief counsel to maintain consistency. Before the retrieval system was established, it was possible for two or more attorneys working on similar cases to come to different conclusions and be quite unaware of it."

Gathering legal statistics is essential, but time-consuming by the time statistical reports are compiled manually, they are in danger of being out of date.

Microfilm was advantageous, but microfilm geared to professional people had to be found. It was essential that the attorney could disregard the mechanical aspects and treat the machine as he would a lawbook.

With the system adopted by IRS, the attorney simply checks the index, requests the microfilm cartridge containing the information he wants, and places it in the reader-printer. By pressing a button he gets a print of the document appearing on the screen in 5 seconds.

The benefit to the taxpayer is obvious. He now has even greater assurance of fair and consistent interpretation of tax laws, Mr. Cohen said.

The "Filmac 400" reader-printer used in the IRS system is the newest of the Minneapolis Mining & Manufacturing Co.'s line of microfilm equipment in MicroForum. This new system development laboratory includes cameras, microfilm duplicating equipment, data processing machines, a printer employing a unique "dry silver" paper process, as well as a complete line of reader-printers.

To make certain that every recordkeeping method can be analyzed and a tailormade microfilm systems can be devised to accommodate any requirement, MicroForum includes equipment of other manufacturers as well as Minneapolis Mining & Manufacturing Co., D. W. McArthur, vice president of Minneapolis Mining & Manufacturing Co. Microfilm Products Division, said.

Mr. McArthur represented the company at the opening of MicroForum. Both are from the St. Paul, Minn., headquarters of Minneapolis Mining & Manufacturing Co.

The first MicroForum was opened in St. Paul. In less than 3 years, Mr. McArthur said, some 600 persons representing 200 commercial organizations and government agencies used that facility. Nearly every Government department and agency in Washington uses microfilm in one or more areas, he added.

With this proven interest, we saw a need for a systems development laboratory closer to Federal Government and major eastern users of microfilm. These people, we felt, needed a convenient laboratory where they could probe and prove microfilm systems compatible with their individual needs.

New and experimental capabilities designed to satisfy these needs may well be shown here in months and years to come.

To bring all this into perspective, I point out that there are evolutionary parts to many of these systems. For example, although the system in use in the IRS offices is the most modern available today, it can be expected to undergo improvement and change. Then, because of this evolutionary nature of information management systems, a problem-solving approach to systems development must have both short- and long-range goals. This is necessary because what you do today must be compatible with what you would like to do tomorrow.

Among those invited to attend the opening were members of the tax-writing House Ways and Means and Senate Finance Committees, ranking members of the Senate and House Space Committees, members of the Minnesota congressional delegation, and officials of the Commerce, Treasury, Agriculture, and Post Office Departments and Veterans' Administration.

John Mill, Jr., is in charge of the Washington MicroForum.

The opening ceremony also featured a presentation to the National Press Club of microfilmed pictorial history of the club's World War II "canteen" for servicemen.

The photographs preserved for NPC records include the memorable pitcture of former President Harry S. Truman accompanying actress Lauren Bacall "on" the piano, another of Mr. Truman playing a duet with "violinist" Jack Benny, several mementos of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt's visits to the canteen and action shots of many of the headliners who entertained there.

William M. Blair of the New York Times, president of the NPC, accepted the microfilmed album presented by Minneapolis Mining & Manufacturing Co. MicroForum.

Farm Labor Management Committee of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD HUTCHINSON
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of the 1964 annual report of the Farm Labor Management Committee of Michigan. This is a voluntary association of fruit and vegetable growers in my State, who several years ago began to recognize the economic and social problems connected with a migrant farm labor supply, and set about to improve the situation.

By their own initiative, they have taken the lead in charting a new course in the solution of problems attending our migrant agricultural workers. They have not waited for some government program. On the contrary, they are making great strides in meeting their problems locally. Better migrant housing, better working conditions, improved human relations between migrants and the communities in which they work, have already resulted from the efforts of this organization.

Growers have developed farm labor management classes which are largely and regularly atttended. An overflow attendance turned out at a workshop on

the subject held on the campus of Michigan State University. Programs involving improved training, supervision, communication, and understanding give promise of improved productivity and reward for workers, growers, and consumers. These growers are demonstrating excellent results and the merit of voluntary group effort.

Present chairman of the committee is Mr. Harry H. Nye, of St. Joseph, Mich., a successful fruit grower in southwestern Michigan who was most instrumental in the organization of the committee, a strong proponent of the philosophy that local problems should be locally met. W. L. Mainland, of Milford, Mich., is vice chairman, and Catherine Daly, of Benton Harbor, is secretary. The organization has a migrant housing committee chaired by Lloyd Fox, of Shelby, Mich.; a committee on human relations under the chairmanship of another of my valued constituents, Oscar J. Dowd, of Paw Paw, Mich.; and in Information Committee headed by Rudolph Reinbold, of Saginaw, Mich.

Activity on the part of growers who are dependent upon migrant labor to meet their problems in the traditional voluntary way should be encouraged and applauded, Mr. Speaker. I am proud to call the attention of the House to the success of the Farm Labor Management Committee of Michigan.

The Case for the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES D. MARTIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following editorial from the Progressive Farmer. It presents the case for the South in the present attempts by power-hungry agitators to discredit a whole section of America.

The editorial follows:

CASE FOR MISSISSIPPI, ALABAMA, AND THE SOUTH

Mississippi, Alabama, and other States of the Deep South have been reviled for more than a century by holier-than-thou fanatics. In the civil rights troubles of recent years, this "Hate the South" campaign has reached a crescendo, with the area represented as a lawless land where hate and fear stalk hand in hand. Everywhere he looks—be it in the press, on television, in books, in movies—the white southerner sees himself libeled, lied about, and dragged through the mud of vindictive misrepresentation.

Ever since we have had a nation, the North and East have been infested with a surplus of self-righteous folks with a Messiah complex. They say: "Look at me. See how pure I am. Why can't you be like me?" Forthwith, they set out to save the world—in fact, to remake it in their own image. But many people don't like the image—and refuse to be recast by it.

This is the crime of the people of Mississippi—and Alabama—and the South. They don't want to be recast in someone else's image. They don't regard themselves as any better or any worse than people in other parts of the Nation.

There is much in the South that needs to be changed. We have all the unlovely traits of people everywhere. But the good people of the South—a section chockful of fine folks of kindness and good will—despise lawlessness and murder. Yet they have never been able to understand why a murder in Mississippi is any more heinous than one in New York's Harlem or Chicago's south side. Murder for any reason is a despicable crime. And is an Alabama murder inspired by racial conflict any more damnable than murder resulting from a labor dispute in Pennsylvania? Every good person is against murder, no matter why and where it happens.

Moreover, when southern people hear their States condemned as a lawless land, they wonder where their critics are getting their crime statistics. Of crime, for example, Mississippi has less than its share, ranking lowest among the States. In spite of lurid stories to the contrary, the vast majority of people—white and colored—are living together in all our Southern States in peace and good will.

Much publicity has been given to the Oberlin contingent that has come south to rebuild a burned church. But how many know of the Mississippi Committee of Concern, a local group, whose sole purpose is to rebuild burned or damaged churches? And how many know that this group is rebuilding 20 or more burned Negro churches?

Of course, we must face plain facts. Not even its most sympathetic friends can condone the restriction of voter registration in any State on a basis of the voter's color. The right to vote is a free man's most precious possession. And while we recognize the problem facing white citizens where they are outnumbered 2 or 3 to 1, there is no alternative to giving the vote to all who can qualify.

There is no excuse for the mass violation of laws by civil righters. Often, southern officials play into their hands by not letting them demonstrate. We say: Let them demonstrate so long as they are law abiding. Throw them in jail if they get rowdy, obstruct traffic, or otherwise break the law. Many times when given permission to parade, they decide not to. For 9 out of 10 of their leaders are more interested in publicity than in establishing the right to vote.

Those who seek to gain their ends by any means, no matter how destructive or vicious, are nothing new in history. But it does seem to us we have those today who, to gain their ends, would throw overboard all the principles that have made us the strongest and most envied nation in the world. America must choose between law and order and responsible democracy or mobocracy and anarchy. Either we make that choice or no citizenry—East, North, West, or South, will tomorrow be safe.

Public Library Progress in Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, this Nation is now more library conscious than at any time in the history of the Republic. Greater progress has been made in the development of libraries throughout the Nation in the past decade than in any period of the movement's history. The Federal Government in cooperation with the States has made millions of dollars available for this purpose.

But, Mr. Speaker, in no State of the Union has this movement been more substantial than in my native State of Mississippi. While this has been a cooperative effort on the part of the citizens of Mississippi, I am sure that all would agree that this would have not been possible had it not been for the unselfish and dedicated efforts of one person, the director of the Mississippi Library Commission, Mrs. Lura Gibbons Currier. I have never known a more dedicated public servant than Mrs. Currier. Surely future generations as well as the present one will be immeasurably indebted to her for her dedicated and tireless effort in the expansion and development of Mississippi's libraries.

However, her efforts in behalf of her life's work have not been confined to Mississippi. She is recognized all over the Nation as an outstanding leader in this worthwhile movement; and is in great demand throughout the Nation as a public speaker in this work.

A former resident of my hometown of Pascagoula, she was instrumental in the planning and establishment there of one of the most modern public libraries in the country. All Mississippi, as well as people throughout the Nation, are deeply indebted to this friend of the library.

The Mississippi Library News in a recent and factual and illustrated booklet contains a well deserved and appropriate editorial captioned "An Important Milestone." The editorial follows:

AN IMPORTANT MILESTONE

February 1 marked an important milestone at the Mississippi Library Commission. On that date 10 years ago Lura Gibbons Currier became the 39-year-old agency's fourth executive director. If we measure progress by the distance from the starting point, great strides have been made in library development in Mississippi in these 10 years. If we measure progress by the distance from the goal, Lura would be the first to say "We have just begun." The broad accomplishments of this decade are too numerous to detail here.

We wish only to speak of the one who has been the motivating power behind these accomplishments.

Lura works hard at her job of improving and developing libraries in Mississippi. Her schedule is a round-the-clock one, week in and week out. Only an extraordinary person could stand up to it. But even so no one State could possibly contain her great energies and unusual talents. Her contribution to librarianship has been spread over the entire United States in a variety of forms. Legislatively on a number of occasions she worked long hours with the ALA Washington office. She merits a significant portion of the credit for the successful passage of the Library Services Act of 1956 and its renewal in 1961. Published articles in library literature (many less than requested) attest to her prolific mind and unusual style of writing. Lura is the only person we know who can make exciting reading out of a routine and otherwise dull report. More than a score of out-of-State offices put aside everything when a "Currier communication" arrives. And often we are surprised to see in print comments from one of her letters.

And finally her wise counsel and professional knowledge have been generously given as she answered calls (again more than she ever accepted) from many States and from

her own for speeches (and you've missed a treat if you have not heard one of her speeches with intriguing titles), workshops, and consultant services. The time consumed in these services did not take the place of but was in addition to her regular duties in the State.

So, Lura, on this 10th anniversary the editor of MLN and the editorial staff salute you. You have given style and status to the library profession. May the first 10 years prove to be the hardest (though we seriously doubt it) even though we are certain the next 10 will be the fullest.

Drifting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD RUMSFELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, among the many newsworthy items that appear in the Chicago Tribune is one which I believe serves a most worthwhile purpose—that of giving an opportunity for the youth in the Chicago area to find expression in the printed word. One of the recent articles which the Voice of Youth printed was written by a young constituent, Peter Baugher, 17, who is on the honor roll and in top level courses at New Trier Township High School in Winnetka, Ill. Mr. Baugher presents a thoughtful and clear-sighted view of the weakness in our foreign policy where communism is concerned, and I commend his article to the readers of the RECORD:

DRIFTING
(By Peter Baugher, New Trier Township, junior)

We consider a Boy Scout who hikes in unfamiliar woods without a compass foolish. We would condemn as incompetent any sea captain who left port without knowing his destination. These statements we accept as obvious. Yet our commonsense seems to desert many of us when we discuss American foreign policy.

For many years now the United States has been drifting from crisis to crisis, considering each one individually with little apparent realization of the need to define our stand in the overall struggle between communism and democracy. President Johnson has told us that the United States will stand firmly behind any freedom-loving nation. Yet that generalization is neither sufficient to satisfy our allies of our steadfastness, nor to convince the Communists of our determined opposition.

The reluctance of our officials to declare their policy, results from the quixotic hope that the nature of communism will change, and that we all will live happily together. We need only refer to speeches of Communist leaders to observe the fallacy of this argument. Whether through warfare, subversion, or sanctimonious pleas for coexistence, the Communist purpose has never faltered from a desire to control the world. We can recognize the threat by refusing to negotiate over Vietnam until the last invading Vietcong guerrilla is expelled. Those who advocate neutralization are blind to the failures of this course in Laos. Those who argue for immediate settlement, at any cost, lobby for defeat—not victory.

Astounded at the audacity of such a proposal, our leaders tell us these problems are too complicated to be understood by private citizens who have not had the benefit of hearing the scholarly analysis of McGeorge Bundy or Walt Rostow. Recognizing and determining to fight communism at all levels is too simple to solve these difficult dilemmas. We must realize, however, that it is our policy of drifting which makes our oversea decisions so complicated. We have contradicted ourselves so many times that we must now assess which course of action will break the fewest of our promises.

Further, we should understand that regardless of any involved policy considerations, the basic choice is a simple one between continued weakness, and a determined counterattack on communism.

Wilbur Mills and Medicare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL R. KING
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. KING of California. Mr. Speaker, there were, of course, many comments by various columnists, broadcasters, and TV newscasters on the day H.R. 6675 passed the House of Representatives. I think one of the best of these newscasts was the TV news show by Joe McCaffrey at 11 p.m., Thursday, April 8, in which he described the part that the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, our distinguished colleague from Arkansas, WILBUR MILLS, played in the passage of this momentous legislation. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including this newscast in the Appendix to the RECORD at this point:

WILBUR MILLS AND MEDICARE
(By Joe McCaffrey, TV News show)

WILBUR MILLS comes from a town called Kensett, Ark.

WILBUR MILLS comes a long, long way from that town.

The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee is now, for praise or blame, the father of the medical care for the aged program.

Over the years, organized oldsters have pointed the finger at MILLS and blamed him for not bringing the medicare bill out of his Ways and Means Committee.

When the time was right, MILLS not only brought out the medicare bill, he brought out a deluxe, chrome model, which far exceeded the hopes of even the most rabid medicare supporter.

No one forced Chairman MILLS to act. He moved once he had made his determination and then he moved in his own way.

When he brought that bill to the floor he was, as he always is, a model parliamentarian.

For one thing, he knew the bill, section by section, paragraph by paragraph, sentence by sentence, word by word. No chairman knows his legislation as well as the man from Arkansas.

But what most impresses those in the gallery and, for that matter, those on the floor is the courtesy, the patience, and the thoughtfulness of the gentleman from Arkansas as he makes a presentation. He will yield for any question, he will carefully explain and, the committee members say, he is like that in the committee.

He never gets ruffled, he never is discourteous, he is never impatient. Yet he never seeks headlines, he never takes bows.

To know and watch WILBUR MILLS in action is to appreciate Congress at its best.

Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 12, 1965

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the Detroit News has published a series of articles on the poverty program written by Jo Ann Hardee. The third of this series of articles follows:

MILLION YOUTHS MIRRORED IN FIRST JOB CORPS RECRUITS—PART 3
(Third of a series)
(By Jo Ann Hardee)

THURMONT, MD., March 16.—These are the first recruits in the war on poverty, 85 young men wearing the green uniform emblem of the Job Corps, a ladder with an arrow pointing upward.

Their stories are very like those of an estimated 1 million out-of-school unemployed youths, aged 16 to 21, throughout the Nation.

A boy from south Jersey looks 10 years old, is actually 16 and a dropout from the ninth grade.

A husky 17-year-old from Connecticut dropped out of school in the seventh grade, finished the eighth in night school.

NEED A TRADE

"I'd hoped for something like this," he said. "I need to learn a trade. I thought it would be better outside (of school). I didn't like school much. But I guess I've learned. You don't go anyplace without a trade."

An 18-year-old from West Virginia who worked in the coal mines after he left school in the sixth grade wants to learn to operate a bulldozer.

They come from 14 States—some with the thin, pinched faces of Appalachia, some with the bravado of the big city gang. All with no diploma and no job.

The Job Corps, illustrated by this first camp, and its urban brother, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, are key features of the antipoverty drive.

THE MOST CRITICIZED

They are also its most criticized facet.

Nearly half of the $727 million appropriation for the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 was set aside for youth programs. These are:

The Job Corps: Residential centers for unemployed youths, 16 to 21. Projected enrollment by July 1 is 40,000 with 100,000 more to be enrolled by July 1966.

To date, 77 conservation centers in 40 States have been announced. These have a capacity of 100 youths each who will engage in conservation work while gaining basic literacy and job training.

THREE WOMEN'S CENTERS

In addition, there are 6 urban job skills centers, each with a capacity of 1,250 to 2,600 youths and 3 women's centers for 250 to 325 women each.

Enrollment is for a maximum of 2 years, with the average stay projected at 6 months.

Corpsmen will be paid a "terminal allowance" of $50 for each month of service. Of this, $25 may be allotted to a dependent and the Federal Government will match such

allotments with an equal amount. The trainee will receive $30 a month allowance room, board, clothing, and medical care.

Neighborhood Youth Corps: Designed for 150,000 young persons who stay in their communities. Its aim is to return an out of school youth to school and keep others from poverty families in school.

BASIC TRAINING

Such young persons receive $1.25 an hour for service in government or nonprofit agencies. In the out-of-school program, they are to gain basic literacy and job training.

Work study: Gives employment to 100,000 low-income college students and is administered through the colleges.

Chief criticism of the Job Corps and Neighborhood Youth Corps is that they will not produce employable youths.

Senator JOHN G. TOWER, Texas Republican, who was a key opponent of the bill said today:

"The Job Corps makes no pretense of skills training. Instead it offers improved physical health, increased weight, cheerfulness, self-confidence and a feeling of security.

"The underlying purpose of the program is claimed to be the improvement of the employment prospects of our youth. Supplying them with suntans and an appreciation for outdoor living clearly won't help them find jobs.

He is seconded by Representative MELVIN R. LAIRD, Wisconsin Republican, who is chairman of the House Republican Conference.

"In Wisconsin, we've had State conservation camps for 4 years.

CALLS IT GIMMICK

"It's a fine program for young boys. But nobody kids anybody that it's an antipoverty program. These boys aren't helped, they're helping us with our conservation efforts.

"If the poverty program wants to do the proper job, it should utilize and expand existing vocational education facilities," he added. "But the Job Corps camp in one Wisconsin county is 85 miles away from the nearest vocational school.

"I wouldn't say the program is a hoax, but it's an attractive gimmick."

Director of the Job Corps, Dr. Otis A. Singletary, former chancellor of the University of North Carolina at Greensboro, disputes this view:

"In the rural centers, we can't do as precise a job of vocational training as the urban centers," he said today.

"We offer basic education to young men who aren't ready for vocational training that requires basic education, job habits, and a certain degree of physical health.

GOAL TO MOVE FAST

"Our goal is to move the youths as rapidly as possible from the rural centers into the urban ones for skills training."

He noted that some urban centers are being jointly operated by universities and large industrial firms such as the Job Corps center at Camp Kilmer, N.J., operated by Federal Electric Corp. and Rutgers University, or the center at Astoria, Oreg., operated by the University of Oregon and Philco Corp.

"It is this cooperation between educational institutions and industry that will offer a new approach to job skills training," he said.

RAPPED BY REPRESENTATIVE FORD

A similar criticism is made of the Neighborhood Youth Corps.

House Minority Leader GERALD FORD, Michigan Republican, said the Neighborhood Youth Corps is a potential "new WPA."

"If this program develops into a means of getting Federal funds to perform menial city jobs, it is not worth the investment.

"The need is for on-the-job training that will produce employable persons. But it could develop into an unfortunate boondoggle."

Other critics have suggested that the Neighborhood Youth Corps is "make work" and complain that young people will not learn saleable jobs skills in "meaningless busywork activities."

Small Business Urges Continued Independence of SBA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, a letter has been received by me from the National Federation of Independent Business commenting on my press release of March 19 concerning the independence of the Small Business Administration. This letter by Mr. George J. Burger, vice president of that organization, endorses the view expressed in my press release.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from Mr. Burger and the press release be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
San Mateo, Calif., March 19, 1965.

Re Small Business Administration.
Hon. JOE EVINS,
Chairman, House Small Business Committee, House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN EVINS: You are to be complimented on your release of March 19, "EVINS Backs Independence of SBA" in the expressed views as outlined in your release, in which we concur 100 percent.

The proposed action of merging SBA in the Department of Commerce comes to the writer with no surprise as it will be found from the first instance our action, beginning in 1953, in our testimony before the Small Business Committees and the Banking and Currency Committees we continually and repeatedly recommended that SBA be made an independent agency, and more important, that the overall policy of SBA be placed exclusively in the hands of the Administrator, subject to review by the Congress.

You are privileged to insert this letter in the RECORD, and we are also directing a letter to the President of the United States on this.

Sincerely,

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President.

EVINS BACKS INDEPENDENCE OF SBA

Representative JOE L. EVINS, Democrat, of Tennessee, chairman of the House Select Committee on Small Business, said today he is "opposed to any change affecting the independence of the Small Business Administration, the one Federal agency that represents the interests of the Nation's 4.6 million small businessmen."

EVINS said he was making his position clear because of "rumors and reports that plans are underway in some quarters to terminate SBA's status as an independent agency and make it, in effect, a subdivision of the Commerce Department."

The latest report, EVINS said, was in the March 15, 1965, edition of the Washington Post in the column on internal Federal matters written by Jerry Kluttz. "Mr. Kluttz has a reputation for accuracy," said EVINS, "and I believe that his report is based on knowledge he has gained from qualified sources."

EVINS said in a statement:

"To place the department that champions the interests of small business under the Commerce Department is illogical and retrogressive. It is illogical because the Department of Commerce has responsibilities now that require its full attention. It is retrogressive because prior to 1953 a bureau dealing with small business matters on a limited basis was in the Department of Commerce.

"After much debate and lengthy hearings, Congress concluded that small business had to have a one-stop agency where it could take its problems and get an answer without having to go to a half dozen different agencies. This necessity is even more pressing now than in 1953.

"With small business subjected to greater stress from the technological revolution, from the pressures of competition from giant competitors, and from a dozen other facets of change that challenge its very survival, this is no time to downgrade small business programs and lose them in one of the Federal Government's largest departments.

"Small business is important to our economy. It provides the livelihood for about 60 percent of our population and supports about 40 percent of our labor force.

"It accounts for 80 percent of dollar volume in construction and more than 70 percent in retail, in wholesale, and in services—and for more than 30 percent of value added in manufacturing.

"Its role in the economy must be stimulated and strengthened. That is the purpose of SBA and that must continue to be the overriding purpose of the Nation's small business assistance programs."

A Tribute to the House Democratic Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following interesting remarks made by Joseph McCaffrey, a distinguished news commentator, on March 29, 1965, on his daily program carried on Channel 7, ABC television, Washington, D.C.:

COMMENT OF JOSEPH MCCAFFREY

There is nothing Speaker JOHN MCCORMACK likes better than a cigar and a big margin on a rollcall vote.

Overlooked in all the Presidential sleight of hand last week over the passage of the aid to education bill in the House of Representatives was the work of the team of MCCORMACK, ALBERT, and BOGGS.

That's the Democratic leadership team in the House of Representatives: CARL ALBERT, the majority leader, and HALE BOGGS, the party whip. Although credit goes to the President for getting his education bill through the House, the work at the voting level was still done by the men who know the House the best: MCCORMACK, ALBERT, and BOGGS.

Gone are the stories which we used during the weeks after the election about the Democrats having so many Members in the House they would never be able to hold the party together. Those Democrats, we said, will break up, no one will be able to hold them together on the key votes.

Remember, we said, what Sam Rayburn used to say about it being better to have a slim margin than a big one?

But even when the Democrats lost a respected voice on the Education Committee, as Mrs. EDITH GREEN lead the fight against the administration formula for funds to educate poor children, the leadership in the House was able to hold.

There are some close ones yet to come in the House, but on the record to date the team of MCCORMACK, ALBERT and BOGGS should win most of them.

A tribute, perhaps, to three men who know the playing field, the opposing players, and their own men better than any three men who have worked together in those jobs in years.

Education Bill—More Homework

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD RUMSFELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, a recent Christian Science Monitor editorial, which follows, expresses the concern felt by many citizens about the haste with which bills are being approved by the Congress and, specifically, about certain aspects of the elementary and secondary school aid bill:

EDUCATION BILL—MORE HOMEWORK

President Johnson is keeping up a relentless pressure to get his aid to education bill adopted quickly and without further amendments. He wants the House version accepted by the Senate without change. The Senate Education Subcommittee granted the President his wishes by rejecting all amendments in 3 days of consideration.

Some are still hopeful of getting an amendment giving the poorer States a larger proportion of the aid. Others would like to see amendments to clarify the church-state questions involved.

In the House, for example, Representative EDITH GREEN, Democrat, of Oregon, one of the stanchest and most knowledgeable supporters of Federal education legislation, declared herself "in the unfortunate position * * * of being one of the dissenters," troubled by the religious school aid issue. The implications of this bill for the future of the public school in America are tremendous.

Republicans in the House wanted to know whether public school teachers would be allowed to teach in parochial schools. Answers were not clear cut. It would appear, however, that local school officials could permit public school teachers to extend educational services and arrangements such as shared-time classes and educational television programs, to parochial school students in parochial school buildings.

Because there is considerable doubt among some constitutional law experts as to the constitutionality of the bill, some, including Representative GREEN, favor an amendment to provide for judicial review. They contend that otherwise there is a good possibility courts would hold that neither individual taxpayers nor institutions have legal standing to sue.

We question whether it is in the ultimate interest of the United States for an administration to put so much pressure on Congress to push through so many important measures with such undue haste. Our concern is due to our belief that the education bill, as well as other vital administration proposals such as the voting rights bill and the presidential succession bill, can and ought to be amended to provide much needed safeguards.

We would like to see congressional resistance to executive pressures sufficient to improve these measures.

Miss Ann Tarleton Wins Louisiana State Competition in Oratory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. A. THOMPSON
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. THOMPSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, just recently, during the month of March, a young lady from my congressional district, Miss Ann Tarleton, a senior student at the St. Charles Academy in Lake Charles, La., won first place in Statewide competition in the field of oratory at the Louisiana Junior Classical League Latin Club Convention. I feel this accomplishment is worthy of note inasmuch as it is significant to see our youth of today developing to the extent that some can reach such heights both in thinking, and in the ability to voice, and put these thoughts across to others.

This is by no means the first competition in which this particular young lady has been engaged, and in which she has won honors. She has won trips to various parts of our Nation as a result of her interest and aptitude in Future Homemakers and Farmers of America. As an indication of her versatility, she has won many blue ribbons in sheep competition which she raises herself on what she has named "the world's smallest sheep ranch"—her own backyard in the city.

Miss Tarleton's accomplishments and success in all her endeavors reflects credit not only upon herself and family, but upon her instructors and school where she has become inspired and trained.

I commend to the attention of this body the very short theme upon which Ann Tarleton won her most recent honor in oratory. The text of her address follows:

LOUISIANA JUNIOR CLASSICAL CONVENTION SPEECH

(By Miss Ann Tarleton, St. Charles Academy, Lake Charles, La.)

Twilight zone—that undefined moment which precedes total darkness—now encompasses the 20th century. Twilight is considered the forerunner of peace and contentment, yet this twilight which encompasses the 20th century is the foreshadowing of another darkness—the darkness acquired through man's deceit and mistrust. As partners in propaganda, mistrust and deceit have woven a web of darkness which threatens the soul of civilization, a threat which is the essence of the ills of the world.

The problem today is not unique. The threat of deceit haunted man when Cain killed Abel. The threat of mistrust haunts man in the cold war. And together mistrust and deceit will continue to haunt man unless something is done.

This ghostly picture is readily exemplified in foreign affairs, our own Government actions, and social pressures. Perhaps the country which best depicts the picture of deceit in foreign affairs is Russia. Since 1945, Russia has broken 50 of her 52 major agreements. Naturally, this causes men and nations in all parts of the world to feel the shadow of disbelief.

When Cuba was granted her independence, the United States promised to protect her citizens. Yet, because of a masterful campaign of deceit, the Cubans not only mistrust the United States, but their own leaders.

This atmosphere of mistrust has settled in our own country. Many American citizens are outspoken in their lack of confidence of our national leaders. This prompts misunderstanding.

When our Government resorts to arms to oppose Communist aggression, it is called a war monger. Yet, if it attempts to negotiate foreign entanglements, it is tagged "appeaser." Our citizens are confused by this growing lack of confidence, mistrust, and misunderstanding among nations.

This reveals the problem in its true nature—insincerity of society. For example—if a person saves his earnings, his friends call him a miser. If he spends his money, he is called a spendthrift. If he goes to church regularly, his associates call him a hypocrite. But if he misses church, he is called a heathen.

This attitude continues to grow, and unless the nations of the world find a solution, the future may well become an era of discontent. This growing menace to our future security and progress can be surmounted—by individual process. Our challenge today is to enkindle in man truth, understanding, and sincerity.

Perhaps Stephen Vincent Benét meant to insure the peace of twilight when he wrote: "Our earth is but a small star in the great universe. Yet of it we make, if we choose, a planet unvexed by war, untroubled by hunger or fear, undivided by senseless distinctions of race, color, or theory. Grant us the courage and foreseeing to begin this task today, that our children and our children's children may be proud of the name of man."

Colgate-Palmolive Co. Shows High Level of Ethical Conduct

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, a recent news story from New York City points to a high standard of ethics and fair competitive practices in America's business community.

I refer to the action taken by one of the largest companies in the Nation, the Colgate-Palmolive Co., in refusing a so-called bargain offer to purchase highly valued trade secrets of a competitor, Procter & Gamble. In view of the amount of adverse publicity so often unfairly directed at the U.S. business community, I believe the story of the Colgate-Palmolive Co.'s exemplary action should be duly noted.

The story is this, in brief: Colgate-Palmolive and Procter & Gamble are companies engaged in one of the most keenly competitive areas of the American consumer merchandise market. Obviously, an extensive amount of research, planning and creative thought goes into the shaping of marketing strategy and tactics by each of these companies. Equally clear is the fact that in such a highly competitive market area a great deal of time and thought is given to considering what the opposition is planning.

With this as background, consider the monetary value it would be to one of these companies to obtain its competitor's detailed budget for sale and distribution of one of its leading consumer products. According to an assistant U.S. district attorney, Procter & Gamble placed the value to a competitor of inside knowledge of such a budget at no less than $1 million.

The Colgate-Palmolive Co. was offered such inside information, in the form of a detailed 188-page marketing and advertising plan devised by Procter & Gamble. Colgate-Palmolive, immediately upon receiving this offer, reported the incident to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for that agency's action. Last week the U.S. attorney for the Eastern District of New York, Mr. Joseph P. Hoey, commended the Colgate-Palmolive Co. for its conduct in promptly alerting authorities to this illicit offer. A former employee of Procter & Gamble has been arrested and charged with industrial espionage in the matter.

Mr. Speaker, as the Representative of a congressional district in which the Colgate-Palmolive Co. has a major plant, I of course am greatly interested in any news story which reflects well on one of my constituents. But of even greater importance, the action taken by Colgate-Palmolive officials reflects well on our entire American business community—and at a time when the free enterprise system is under attack from foreign enemies and domestic, homegrown critics.

As I have said, too often do gaudy, misleading headlines lead the public to believe that the ethics and sense of competitive fairplay of our Nation's business community is at an alltime low. We hear baseless charges of a so-called profit-first philosophy allegedly held by executives of today's large corporate enterprises. By such charges, the enemies and critics of American business hope to undermine public confidence, not only in this country but abroad as well, in the social efficacy of the free enterprise system.

For this reason, at this time the story of one large U.S. company's exemplary demonstration of the highest of ethical business standards, even in the most aggressively competitive areas of the free enterprise market, deserves notice and consideration.

I join U.S. Attorney Hoey in commending the Colgate-Palmolive Co. for its action in this case. And I earnestly hope that the real significance of this incident is brought home to all those who, without facts to support their charges, have unfairly and unjustly projected a false picture of American business ethics and standards in recent years.

H.R. 2362 Should Be Promptly Approved in the National Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I most earnestly hope and trust that the Senate will promptly and overwhelmingly approve this afternoon, H.R. 2362, the Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965, that this House resoundingly adopted just a week ago.

It is practically the unanimous judgment of most educational and legislative authorities that this measure is the best practical compromise that could be reasonably devloped to meet and dissolve the conscientious objections of the various groups who sincerely desire to effect the fundamental objectives of this measure.

In substance this bill will provide: First, a 3-year $1.06 billion program of Federal grants to States for allocation to school districts with large numbers of low-income families; the uses of the funds to be decided by local school districts, subject to State and Federal approval; second, a 5-year program of grants for the purchase of books and library materials; third, a 5-year program for the establishment of supplementary education centers and services; fourth, 5-year programs to improve educational research and to strengthen State departments of education; and fifth, a 2-year extension of school aid to districts impacted by the presence of Federal installations.

Let us all be reminded of the fact that $1 billion of the expenditures proposed in this bill will be directed at raising educational quality for deprived children and these funds will be distributed into and throughout more than 90 percent of the Nation's school districts.

The 2-year extension of assistance to impacted areas, although in my opinion it should be extended for at least 5 years for proper school planning purposes, is at least an acceptable adjustment and is imperatively needed in a great many school districts.

Let us also remind ourselves that no Federal money may, by this bill, be provided directly to nonpublic schools and that the bill specifies that none of its provisions authorizes any Federal control over school curriculums, instruction, and administration of personnel, or the selection of teaching materials. The bill also states that nothing in it "shall be construed to authorize the making of any payment for religious worship or instruction."

Mr. Speaker, for some 20 years this country and this legislature has been trying to reasonably solve the problem of providing this type of Federal aid to our elementary and secondary education groups. Very likely the bill that we passed here a few days ago and is now being debated in the Senate constitutes the last, best chance to provide it. Let the Congress, finally, stop talking about the education of children who yearly grow older and beyond legislative assistance while we quarrel and quibble and delay. Let us exert this last effort to revitalize these particular segments of our national school system.

This bill represents merely a 1-year authorization and, if need be, it can be wholesomely amended after a year's experience. The passage of this educational bill will be, in truth, an experiment and not an irrevocable act. I urge the Senate to follow the patriotic example of this House and give it a try before this day is over.

King's Boycott Immoral

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES D. MARTIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the demand of Martin Luther King for a boycott of Alabama is awakening Americans to the immorality of this agitator. Under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD I would like to include the following column written by James J. Kilpatrick which appeared in a number of newspapers across the country:

A CONSERVATIVE VIEW: KING MAKES A TACTICAL ERROR

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

The Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, being still mortal and not yet divine, remains subject to the same rules of fate that act upon other men; and one of these rules is never to push your luck too far.

Dr. King blundered Sunday evening in his call for a boycott on Alabama. At a moment when he had everything going for him—when a combination of superb strategy and tragic circumstance had won the country and shamed his antagonists—he overstepped himself. He may never know how much this act of arrogance will cost him among those decent elements of the South's power structure on whom so much of his cause depends.

Consider the course of events in recent weeks. Until Dr. King and his associates moved on Alabama, the name of Selma was almost unknown. Not one man in 10,000 could have located Lowndes County. Highway 80 to Montgomery was a meaningless line on the map. The issue of voting rights was barely simmering on congressional stoves. The conscience of the white South was troubled, but not troubled deeply.

Over a period of 9 weeks, Dr. King singlehandedly changed all that. He elevated Selma to a household word, roused the Nation to the denial of the franchise in Alabama, and raised Highway 80 to the prominence of the early Christians' Road to Rome. He prompted Lyndon Johnson into sponsorship of the most drastic voting rights bill since 1870, and he galvanized the Congress into pledges of immediate action.

Then came the murder of Mrs. Viola Liuzzo, and the drama to its shocking climax. There should be no mistaking the reaction of the white South to this vicious and cowardly crime. Decent southerners from the Potomac to the Mississippi were left sick—almost physically sick—by the wretched event. A moment of catharsis was at hand. In shame,

sorrow, and revulsion, an agonized South might well have yielded significant gains to the Negroes' cause.

Out of the jaws of this victory, in the old phrase, Dr. King on Sunday evening snatched defeat. His call for a punitive boycott of Alabama will undo the most important part of his achievement, for the latent forces of decency in the South, ready to concede much rightness in the Negroes' demands, will react to the boycott with hot resentment. There can be no armistice now.

If I am not mistaken, the overplayed hand will cost Dr. King some measure of respect elsewhere in the country, too. He is in the position of a man whose case at bottom rests on one appeal: Be fair. But here he says to the country: Be unfair.

He was urging the South to do right because it is right; now his case loses its moral urgency. Do right, he says, or it will cost you money. The effect is to hang a price tag on justice, to confuse the granting of rights with the selling of steel.

Dr. King no longer is engaged in searing the South's conscience; he is out to hit the South's pocketbook. Along with prejudice, he would eliminate bank deposits. He is a curious exercise in morality.

The sweeping and unselective boycott demanded by Dr. King would hit the just and the unjust alike. If the maneuver succeeds to any appreciable degree, Alabama's economy surely will suffer, and in the nature of things, Dr. King's own people will suffer along with it.

In truth, they will suffer most of all, for the Negroes' future in the South depends heavily upon employment opportunities and improved education. A prolonged boycott, sustained through the cooperation of organized labor, could have a catastrophic effect upon programs of the greatest importance to the ultimate solution of all these problems.

The most regrettable effect of Dr. King's new strategy will be to alienate the good will of many white southerners who were moving in his direction.

The rest of the country may not fully understand the remarkable change in attitude that has been developing in the South. From Virginia to Louisiana, fresh currents of thought and reflection have been stirring. Old barriers have been falling in windrows. Many whites and many Negroes were quietly exploring areas of understanding never before explored. But if there is to be a boycott, everyone must be flung centrifugally back to the edges once more.

We have moved in a twinkling from what is right to what is expensive; we have gone from love to money, and a South that was ready to be persuaded by the one appeal will only be antagonized by the other.

A Bombshell in Rio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, recently at one of the White House briefings, I asked the question as to why there seems to be a news blackout on Cuba, both from the State Department and the White House, and was assured that communism had lost its adherence in Central and South America and was no longer an important factor, and that Cuba was in a mess both socially and economically.

I felt at the time that this casual dismissal of Cuba as a communistic problem did not have in fact the background assurance which the State Department seems to offer as an excuse for this apparent news blackout.

Now comes the news that Saturday $300,000 in large bills was captured from Communist Italian leaders who were transporting the money on behalf of Russia, to be used in Brazil to further Communist parades, sit-ins, and all types of Communistic propaganda projects.

In this morning's Washington Post, an article by Messrs. Rowland Evans and Robert Novak again brings to the front the Communist proposals from South America wherein the United States will be asked to leave the Organization of American States as well as the Inter-American Development Bank, to be replaced by Fidel Castro.

It seems to me that the Communist activities within 90 miles of our shore should receive far more attention than is apparently the case, and also I feel the public should be informed by the State Department or by the administration of what is going on, rather than having to get the information entirely from the newspapers.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 12, 1965]

INSIDE REPORT—A BOMBSHELL IN RIO

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

A cabal of South American governments is secretly fusing a political bomb to toss in Uncle Sam's lap at the pan-American conference in Rio de Janeiro next month.

The bomb: A proposal now in the draft stage, by adventurous young nationalists of Chile's new Christian Democratic government. If presented in its present form, the Chilean proposal could turn the Rio meeting—and the whole inter-American system—upside down.

The plan would junk both the Organization of American States (OAS) and the Inter-American Development Bank and replace them with all-Latin organizations excluding the United States. Moreover, while Uncle Sam would be asked out, Fidel Castro would be asked in. Thus would the United States be isolated from Latin America.

This is precisely the goal of the Communists. But what is being readied for Rio is not a Communist invention, but the product of emotional nationalism (spliced with generous portions of anti-Yankee sentiment) now running rampant through South America. This is the most troubling Latin development since Castro's attempts to export revolution came a cropper and is potentially more dangerous.

The prophet of this movement is an Argentine economist and international bureaucrat named Raul Prebisch. As head of the United Nations Economic Commission on Latin America (ECLA), Prebisch devised a doctrine that shows the developed half of the world (led by the United States) dominating and victimizing the undeveloped half (including Latin America). This is accomplished, according to Prebisch, by paying the underdeveloped half far less for its raw materials than they are really worth.

The appeal of this doctrine to the Latin American mentality was immense. Here was a way to shift blame for the region's stunted growth from the Latin's own political and economic inefficiency to the Colossus of the North. The Prebisch cult has disciples in governments all over Latin America—Argentina, Uruguay, Peru, even the primarily pro-U.S. Government of Brazil.

But nowhere is the Prebisch sway stronger than among Chile's high-flying Christian Democrats. ECLA's headquarters are located in Santiago. Chile's President Eduardo Frei has asked Prebisch and three other international bureaucrats to study the prospects of further economic integration in Latin America.

One prominent Chilean Christian Democrat put it to us this way in Santiago last December: "Here in Chile we are all sons of Prebisch."

From this flows the four remarkable proposals contained in the secret Chilean draft proposal.

One of these—calling for the United States to give Latin American commodities special trade preferences just as European nations help their excolonies in Africa—is quite sensible. It has long been quietly pushed by Thomas Mann, U.S. Assistant Secretary of State for Economic Affairs. The three other points, however, go off the deep end, as follows:

1. Establishment of a new Latin American organization, which would in effect supplant the OAS. Far from including the United States, this new organization would bargain against the United States.

2. Conversion of the Inter-American Development Bank into a bank to encourage Latin American integration. The United States would have no say in the management of this bank, though, quite naturally, it would be financed mainly by Uncle Sam.

3. A cordial invitation to Castro to join these new organizations now that the United States has been excluded.

Unbelievable? Consider a recent interview in a Santiago newspaper of Gabriel Valdes, the Chilean Foreign Minister.

Attacking U.S. control over its own aid money and the economic isolation of Castro's Cuba, Valdes says: "The United States grants either more or less assistance or loans to those countries it likes or which it considers more democratic. This discrimination cannot continue."

Further, Valdes calls for "permanent assistance, not voluntary or with a fixed deadline," from Washington in return for continued political alliance.

With hardboiled Tom Mann in charge of economic policy, Washington is not about to knuckle under to this thinly disguised blackmail. But if the Chilean blueprint for dividing the United States from its Latin neighbors actually is unveiled in Rio next month, the detonation will be music to Communist ears everywhere.

President's Speech on Vietnam Restates Firm U.S. Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to reprint in the Appendix of the RECORD a perceptive analysis by Washington correspondent William S. White of President Johnson's recent speech on our country's Asian policy.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 9, 1965]

VIETNAM SPEECH: POLICY AS FIRM AS EVER

(By William S. White)

President Johnson's so-called "new" policy for dealing with Communist aggression in South Vietnam is not new in fact nor does it in the smallest way soften his real position.

To the contrary, he feels—and objective reading of what he said at the John Hopkins University supports him in this—that its meaning is simply firmly to establish the two bedrock necessities for remaining in Vietnam until aggression has been brought to a halt by self-enforcing peace arrangements that will not and cannot be later cast aside by the Communists as other agreements have been.

The vital words here are "self-enforcing." The President will never go along with some spurious deal resting only on Communist promises to quit attacking South Vietnam. For his own part, in short, he considers himself more deeply committed than ever before to bringing those attacks to an end. If others think he is less committed, as some seemingly do, the answer is simple: Surely, he ought to be the best witness of the intentions of Lyndon B. Johnson.

The first of the twin bedrock necessities to staying in Vietnam is a continuing American military action, which will be carried just as far as the Communists force it to be carried. The President is astonished, as to this point, that so much of the interpretation of his Johns Hopkins speech has so stressed his promise in some circumstances of American economic aid to Vietnam and southeast Asia generally and so kissed off these other passages:

"We will not be defeated. We will not grow tired. We will not withdraw, either openly or under the cloak of a meaningless agreement * * * peace demands an independent South Vietnam—securely guaranteed and able to shape its own relationships to all others—free from outside interferences—tied to no alliance—a military base for no other country." How do you get any more committed than this?

This continued American military action is not merely to help protect South Vietnam. It is vital to prevent what has always been the nightmare of American policymakers, the nightmare of a total collapse in South Vietnam's morale and government which might make impossible further effective American assistance of any kind.

The second bedrock necessity is to placate, so far as may be rationally possible, the endless fretful complaint from Allied governments and some sections of responsible opinion at home that the United States is offering no "constructive" alternatives to continued war.

It is here that Mr. Johnson's suggestion for a cooperative economic development of southeast Asia takes its place. Once the nations directly involved begin this development in good faith, he is prepared to ask Congress to authorize a billion-dollar American "investment"—not, by the way, a mere American gift—in such an enterprise. Here, again, the President is both disappointed and surprised at some Republican criticism of this as an effort to "buy peace."

In the first place, we are already spending far more than a billion a year in South Vietnam alone, putting military and economic expenditures together. In the second place, what he is speaking of as a possibility for southeast Asia generally is already taking place in South Vietnam. In the third place, the principles of such a program were in fact recommended to President Kennedy by Mr. Johnson as Vice President as early as 1961. He sees it as about what we have done widely long since in Latin America to prevent chaos and Communist encroachment.

In the fourth place, this problematical and future American carrot, though sincerely held out if the Communists will make it possible to hold it out usefully, weighs far less than the here-and-now American stick that accompanies it. No country being attacked has in all history been given a more profound and more powerful military American guarantee than the guarantee the President has now given to South Vietnam.

Major Theatrical Production Will Have Memphis Premiere

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. GRIDER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, some persons think that we are having a cultural explosion in this country.

While that point is highly debatable, I think we can all agree that the interest in the arts is on the increase. An interest by leaders of governments at all levels and financial support from foundations and other philanthropists have certainly contributed to enlivening the lively arts. Just last week President Johnson administered the oath of office to members of the National Council on the Arts. This new group will do much to encourage the creative activity and interests of our people.

The growth of repertory theaters such as Memphis' Front Street Theatre has been spotlighted by Time magazine and other national publications. No longer must we in the hinterlands depend on New York as the sole dispenser of entertainment and enlightenment from the legitimate stage.

In fact, next month the American and English-language premiere of Ugo Betti's "Troubled Waters" will be presented at Memphis State University. My city takes an especial pride in this because following its Memphis performance, the professional company will move to New York with the late Italian dramatist's modern tragedy.

Edwin Howard, amusements editor of the Memphis Press-Scimitar, reported this forthcoming event in a recent edition of his column, The Front Row. His article follows:

[From the Memphis Press-Scimitar, Apr. 7, 1965]

THE FRONT ROW—MEMPHIS GETS BETTI PLAY BEFORE NEW YORK CITY

(By Edwin Howard)

Memphis' emergence as a hub of theatrical activity takes another spurt forward today with the announcement of the American and English language premiere at Memphis State University May 13 to 15 of Ugo Betti's "Troubled Waters." The professional production will then move to New York for what it s hoped will be an extended run.

The late Italian dramatist's modern tragedy will not only be performed, but produced, in Memphis. Following the Memphis premiere, the company will move to the Gramercy Arts Theater off Broadway in New York. Previews in New York will begin about May 20, followed a week later by the official opening.

This major theatrical event for Memphis was announced jointly today by Dr. Harry Ausprich, chairman of the MSU speech and drama department, and Eric Salmon, guest professor of drama for the spring semester.

Salmon's own company, Theater Outlook, is now casting and will produce the Betti drama on the MSU campus. Theater majors will be permitted to watch rehearsals and will participate in weekly seminars on the production. A company of eight actors will arrive on the campus about April 15 to begin rehearsals. Salmon will direct and design the production. Also on the campus during the production period will be a lighting designer from New York and one of the translators of the play, Gino Rizzo. "Troubled Waters" will shortly be published in a new collection of Betti's plays translated by Rizzo and William Meriwether.

RENEWED INTEREST IN BETTI

Betti, who died in 1953, is the most important Italian dramatist since Pirandello and one of the major figures in the modern theater. He has been relatively neglected in the United States until recently. Last year his "Corruption in the Palace of Justice" was produced off-Broadway. "The Queen and the Rebels," his best known play in this country, was revived off-Broadway this year. Salmon's production of "Troubled Waters" will reach New York late next month, and in September Claude Rains is to appear in a Broadway production of "The Burnt Flower Bed."

Salmon considers "Troubled Waters" one of Betti's most important plays. "It is," he says, "another in the fascinating series of attempts by 20th century dramatists, from O'Neill to Camus and Pirandello to Miller, to write a modern tragedy of major proportions."

The English actor-director's first appearance on the Memphis theatrical scene was made last spring when he lectured on Britain's so-called "angry young men." When MSU initiated a guest professorship in drama, Salmon was the first person Dr. Ausprich thought of. Salmon has been on the campus 2 months now, teaching classes in advanced acting and directing, and himself directing the forthcoming MSU-community production of "The Winter's Tale," to be presented April 27–May 1 by the Memphis Shakespeare Festival, Inc.

AT $25 A TICKET FOR OPENING NIGHT

I asked Salmon how he was going to teach and direct two plays at the same time. He said, "It is going to be rough, actually. But the frame of 'Winter's Tale' is there. The hard, imaginative work is finished, but there is, of course, a lot of polishing yet to be done and the two productions will overlap about 10 days.

"I propose to handle that by gritting my teeth."

The first of the three Memphis performances of "Troubled Waters" will be a gala premiere for special patrons of the production. Tickets will be $25 each and will include an after-theater supper. The other two performances will be open to the public at $2.50 each.

After production costs are paid, proceeds will go to MSU to help underwrite the special chair in drama. Salmon has already agreed to return next spring and Dr. Ausprich said it is hoped he may be resident professor of drama all next year.

THE 750 JONESBOROANS APPLAUD FRONT STREET'S "FANTASTICKS"

Memphis' growth as a theatrical center got another boost Monday night when Front Street Theater's touring unit presented "The Fantasticks" to an enthusiastic crowd of 750 at Arkansas State College in Jonesboro.

The audience was made up of about half students and half townspeople and "they really flipped," according to one observer. Director George Touliatos said that, as after

last week's performance in Clarksdale, Miss., the company was asked to come back some time in the future.

"The Fantasticks" played to about 1,150 people in its two road-show engagements. The Lions Club in Clarksdale broke even and Arkansas State made about $1,000. Front Street charged a flat fee to cover costs for both performances, leaving profits, if any, to local sponsors.

James A. Farley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. DELANEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, it is always educational to read the observations of a man who is probably the keenest political observer of our time. I refer to James A. Farley, former Democratic National Committee chairman and U.S. Postmaster General, now chairman of the board of the Coca-Cola Export Corp. His remarks about the changing world in politics are worthwhile reading. So that all Americans may have the benefit of his views, I request that his comments be included in the RECORD.

[From the Dallas (Tex.) Morning News, Mar. 15, 1965]

PERSONAL REPORT: WASHINGTON

(By Robert E. Baskin)

The Nation's Capital, of course, is famed for its large number of resident political experts, who can prophesy, project, and interpret just about anything that happens or is about to happen on the political fronts.

But if one wants to get a quick, 1-hour lesson in politics and the meaning and background of public affairs, there is no better place to go than suite 1800 at 515 Madison Avenue in the heart of Manhattan.

The man you meet there is 76 years old, but he stands tall and straight, his mind is as sharp as it was 30 years ago when he masterminded great campaigns, and his attitude is one of great vigor, tremendous enthusiasm, and unflagging curiosity.

He is James Aloysius Farley, who for half a century has been one of the great figures in Democratic politics, the man who engineered Franklin D. Roosevelt's 1932 and 1936 campaigns, who forecast uncannily the outcome of the latter (F.D.R. winning all but Maine and Vermont) and who early last year predicted President Johnson would win a landslide victory.

Today the former Postmaster General and Democratic National Committee chairman is board chairman of the Coca-Cola Export Corp. He is a busy man.

But he has not relinquished any of his interests in politics and can talk charmingly and succinctly on intricate political matters, such as the present confusing situation between the forces of Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY and New York Mayor Robert Wagner in New York State.

Farley keeps his ears open. His advice on political matters is sought by many persons. It is no secret in Washington that Mr. Johnson has maintained close contact with him, and there are few occasions when Farley can not come up with a forthright piece of advice. Almost invariably he is heeded.

Although he eventually fell out with Franklin Roosevelt, he's never been an outsider in Democratic Party circles that really count. His acute political sense has been and still is one that cannot be ignored.

It is interesting to observe that Farley does not live in the past, and he firmly believes the political world of today.

"The new breed of politician," he wrote recently, "is far superior to its predecessors." The reason is patently simple.

"The country has improved immeasurably, has become far more complex and hence requires far more able men to run it."

In the modern world, Farley continued, "the old-fashioned ward leaders who relied on the May-waltz, the clambake, and the Thanksgiving turkey are as quaintly moribund as the old harness shop.

"The modern district leader has to have the answers on new school financing, public health policies, and proposed zoning changes."

The expanding news media have also made American citizens better informed, Farley says, and this tends to liberate them from "the outmoded bosses of our political past."

In his office, which is cluttered with memorabilia of his political years, Farley enjoys talking with visitors and makes it a point to answer his phone whenever it rings.

"It's simpler than having a secretary running in to tell me somebody is on the phone," he said recently.

Despite his high standing with the party's wise men, New York Democratic leaders passed him over for the senatorial nomination in 1958 and for Governor in 1962 and in both cases the lesser known nominees were defeated. Farley's conservative views may have been the reason for being passed over by the liberally oriented New York party.

Farley is blunt about some long revered political practices. In a law day speech at the University of Georgia last spring he had this to say about logrolling:

"I have rolled many a log, secure in the knowledge if someone didn't roll the logs there wouldn't be any lumber even to build a stadium for these grandstand quarterbacks. I count it as a vital part of government that a Senator from Arizona, for example, is likely to look with favor upon a new lighthouse in Maine, provided the Senator from Maine views with sympathy an irrigation project in Arizona."

Investiture of Anthony J. Paterno as Knight Commander of the Sovereign Military Order of Malta

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to have inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the House Resolution 99 passed by the 74th General Assembly of Illinois and introduced by State Representatives Euzzino, DiPrima, Romano, Merlo, Pusateri, Ropa, and Zagone. On Saturday evening, April 10, over 2,000 Chicagoans attended a banquet in honor of Mr. Anthony J. Paterno on the occasion of his official investiture as knight commander of the Sovereign Military Order of Malta. The resolution congratulating him on his investiture follows:

STATE OF ILLINOIS, 74TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HOUSE RESOLUTION 99

(Offered by Messrs. Euzzino, DiPrima, Romano, Merlo, Pusateri, Ropa, and Zagone)

Whereas on April 10, 1965, Anthony Paterno, an outstanding civic leader and highly respected American of Italian ancestry will be vested as knight commander into the Sovereign and Military Order of Malta; and

Whereas the Sovereign and Military Order of Malta was founded in the 11th century in Jerusalem, by Blessed Gerald, an Italian Benedictine monk, with the help of some pious citizens from Amalfi; it is the most ancient of all orders of knighthood; and

Whereas it is indeed proper for a man who served as president of the joint civic committee of Italian-Americans with the unflinching spirit of a pioneer, the steadfast devotion of a servant and idealist, the deep-rooted love of a humanitarian; and who has atained the very height of affection he now enjoys in the Italo-American community, be invested into this outstanding worldwide organization; and

Whereas the life of Anthony Paterno is an outstanding example of integrity, individual initiative and solid accomplishment: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 74th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That we extend our hearty congratulations to Anthony Paterno, upon his receiving this high honor; and extend our best wishes for many more great moments in the service of our people; and that a suitably engrossed copy of this resolution and preamble be sent to Mr. Paterno, the joint civic commitee of Italo-Americans and the Fra Noi newspaper in Melrose Park, Ill.

Adopted by the house, March 24, 1965.

JOHN P. TOUHY,
Speaker of the House.
CHARLES F. KERVIN,
Clerk of the House.

Anthony J. Paterno is a real life Italo-American success story that matches any Horatio Alger dream.

A guiding light for his fellow man, Anthony Paterno is faith in action—his is the unflinching spirit of a pioneer, the steadfast devotion of a servant and idealist, the deep-rooted love of a humanitarian.

Our community has benefited by his hard work, loyalty and love for mankind and his integrity, individual initiative and solid accomplishment, his is a most outstanding example of what one man can achieve in our great democratic society.

At age 18, he made an important decision. Courageous and ambitious, young Tony decided to immigrate to America from his native Sicily.

He arrived in Chicago in August 1923, and immediately sought employment. What he found were sweatshop jobs—backbreaking, long hours, and low-pay employment.

He worked on railroads, in factories, on constructions, and became a barber, insurance agent, plastering contractor, repair man, sold fruits and vegetables, and operated a grocery and meat market and restaurant and then became a pioneer in the pizza business in Chicago.

In spite of the tremendous pressure of his business, Anthony Paterno has always found time to help men of every race, creed and color.

It would be impossible to number all who have been guided by Mr. Paterno in

helping to obtain American citizenship or who have been assisted by his counsel and financial aid, or the many causes and charities that have been aided by his energies and resources.

Just as he is a leading figure in Chicagoland, Mr. Paterno is held in high acclaim in Italy. He has helped hospitals and orphanages in Sicily and other parts of Italy.

Born at Vizzini, Catania, Italy, January 24, 1904, the son of Giovanni and Giuseppa (LoGiusto) Paterno. Married Lena LoGiudice, October 24, 1929. Three children: John, born 1930, died 1960; Josephine, Mrs. Anthony Terlato, and Michelina, born 1947. Five grandchildren.

Past President Joint Civil Committee of Italian Americans, the Italian Chamber of Commerce of Chicago, and the Vizzinese Society.

Awarded third, second, and first stars of solidarity, Republic of Italy, Cavaliere, Cavaliere Ufficiale and Commendatore, Order of Merit, Republic of Italy.

Awarded plaque by the Italian Chamber of Commerce, the Vizzinese Society for devotion and distinguished service to Italian community, 1959; John Scalabrini Award for his liberal generosity to Villa Scalabrini, Italian old peoples home, in 1960; leadership award of Joint Civic Committee, 1961; Amerital-Unico Citizen of Year Award, in 1961.

And now, as the owner of Pacific Wine Co. and Paterno Imports, Ltd., he is recognized as a leader in this industry and also one of the most respected.

Auditors' Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. RACE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, various proposals have been introduced in this House which would provide the citizens of this city with some fashion of control over their affairs.

I have joined numerous colleagues in an appeal for committee hearings on the home rule proposals. This appeal requests that hearings be held and a home rule bill be reported to the floor of the House.

Although there are innumerable good reasons why the people of this city should have control over their affairs, one of the most poignant was the subject of an editorial in today's Washington Post.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the thoughtful examination of this editorial to my colleagues and request unanimous consent to have it printed in the Appendix of today's RECORD:

AUDITOR'S REPORT

Children's Hospital is being systematically and deliberately cheated by Congress. The appropriations committees bluntly refuse to pay the bills of the children who are the city's responsibility. Last summer, the hospital told Congress that its annual deficit was approaching half a million dollars in unpaid services to indigent children. Congress grudgingly made a small increase in the payment schedules, covering less than one-third of the deficit. Asked to come a little closer to their obligation, the appropriations committees demanded an audit of the hospital.

The audit has now been published. Having now wasted 8 months and $25,500 to be told once again that Congress is defaulting on its responsibilities, the committees are precisely as wise as they were last summer. And the hospital is several hundred thousand dollars deeper in trouble. One new fact developed by the audit was that, following the Government's lead, the Blue Cross is also paying the hospital less than true cost of care.

"Its generosity," one of the audit reports concluded, "has placed the institution in a position where it must now either curtail many of its services which have been given freely in the past or look to the community for increased support, and to Blue Cross for a more realistic reimbursement, if it is to continue to operate."

Children's Hospital is the only place in Washington where sick children are treated without regard to ability to pay. The emergency room at Children's is the family doctor for thousands of slum children in whose neighborhoods there are not many other family doctors. Another auditor's report said: "Virtually all of its out-patient service, much of its emergency service, and at least 40 percent of its patient days of in-patient services are devoted to the care of children whose families are in financial need."

The deficit at Children's Hospital has two chief sources. The city does not pay the hospital nearly as much as the hospital must spend to care for the children who are indigent and eligible for public help. And, even more serious, the peculiar eligibility rules prohibit the city from paying anything at all for the care of many thousands of other children, equally indigent.

Senator BYRD of West Virginia, the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee, prevents the city from changing the eligibility rules. And Congressman NATCHER, the chairman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee, prevents the city from paying the full bill even for the eligible children. Three weeks before the auditors' reports appeared, Mr. NATCHER struck out of the city's 1966 budget the small increases in rates that, at President Johnson's request, Congress had reluctantly put into the city's 1965 budget last summer.

Congress reckless vendetta against the city of Washington is driving to the wall one of the country's outstanding centers of pediatric medicine. Congressmen who think that they are saving money may want to read the sections of the auditors' reports that estimate the costs of forcing the hospital to curtail its service.

A "Government Man" Makes Friends in Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the editor of the Delta Democrat-Times of Greenville, Miss., has a keen appreciation of the true relationship between the States and the Federal Government, as he demonstrates in a recent editorial captioned: "A 'Government Man' Visits Us."

There is an important lesson, wittily stated, in this editorial, which is included in the Appendix of the RECORD under unanimous consent.

The editorial follows:

[From the Delta Democrat-Times, Greenville, Miss., Apr. 1, 1965]

A GOVERNMENT MAN VISITS US

A "Government man" came to Greenville and to Mississippi this week. Strangely, no one fell dead in the streets. Women did not swoon and strong men did not blanch. As it turned out, the first visit from a high-ranking U.S. Government official in almost 4 years turned out to be a very pleasant—and hopefully productive—occasion.

It didn't hurt that the visitor, Eugene Foley, Administrator of the Small Business Administration, is a very personable, witty, and intelligent man.

But consider the strikes that the official Mississippi attitude would have us believe he has against him. He is actually a top-ranking Federal appointee. He once worked (whisper) under then Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY, who we all know has horns. He believes in the positive role of Government in the economy and society in general. He now represents the Johnson administration, which everyone knows "hates" the South.

And yet, there he was, looking just like a human being. What's more, he was encouraging Mississippians to think of that octopus up there as their Government too—to think of it as most Americans in at least 48 of the States do. And he didn't come into the State treating his hosts like pariahs, but as possible partners in the quest for the Great Society.

We don't know what kind of impression Eugene Foley took back to Washington when he left Mississippi after his visits to Greenville, the A. & I. Board in Jackson and Natchez. But we do know that his visit here didn't do any harm, except to a few of our more cherished myths. Let's have some more "Government men" visit down here.

A Longer Look at SNCC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, several weeks ago I wrote the chairman of the House Un-American Activities Committee and suggested that the committee investigate the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee—SNCC. I am today renewing my request that such an investigation be launched, and in support of my opinion that an investigation be made I would like to call to your attention an article by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak which appeared in the Washington Post dated April 9, 1965. The committee should certainly give very serious consideration to the charges made by Messrs. Evans and Novak.

The article follows:

A LONGER LOOK AT SNCC

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

The presence of Communist elements within the operations of the Student Nonviolent

Coordinating Committee (SNCC) is not really a case of diabolical Red infiltration. In the civil rights battle, SNCC simply has left the door open to all who want to enter.

It would be a miracle if Communists had not attached themselves to SNCC. Instead, SNCC leaders make no secret of their refusal to bar Communists.

And because SNCC is the inspiration for so many idealistic young collegians, this refusal to recognize the danger of Communist infiltration is tragic. By providing ammunition to the segregationists, it poses a long-range threat to the civil rights movement itself (as Communists almost wrecked U.S. labor a generation ago).

Ever since we first wrote of this danger, in August 1963, we have been denounced by angry SNCC defenders challenging us to cite evidence. We do so now, but with these two caveats:

First, extreme radicalism in SNCC is by no means solely or even principally due to Communist influences (for example, black racism is rising inside SNCC). Second, only an infinitestimal fraction of SNCC workers have Communist ties.

But in infinitesimal fraction can be quite influential. Consider the fact that SNCC's legal arm, particularly in Mississippi voter registration, is virtually the same as the National Lawyers Guild, long-time follower of the Communist line. It was this legal advice that helped propel the Mississippi Freedom Party (a subsidiary of SNCC) to extremist positions at the 1964 Democratic Convention.

Two Lawyers Guild members active in SNCC projects—Morton Stavis and Arthur Kinoy—are illustrative of many.

Both have specialized in Communist clients (Kinoy participated in the defense of atom spies Julius and Ethel Rosenberg). Both have belonged to Communist fronts (Stavis took the fifth amendment before Congress in regard to Communist Party membership). Both have been attorneys for the United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers (the notorious UE expelled from the CIO in 1950 because of Communist domination).

Moreover, there is a clear connection between SNCC, the UE, and an ultraleftist publication called the National Guardian (which currently spews out the Chinese Communist line).

Copies of the National Guardian are standard equipment at SNCC field offices. SNCC leaders have signed testimonials praising the Guardian. The Guardian's general manager is Russell Nixon, formerly of the UE. At the UE national convention last September, the potentiality of allying labor and civil rights was discussed by Ella J. Baker, a prominent SNCC adviser.

It was Miss Baker, a veteran leftist, who harangued neophyte Mississippi Negro leaders into refusing a good compromise at the 1964 Democratic Convention. She also helps link SNCC with the Southern Conference Educational Fund (SCEF), where she has intimate ties. SCEF, impregnated with pro-Communists, has provided financial and personnel assistance to SNCC.

More ominous are the ties between SNCC and Communist youth groups abroad. A SNCC representative named Reginald Robinson attended the Moscow World Youth Forum last September. SNCC workers plan to attend a Red-sponsored youth rally in Algeria this summer. And SNCC is seeking alliances with young radicals abroad.

John Lewis, SNCC's national chairman, seems to be no Communist. But he is repeating the error of so many liberals of the past who believed they could use the Communists rather than be used.

Statement of Faith

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 15, 1965

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of the House an expression of sentiment on the events of last month in Alabama and the voting rights bill which, I trust, will soon come before us. As will be noted, 67 faculty members of the Newton, N.J., school system have placed themselves on record in support of the guarantees accorded our citizens by the 14th and 15th amendments to the Constitution. This expression is set forth in the form of an open letter which appeared in a recent edition of the New Jersey Herald, a fine weekly newspaper published in Newton, N.J. I commend to your attention, too, the editorial entitled "Statement of Faith" in which that newspaper commented upon the open letter.

The letter and editorial follow:

UNEQUIVOCAL SUPPORT

EDITOR, THE NEW JERSEY HERALD:

Standing in the shadows of the Lincoln Memorial during the march on Washington in August 1963, Rabbi Joachin Prinz spoke: "When I was the rabbi of the Jewish community in Berlin under the Hitler regime, I learned under those tragic circumstances that bigotry and hatred are not the most urgent problems. The most disgraceful, the most shameful, and the most tragic problem is silence."

As educators, we, the undersigned, feel we must take a strong stand on the moral and legal issues of civil rights. We totally reject the voting laws enacted under States rights as unjust and lacking both historical and legal justification when those laws ignore other rights guaranteed to the individual in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. Article XIV of the U.S. Constitution asserts that "no State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of the citizens of the United States, and representation of a State shall be reduced when that State limits its franchise." Article XV states that: "(1) the right of the citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude; (2) the Congress shall have the power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

No State government or State law has the right to circumvent the law of the land—the Constitution of the United States.

We also, without qualification, renounce any political force that denies the basic civil liberties to anyone. We deplore any local, State, or National Government which violates human freedom, be it in Selma, Ala., or Hanoi, North Vietnam. We cannot be intellectually honest with ourselves if we condemn Peiping and tolerate Philadelphia, Miss.

As a professional group, we add our voices to the national chorus of indignation over the brutal and inhumane treatment of American citizens on Sunday, March 7, 1965, in Selma and again on March 16, 1965, in Montgomery, Ala. There is no place in the United States for police terror.

We humbly, but proudly, add our crying conscience to that of the religious leaders in America and the world. We join with Pope Paul VI of the Roman Catholic Church in supporting Martin Luther King and his Christian policy of nonviolence. We stand shoulder to shoulder with the National Council of Churches in repudiating every form of racial injustice. As teachers, we endorse the stand of the American Jewish Committee in their support of racial and religious equality.

We give unequivocal support to our fellow-Americans, the Negroes, in their quest for the most basic sacrament in a democracy—the right to vote.

Signed by:

H. Ackerman, S. D. Alder, E. Angle, W. Barnhill, L. Beatty, G. Beierle, L. Bertsch, D. Bole, S. Bole, H. Byrne, R. Cantor, K. Childs, E. Cole, B. Cummings, R. Davies, V. Davies, G. Doland, M. Dougnerty, C. Duane, C. Ford, C. Gerth, E. Goble, M. Graebner, C. Guirreri, M. Hanley, J. Herman, E. Hess, J. Hontz, G. Hubbard, M. Jaeger, A. Jones, B. Jones, G. Kaiser, Z. Kiss, F. Kochey, B. LaBone, R. Lawton, F. Linkey, F. Mara, G. Marotta, G. Marshall, M. Mathews, L. McCoy, E. Miller, V. Mills, A. Newlun, A. Osmun, J. Pascoe, D. Proctor, B. Pugsley, P. Reger, J. Rydell, R. Scheer, H. Selover, R. Seplow, A. Shannon, S. Snyder, F. Stanaback, B. Strzelczyk, A. Sutton, T. Taylor, E. Thorne, I. Ward, D. Will, K. Wooden, C. Yeter, J. Zamos, Teachers in the Newton School System.

STATEMENT OF FAITH

Immediately below this in the "Editor's Mail Bag" is an open letter signed by 67 Newton teachers and administrators. In submitting the letter for publication, the teachers said it was circulated in the three schools and all teachers and administrators given an opportunity to sign and subscribe to it. The letter is signed by less than 50 percent of the members of the faculties in the three schools.

The letter is, in effect, a statement of faith, an expression of conscience on the greatest moral, social and religious issues now facing this Nation. In unequivocal terms, the teachers take their stand on the constitutional side of civil rights, and "add our voices to the national chorus of indignation over the brutal and inhumane treatment of American citizens on Sunday, March 7, 1965, in Selma and again on March 16, 1965, in Montgomery, Ala."

It is right that teachers should speak out on these matters. And they have every right to speak out. In fact, they have a duty to do so. To do otherwise would be to abdicate their position of leadership in the community.

The letter signed by the 67 teachers is not an inflammatory or radical statement. It is simply a reaffirmation of the rights guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution and a denunciation of "any political force that denies the basic civil liberties to anyone." Who can quarrel with that? It is a statement of principles to which every right-thinking person in the country can subscribe.

It is regrettable that less than half the teachers saw fit to sign the statement. However, it must be assumed that those who did not subscribe had good and sufficient personal reasons for abstaining. This is a matter of deep personal conviction, and is not one that should involve recriminations or personal abuse. The teaching staff, like any other group of 150 people in our society, is bound to include persons of widely differing opinions.

And those who have the courage of their convictions, and speak out for what is right and lawful deserve the support of the community.

The Reverend Malcolm Boyd Calls for Strongest Possible Voter Registration Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK J. HORTON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, last week here in Washington, "Four Plays on Race," were presented during the four-evening period, April 4 through 7. The plays, written by the Reverend Malcolm Boyd, were sponsored by the Catholic Interracial Council, the Episcopal Society for Cultural and Racial Unity, the Fellowship of the Committees of the United Church of Christ, and the Presbyterian Interracial Council.

I was highly honored to be a patron for these performances. A great deal of human understanding was left with the thousands who witnessed them and who heard the sermons preached by Chaplain Boyd at the end of each evening.

On two of the evenings, Chaplain Boyd devoted his sermon to a question that very much concerns Congress at this time; namely, the pending voter rights legislation. His message on this matter is so strong that I have asked him for a copy of the sermon.

Mr. Speaker, Chaplain Boyd has generously responded to my request, and I take pleasure in sharing with my colleagues comments which were contained in his sermon as it was given at the National Cathedral on April 6 and 7:

The freedom revolution has given American life a redemptive awareness of the very transitory quality of false peace. This is a revolution, posing for every man the question of his own freedom. A light has been cast into a locked room of horrors; there is terror inside it but also the key to reconciliation and peace.

The Selma crisis has most recently demonstrated how deep are the chasms between human persons in America; Negro and white, Negro and Negro, white and white. The depth of hate is matched only by that of a lack of communication. The issue of separation between human persons is illustrated by the 1964 civil rights bill and the pending voter registration bill. These have been necessary to make clear that the direction the Nation is taking is not that of South Africa but, however fumblingly, in the direction of an open society.

A large part of the issue depends on the creation of an atmosphere of trust. We were given heart by the moral leadership of the President's message to Congress and his introduction of a basically strong voter bill. However, our attitude is now one of some shock and disbelief as, at this point, the administration seems willing to settle for less than the strongest possible legislation. There is sentiment in the Nation for the most effective possible bill. The amendments presented by the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights would help to make the proposed bill accomplish the ends sought and prove that the Nation does mean to end discrimination.

The basic issue is more important than any mere partisan gains. The issue has to be kept nonpartisan. It further dehumanizes the Negro to wheel and deal in the categorized Negro vote, and this applies to both parties.

To strengthen the bill so that it may be more effective, we ask for the total elimination of the poll tax in State and local elections as well as Federal ones; elimination of the requirement in the bill that a prospective registrant has first to go to a State official before going to a Federal reigstrar; extended coverage of the bill so that it does not apply just to the hard-core States but also to Texas and New York, indeed, to any geographical location; and maximum protection of registrants and voters from all economic and physical intimidation. At present the bill does not protect people who have registered before and people who are actually voting, but only people registering.

Where, in the establishment, is the ground of opposition to strengthening this bill for maximum effectiveness and truly moral usefulness in combating evils? We must ask this question and move creatively, strongly, and immediately—particularly in dialog with our own congressional representatives—against that ground of opposition.

It is too late for closed societies and silence on the part of the good people. Six million Jews died while good Christians kept their mouths, and their ears and eyes, shut. Such a highly respected Negro writer as Lerone Bennette, Jr., has recently warned that if America does not choose authentic democracy now it may find it has drifted into a Fourth Reich.

Amid the holocaust of human pain, the suffering which one man is peculiarily equipped to inflict upon another man, let us pledge ourselves in service, responsibility, and love to our God in a new commitment which cuts below the surface of pop religion, culturally respectable religion, or merely selfish religion. And let us pledge ourselves in an awareness of our shared, brief, sensitive, and vulnerable humanness, to one another.

Mr. Speaker, much national notice has been given Chaplain Boyd and his work. In fact, just a few evenings ago, the respected news commentator, Edward P. Morgan, devoted a principal portion of his broadcast commentary to Chaplain Boyd's "Four Plays on Race."

So that my colleagues may know what Mr. Morgan said on this occasion, I am including excerpts from the news broadcast of Mr. Morgan which was carried on the American Broadcasting Co. Radio Network, sponsored by the AFL–CIO, Friday, April 9, at 7 p.m., e.s.t:

I have just been exposed to a series of four short plays on race presented, significantly enough, not in a theater but within the majestic Gothic mass of the National Cathedral in Washington.

A major obstacle to better understanding of the race problem, so-called, is the difficulty of identifying, or empathizing, to use psychological labels, with the victims. Even with all the good will in the world—and often protestations of good will hide hypocrisy—the average white Northerner has been too aloof to engage himself personally with what is perhaps the biggest domestic issue challenging the American society. And events of the last tortured decade, in the courtroom and on the streets, have worn threadbare the insistent but defensive white Southern rationalization that "nobody really understands the Negro's problems but us."

In some respects, the fact that Malcolm Boyd's four plays on race were given in a church bears more significance than their content. Ordained as an Episcopal priest in 1955 after a decade of dabbling in advertising, broadcasting, movies and public relations from Madison Avenue to Hollywood, the Reverend Malcolm Boyd is an angry man. Much of his anger is directed at what he scornfully calls "pop religion" and one of his plays, "The Community," deals with the tensions within the church—not any particular denomination but the church as an institution. He concludes that the church is dead or alive depending on whether its members are dead or alive and he charges that too many of them have been dead in their lack of commitment and moral response to the race issue. "I know what the gospel says," one of his characters, a white woman, declares, "but I don't intend to hear it preached in church—I want a gentle, loving pastor who will tell me how to live in comfort and spiritual security—until next Sunday morning."

It is never a comfortable exercise to have your conscience, individual or collective, exposed in public and this was what the tempestuous, 41-year-old priest was doing—with some authority because he has participated in freedom rides, sit-ins, and other civil rights demonstrations in the South and elsewhere and he has preached an impatient kind of social and religious evangelism on college campuses across the country.

His perhaps calculated reputation for irreverence had inspired rumors that the plays might be picketed by churchgoers. No such protest materialized though the atmosphere inside National Cathedral during the four-night run might well have shocked many orthodox religionists. Bobbysoxers and slightly older teenagers, black and white, dressed in blue-jeans, t-shirts and sports jackets, or wearing no jackets at all, chanted freedom songs with a passion from the pews and even the pulpit. Folk-singers roused the audiences who in turn contributed some $5,000 toward the cause of racial understanding.

The massive pillars of the cathedral, which soon will look down on the ritual of Easter, seemed to tremble as thousands of voices joined in the verses and chorus of "We Shall Overcome." The participants did not seem to be there for kicks and if the church, which too often has been a citadel of pious complacency and self-righteousness, is indeed becoming a GHQ for the conquest of bigotry and prejudice, we are entitled to observe this centennial day of Appomattox with more hope than sadness.

This is Edward P. Morgan saying good night from Washington.

Resolution Concerning Soil Conservation Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Legislature of the State of Tennessee has officially gone on record in protest against a proposed drastic reduction in the Federal Government's soil conservation program.

This legislature, in a joint resolution recently adopted, urges Congress to support the restoration of soil conservation district assistance to the level of present and future needs.

Under unanimous consent, this memorial to the Congress is included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The resolution follows:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 73

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress to oppose the proposed drastic reduction in technical assistance to soil conservation districts

Whereas the proposed Federal budget for 1966 provides for a reduction of $20 million in the appropriation for the Department of Agriculture's Soil Conservation Service in providing technical assistance to landowners in carrying out soil conservation district programs; and

Whereas this budget also proposes a radical change in the basis for technical assistance which would seriously reduce the amount and the effectiveness of soil and water conservation measures applied to the land; and

Whereas practically every soil conservation district now has insufficient personnel to meet the growing demands of farmland owners, suburban dwellers, and municipal governments requiring technical guidance and assistance in soil and water management problems; and

Whereas this proposed reduction is a strange and questionable form of economy since it would seriously curtail conservation construction work and the sales of conservation materials and supplies representing hundreds of millions of dollars annually in the Nation's business; and

Whereas the Tennessee General Assembly and many units of local government recognize the essentiality of technically sound conservation assistance and make annual appropriations and other contributions in support of soil and water conservation district activities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representative (the Senate concurring), That the Members of the U.S. Congress from Tennessee are urged to vigorously oppose the proposed reduction and related changes; and to give their support to the restoration of funds for soil conservation district assistance to the level of present and future needs; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Members of Congress from Tennessee and the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Adopted March 19, 1965.

WILLIAM L. BARRY,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
JARED MADDUX,
Speaker of the Senate.

Approved, March 24, 1965.

FRANK G. CLEMENT,
Governor.

A "Dark and Gummy" Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post on April 6, 1965, called the administration's policy on residual fuel oil import quotas as dark and gummy as the fuel itself. I have long fought for the removal of this discriminatory restriction which adversely affects so many users of this product, particularly those in New England and Florida.

The Washington Post editorial appears below:

DARK AND GUMMY

Residual fuel oil is dark and gummy, and so indeed is the administration's policy governing its importation.

In 1959 President Eisenhower was persuaded that there is a happy coincidence between national defense requirements and the protection of domestic coal and petroleum producers against imports of a low-priced fuel that is used in powerplants and large buildings. Imports of residual fuel oil—largely from Venezuela—were subjected to rigid import quotas. Thus a few domestic coal and oil producers gained at the expense of millions of consumers who live on the Eastern Seaboard.

Rumor had it that the Secretary of the Interior was given a green light to begin dismantling the system by lifting the quotas from New England and Florida. But the signal was reversed, presumably in the dark and gummy milieu of pressure politics. Then there is the report of a secret cabinet committee which flatly declared that residual fuel oil controls are not in the public interest. Administration officials deny its existence, but one of its irate authors tells a different tale.

Mr. Udall, whose good intentions appear to have been dashed on the White House steps, has taekn refuge from the crossfire of conflicting interest groups by asking the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning for a searching new study of the relationship between national security and residual oil imports. Until that new and penetrating document is released or blasted loose prospects for consumers will remain dark and gummy.

Men With Ideas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the universities and industry in my own city of Pittsburgh have made great contributions to the scientific and technological progress of that area and of the Nation. Mr. Robert H. Ryan, president of the Regional Industrial Development Corp. of southwestern Pennsylvania, writing in the excellent publication Pittsburgh Research—Key to Tomorrow, sees a bright future for this area because of the research potential there.

Mr. Ryan's article, "Men With Ideas," is included at this point in my remarks:

MEN WITH IDEAS

(By Robert H. Ryan)

Men with ideas always have found the Pittsburgh area to be conducive to the creative mind and innovation, whether it be education, industry, business, science, or some other field.

It is where the first university west of the Alleghenies was founded, Andrew Carnegie launched his steel empire, Andrew Mellon captained the financial world, Robert Duncan established the first industrial research institute, and George Westinghouse conceived many of his electrical and railway inventions.

At the end of World War II, when the Pittsburgh area needed a face lifting, imaginative civic leaders initiated a vast redevelopment program that provided new highways and parking, housing and office buildings, smoke and flood control, educational and cultural activities, and new industries—many of which were science oriented.

In the years that followed, the new Pittsburgh gained a reputation as a growing, aggressive, and diversified community on the move. The rebirth of the area has been accomplished by major advances in virtually every phase of political, social, economic, and scientific life.

More than ever before, men with ideas are finding encouragement, assistance, and success in the stimulating Pittsburgh scientific environment. This brochure describes Pittsburgh's achievements and capabilities in the research and development field, and provides a working handbook for increasing diversification and interaction among regional organizations.

Altogether, there are 150 research laboratories in the 9 counties that comprise the Pittsburgh area. Most of the facilities are located in Allegheny County, but a great many also can be found in the rapidly growing suburban counties of Armstrong, Beaver, Butler, Fayette, Greene, Lawrence, Washington, and Westmoreland.

Approximately 7,600 professional scientists and engineers are engaged in research and development activities in the southwestern Pennsylvania region. In addition, there are some 6,500 research assistants and technicians.

The total investment in Pittsburgh area R. & D. facilities exceeds $356 million, while the annual research and deevlopment budgets approach $349 million.

This makes research the third leading industry in the Pittsburgh area, being surpassed only by primary metals (with annual production exceeding $1 billion) and electrical machinery ($483 million).

The R. & D. dollar volume actually is greater than that for such basic industries as nonelectrical machinery ($326 million), chemicals and allied products ($250 million), glass ($228 million), and transportation equipment ($149 million).

The Pittsburgh area is the Nation's leading materials research center. The materials barrier that limits most other technologies is being attacked from a variety of fronts—metals, alloys, ceramics, plastics, glass, and electronic and magnetic materials.

In recent years, the region also has become the international hub for nuclear power research and development. The first commercial atomic powerplant was developed and built in the area, and new techniques of power generation are being studied.

Another field that is receiving increasing attention in Pittsburgh is scientific instrumentation, particularly the industrial applications of spectroscopy and related equipment.

The life and space sciences also are objects of a growing number of research projects. Other major research and development fields are chemicals, electronics, machinery, transportation, food, vacuum, oceanography, cryogenics, and education.

The Pittsburgh area has played a vital role in scientific and technological progress, and it will continue to do so in the future. However, there must be an acceleration of research and development effort—in every field and every industry.

Experience has shown that those undertakings with strong scientific and technological roots are most likely to grow and to prosper in the years ahead. Men with ideas must continue to be encouraged and assisted; specialized know-how and facilities must be sought out and utilized; and new growth patterns must be explored and receive community support.

Hon. F. Edward Hébert To Receive Arnold Air Society's Man of the Year Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to invite the attention of the Members of the House to the annual Arnold Air Society and Angel Flight national conclaves here in Washington during the week of April 12, 1965.

On Wednesday evening, April 14, 1,500 young men and women will assemble at the Sheraton Park Hotel. These visitors are students who come to the seat of government representing 170 colleges and universities located in 47 States, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia.

These young gentlemen and ladies are touring Washington as delegates to the annual Arnold Air Society and Angel Flight national conclaves, conclaves which began here Sunday and end Wednesday with an awards banquet.

The Secretary of the Air Force, the Honorable Eugene M. Zuckert, will present awards to outstanding civilian and military leaders at this banquet. One of the most outstanding Members of this or any other legislative body will receive the Arnold Air Society's highest award. I refer to the Man of the Year Award, which will go to the distinguished, incomparable, highly respected senior Representative from Louisiana, my personal friend, the Honorable F. EDWARD HÉBERT.

The significance of this award can only be appreciated after rendering a few statistics on the Arnold Air Society and Angel Flights. Named in honor of the first Army Air Corps Chief of Staff Gen. Henry H. "Hap" Arnold, the society is a professional honorary service organization of selected Air Force ROTC cadets. Each academic year, more than 5,500 cadets make up the squadrons at 170 colleges and universities throughout the land. Their purpose is to aid in the development and production of Air Force officers through furthering the purpose, traditions, and concepts of the U.S. Air Force.

Each academic year, some 2,500 dedicated young women are selected as members of Angel Flights at many of these same colleges and universities. This honorary service organization promotes the interest of the college man in the Air Force ROTC program. From my review of the 17 Angel Flight delegates competing here for the title of "Little General," I can report that the dedication and scholastic achievement of these young ladies is surpassed only by their beauty.

The majority of these cadets will graduate this summer or next and enter the Air Force as second lieutenants. They are certain to be some of the future leaders of our Air Force and our Nation. Many of these ladies will become future leaders of our democracy in their own right.

Springfield College Students' "Work Week" Project Financially Aids Campus Swimming Pool Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 17, 1965

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, students at famed Springfield College in my home city of Springfield, Mass., have just completed a "Work Week" project to raise funds for financing a planned swimming pool complex on the campus.

Led by radio-television star Art Linkletter, the Springfield College students began on April 13 to render household services in the Greater Springfield area in exchange for contributions for the swimming pool. This Springfield College project certainly reflects the finest effort by college youth in this country to provide a worthwhile community service while fostering a needed campus project. The students at Springfield College who participated in "Work Week" are to be commended for unselfishly giving their time and effort to this college and community project.

Mr. Speaker, under previous permission I include with my remarks a news story from the Springfield Sunday Republican of April 14 giving details of the Springfield College "Work Week."

STAR SPARKLES

The 235 students who tackled the first 65 jobs Saturday morning and afternoon collected approximately $1,000, a college spokesman announced.

The 550 quota for job requests was reached and the student work-teams have stopped receiving assignments.

The students indicated, however, they would still consider jobs which guaranteed "at least $100 toward the new pool."

The theory behind "work week" is that household jobs will be manned by the students in exchange for a contribution.

Linkletter, who according to one college official has "really put zip into this campus," annouhced Friday night at a trustee dinner the college has already raised more than $271,000 in its campaign for the natatorium which is expected to cost $450,000.

APPEARS 26 TIMES

The television star, best known for noting "people are funny," made a total of 26 appearances throughout the area in his 30-hour local stay which ended late Saturday afternoon.

He received several large contributions during his travels here, it was revealed, before flying to New York City from Bradley Field at the conclusion of the day's activities.

The "work week" will continue until next Saturday with students participating between 1 and 7 p.m. daily after classes. College authorities and students directing the project hope to receive nearly $10,000 in contributions from homeowners.

OFFER CAR WASHES

Participating in the project by offering car washes for "contributions only" are four service stations in the area. Linkletter visitied one of them, at Allen and Cooley Streets, Saturday.

The showman stopped in at Trinity Methodist Church on Sumner Avenue where in the church swimming pool a New England Amateur Athletic Union meet was in progress.

Before leaving, Linkletter made a social visit to the home of 94-year-old, Mrs. Edward Appleton, of 313 Maple Street. A long-time supporter of Springfield College projects, Mrs. Appleton is the aunt of college trustee, Attorney Julius H. Appleton, of Longmeadow.

Flying Linkletter to New York in his private plane was Norman C. Keith, an oil executive and college alumnus who this year is serving as chairman of the board of trustees.

Small Business Subcontractors Helped Develop Gemini Space Capsule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, an event occurred recently which emphasizes the importance of cooperation between the big and small business sectors of our economy.

The event to which I refer was a special ceremony held at the Small Business Administration honoring McDonnell Aircraft Corp., the prime contractor on the Mercury and Gemini space projects, for its interest in small business.

SBA also honored on this occasion three small business concerns—subcontractors—for playing important roles in developing the Gemini capsule.

More than 5,000 small firms participated in this Gemini project, Mr. Speaker, demonstrating once again the vitality and the diversity and the excellence of this sophisticated sector of small business.

The three small firms honored by SBA on April 6 are Astro Metallics Corp., of Harwood Heights, Ill.; R. E. Darling Co., of Gaithersburg, Md.; and Snap-Tite Inc., of Union City, Pa.

Mr. Eugene Foley, Administrator of SBA, made an eloquent exposition on this occasion on the importance of the healthy interaction of small and large business in our economy.

His remarks were as follows:

REMARKS BY SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATOR EUGENE P. FOLEY AT AEROSPACE AWARDS CEREMONY, LAFAYETTE BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 6, 1965

We often talk about the ingenuity and the excellence and the creativity of small business. But the concept takes on real substance on an occasion like today.

We are here to recognize the important role small business is playing in our rapidly accelerating program of space exploration. And we are here to honor a large business concern that has carefully nurtured and expanded the participation of small business in aeronautics and space technology.

The large business is McDonnell Aircraft, a pioneer in this area of modern technology—prime contractor on the Mercury and Gemini space flights—an employer of 34,000 persons—a firm with facilities valued at more than $90 million.

The smaller concerns are Astro Metallics Corp. of Harwood Heights, Ill., whose president is Albert S. Kepen; R. E. Darling Co. of Gaithersburg, Md., whose president is R. E. Darling, Sr., and Snap-Tite, Inc., of Union City, Pa., whose president is George A. Clark.

The teamwork of McDonnell and these three sophisticated small businesses is symbolic of our economic system. This refutes the concept that holds that to be pro-big business one must be antismall business—or that to be pro-small business one must be antibig business.

These firms epitomize healthy interaction between large and small business. They point up the economics of this interaction—that it is good business for big business to perform certain functions, and for small business to perform others. They underline the complementary roles small business and large business play in our economic system.

They symbolize teamwork and constructive cooperation.

These firms are representative of many other firms. There were more than 1,100 subcontractors signed by McDonnell for the Gemini project—and they all performed well. And there are many other large concerns that have aggressive programs which utilize the services and products of small firms.

But there is no better example in our free enterprise system of this healthy partnership than is represented by these four firms we are honoring today.

The citation we shall present to McDonnell recognizes his efforts to promote "the growth and welfare of hundreds of small firms through utilization of their facilities and skills in the production of America's first two-man spacecraft."

The citations for the presidents of Snap-Tite, Inc., for Astro Metallics, and for R. E. Darling Co. emphasize their "ingenuity and resourcefulness in producing for the first two-man American spacecraft components whose reliability was crucial to the successful orbit and which exemplified the skills of many small aerospace firms."

SBA takes justifiable pride on this occasion because it was the catalyst that brought McDonnell and these three firms together. Specific information on the capabilities of these companies was provided McDonnell when it was seeking subcontractors for various parts of the Gemini contracts.

We feel that this is indicative of our role in helping to fuse the relationship between large and small business, in helping to coalesce the potential for coordination and cooperation that is inherent in our economic system.

As I think of the roles played by the business concerns represented here today, I recall the mythological story of Daedalus and Icarus. Daedalus, you will recall, helped his son Icarus to escape from Crete by helping him fashion wings of wax. When Icarus flew too near the sun, the wax wings melted and he plummeted to his doom.

The technology that assures our astronauts that their wings are more than wax is intrinsic in the technology represented by these small firms here today.

Albert Kepen and his Astro Metallics manufactured the protective beryllium shingles which along with the Gemini's heat shield secured the spacecraft and the astronauts from the melting heat which would otherwise have consumed them when they reentered the atmosphere.

The Darling Co. manufactured the oxygen hoses used by the Gemini astronauts during their flight while the Snap-Tite Co. produced the quick-disconnect couplings linking the oxygen hoses with the oxygen supply.

And so in the capable hands of the technicians in these firms, a myth became a reality, a science fiction novel became a true adventure.

And so big business and small business are in partnership as they make the dreams of yesterday the realization of today.

That is America.

That is the stuff that made this Nation the unique creation that it is.

A democratic society inherently has the inducements that will build the creative genius of man to its peak.

As Franklin Roosevelt said:

"The basic proposition of the world and dignity of man is the strongest, the most creative force now present in the world."

It gives me great pleasure today to recognize, for the presentation of these awards: Mr. Joseph W. Antonides, director of materiel representing Mr. McDonnell of McDonnell Aircraft; Mr. Kepen of Astro Metallics, Mr. Clark of Snap-Tite, and Mr. Darling, Junior, of R. E. Darling Co.

Congratulations to all of you.

Remarks of Harlon B. Carter, President of the National Rifle Association, at 94th Annual Members Banquet

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert herewith the remarks made by the president of the National Rifle Association, Harlon B. Carter, at the 94th Annual Members Banquet in Washington, D.C., on March 31, 1965:

Fellow members of the National Rifle Association and friends, today, I was elected president of the National Rifle Association. I am deeply grateful that my first public appearance in such capacity can be in front of this distinguished group of thinking people which, each in his own manner and each to his own depth, has an interest in the National Rifle Association.

The social and political flavor of our times indicates the propriety of a few words this evening to review, and to imprint still deeper in the minds of all of us, what the National Rifle Association is and why it exists. These questions inevitably relate to the possession and to the use of firearms—a concept—a fact—which we must maintain if the objects of our association are to have meaning—objectives as they are written today—as they have been written for decades in our bylaws.

Now there will soon be a million of us—men and women who have pledged that they are citizens of the United States; pledged that they are not members of any organization which has, as any part of its program, the attempt to overthrow the Government of the United States by force or violence; pledged that they have never been convicted of a crime of violence and that, if admitted to membership, they will fulfill the obligations of good sportsmen and good citizens—the obligations of good sportsmanship and good citizenship so clearly stated in the objects of the National Rifle Association, often repeated—but not often enough repeated, as the guiding lights by which men of good character and principle—citizens of good repute—shall set their course as responsible members of the National Rifle Association.

Let me repeat again—and again—what those objects are. And, think now, this is the purpose—these are the objectives—these are the reasons, for the existence of the National Rifle Association of America:

To promote social welfare and public safety; to promote law and order; to promote the national defense; to educate and train citizens of good repute in the safe and efficient handling of small arms; to educate and train citizens of good repute in the technique of design, production, and group instruction; to increase the knowledge of small arms and promote efficiency in the use of such arms on the part of members of law enforcement agencies, of the Armed Forces, and of citizens who would be subject to service in the event of war; and generally to encourage the lawful ownership and use of small arms by citizens of good repute.

I sometimes wonder if—and this is as high a tribute as I can make to the wisdom of our predecessors—I sometimes wonder if these objects, often repeated, seriously considered, and to which we are conscientiously dedicated, shall not, over the years, lead all men of good intentions—but sometimes of little understanding—to know us and to support us.

These objects assuredly offer us a sound foundation for reasoning with men.

A sound foundation upon which to resist legislative effort where conscience and good citizenship so dictates.

A sound foundation upon which to promote legislative effort where there is a reasonable expectation it will hamper criminals rather than law-abiding citizens.

The National Rifle Association is not alone in these beliefs, a fact for which we are grateful.

The National Rifle Association is not alone in its work for these objectives.

We are the serious law-abiding citizens who stand in the forefront of tens of millions of others who enjoy outdoor recreation and hunting or else who believe in outdoor recreation and hunting but who enjoy those pleasures vicariously—prevented from actively doing so by the demands of family, of health, or of employment.

We stand in the forefront of all citizens of good repute who wish lawfully and constitutionally to keep firearms.

We stand in the forefront of those who believe that the police activities and the military activities of our people should be in the hands of the agencies lawfully and constitutionally provided for such purposes.

These beliefs and these concepts indicate the tasks, and they indicate the objectives, to which every law-abiding citizen in America can justifiably dedicate himself—and to which, with a hundred years start, it is appropriate that we be in the forefront.

I thank you ladies and gentlemen. We are happy you can be with us this evening.

Resolution on Voting Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, in the interests of doing everything possible to encourage Members of this House to support President Johnson's call for voting rights legislation, I should like to renew my own support of that legislation and to cite another organization in

my own district for its energetic effort to this end. I include at this point in my remarks a resolution adopted unanimously recently by the 21st Ward Improvement League of Pittsburgh.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION ON VOTING RIGHTS

(Adopted by 21st Ward Improvement League, Pittsburgh, Pa.)

Whereas we as a society and individuals aspire to create wider participation in basic and inalienable rights; and

Whereas it is the intent of the Bill of Rights that there be universal suffrage; and

Whereas legislation has been passed including the 1964 Civil Rights Act to implement the intention of the Bill of Rights; and

Whereas Negro Americans in Selma, Ala., and other places still encounter difficulties in registering to vote;

We support President Johnson and call on the Congress to develop and pass new legislation that is aimed at meeting the practical problems that are still being encountered by Negro Americans who desire to become full first-class citizens by participation in the electoral process.

Vice Adm. William F. Raborn, Jr., New Director of the Central Intelligence Agency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the President of the United States for the wisdom he has demonstrated in appointing Vice Adm. William F. Raborn, Jr., U.S. Navy Retired, as the new Director of the Central Intelligence Agency. Vice Admiral Raborn is one of the great men of our Nation. He has already made tremendous contributions to the security of the Nation and, undoubtedly, his appointment and agreement to serve in this vital position involves great personal sacrifice. This is what one would expect from "Red" Raborn.

The Nation has been fortunate in having John McCone as the Director of Central Intelligence—a man of great achievement, dedication, and high integrity. It is not often that a man of brilliance, dedication, and high integrity follows as a successor in such a vital position.

I know I speak for the entire Committee on Armed Services when I extend to Vice Admiral Raborn our sincerest congratulations, our pledge of full cooperation, and our personal pleasure in knowing that a man of his tremendous ability has agreed to assume this position which entails such extraordinary responsibility.

We look forward to renewing our association with this truly outstanding American. As Director of one of the most important agencies of our Government, Admiral Raborn will frequently report directly to our committee, and, even more frequently, to our Central Intelligence Agency Subcommittee.

We anticipate with pleasure our first meeting with him.

The Voting Rights Bill Is Tough

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, there has been much public discussion and controversy over the adequacy of voting rights legislation now being considered by the Judiciary Committee. Much of the criticism has been more directed toward the achievement of purely political ends rather than the urgent need to assure voting rights for all Americans. Mr. Alexander Bickel, in the April 3 edition of the New Republic magazine, has provided a most valuable analysis of the problem which confronts us and the remedies proposed by the President of the United States.

Mr. Bickel's article follows:

THE VOTING RIGHTS BILL IS TOUGH

(By Alexander M. Bickel)

The administration's voting rights bill is a tough measure, make no mistake, the toughest since Reconstruction. It is quite a different article than the Civil Rights Act of 1964. That statute proclaimed broad norms concerning complex and ramified social problems and affecting the daily activities of millions of people, and it necessarily demanded no more than that the country live up to those norms by and large, over time. No more could very well be expected. This voting statute deals with a narrow problem that has been solved in many places and reduced to manageable proportions elsewhere by intensive investigation and litigation over the past 6 or 7 years. Its objective is no longer openly controversial in respectable quarters, as the objectives of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 still are. Not even Governor Wallace openly opposes the principle that qualified Negroes should vote and that Negroes should be qualified by the same standards as whites, although he and others argue on principle against desegregated schools and public facilities, for example.

The President's bill, therefore, could afford to be all muscle, and it is. Furthermore, it is not only the toughest bill since Reconstruction, it is a Reconstruction measure, for it applies exclusively, with one or two incidental exceptions, to the hard-core Southern States and Black Belt counties, where prospective voters are required to pass various tests, and where, as of November 1964, fewer than 50 percent of voting age citizens were registered or voted, a figure well below the average in the rest of the country. The area affected, according to the administration (in addition, quite incidentally, to Alaska and, it seems, some three counties in such places as Maine, Idaho, and Arizona), consists of Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, South Carolina, Virginia, and 30-odd counties in North Carolina. But there is no reason to suppose that the enforcement provisions of the bill will be applied throughout the States affected, say, in Atlanta, or in Alexandria, Va., or, indeed, in Alaska. The Attorney General is authorized to invoke the bill county by county rather than statewide only, and he will enforce it where needed.

Unquestionably, this is a strictly regional measure, but then voting is the one aspect of all the many aspects of the racial problem in the United States which is strictly regional. The right to vote may be impaired in one or another undesirable manner elsewhere as well, but where else is it systematically denied on account of race? The 15th amendment forbids any State to deny the right to vote to anyone "on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude," and that is all it does. The President's bill is entitled "A bill to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution on the United States," and that is all it does, and that is why it is a regional measure. The South ought not to be singled out in respect of racial problems that it shares with other parts of the country. But voting is not one of these.

In the area affected, the right to vote may not be denied for failure to pass a reading or writing test, or one of the many kinds of tests requiring an applicant to show that he can correctly interpret, say, a provision of the State constitution, or that he knows and understands the Federal and State Constitutions and like documents. Nor may an applicant be disqualified for failure to prove "good moral character," or because he has not been vouched for by other registered voters. These provisions throw into doubt—they render voidable—all State-imposed voting qualifications except age, citizenship, residence, and perhaps soundness of mind and lack of a criminal record. And this has led to some questioning of the bill on both constitutional and prudential grounds. For—except as they may be applied to discriminate on the basis of race, and except as, for purposes of Federal elections, Congress may regulate the manner of their application—voting qualifications are under the Constitution to be set by the States, not by the Federal Government. And a minimal literacy qualification is not generally thought unreasonable.

But it overstates the necessary or even probable effect of the bill to say that it outlaws the requirement of literacy in the region in which it applies. To begin with, once the Attorney General and the Census Bureau have examined the relevant statistics, and have certified that the statute covers a given State or county, it is open to that State or county to come before a Federal court and prove that it has not in the past 10 years discriminated against prospective voters on account of race. If the court so finds, and if during this 10-year period there has been no other judicial finding (under the Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960, and 1964) of voting discrimination in that State or county, the State or county becomes as free of the provisions of this act as New York or Cleveland. And so it is not only statistics that lead to invocation of this statute, but the fact of past discrimination.

Moreover, even in places where there has been discrimination in the past 10 years, the bill does not outlaw literacy as a qualification for voting. It outlaws existing tests administered by State registrars, on the theory that they are presumably instruments of discrimination, and it empowers the Attorney General to have the Civil Service Commission (the Federal Government's general employment agency) appoint examiners (not necessarily residents of the county in question) who, in turn, are authorized to register voters. It is made fairly clear in the bill that an examiner may register as voters only those persons who "have the qualifications prescribed by State law * * *." The Attorney General and the Civil Service Commission will tell the examiner what those qualifications are. There is no reason to suppose that

they will instruct the examiner otherwise than that literacy is a qualification where in fact it has been, since it would quite likely be unconstitutional to instruct him otherwise. But there is very reason to expect that they will also instruct him that: (1) he need not apply some complex state literacy test, which has in the past been used to discriminate, but may consider anyone with a sixth-grade education literate, or administer a simple signature or reading test; and (2) he need not impose a literacy requirement at all where in fact the State registrar has in the past not applied one to whites who are still on the voter rolls. Properly administered, therefore, the statute will not abolish the literacy qualification for voting where it has existed—but existed not just on paper, rather, in the actual implementation of the State voting law. The statute will abolish only devices, including particular kinds of literacy tests (not qualifications, as such), which have been used to discriminate.

NO CONSTITUTIONAL POWER

The President said at his press conference on March 20 that he would have liked to abolish the literacy qualifications altogether and allow voting upon proof merely of age (18 years, at that) and citizenship, but that he was advised the Federal Government had no constitutional power to impose such a rule. He was correctly advised. Besides, while it is true that in Mississippi, for example, any literacy requirement will disqualify very large numbers of Negroes, and will do so, with painful injustice, because of the State's past neglect of its duty to educate Negroes as well as whites—nevertheless, and apart from the constitutional inhibition on the authority of the Federal Government, one may doubt the wisdom, in Mississippi or anywhere, of enfranchising illiterates.

Qualifications other than literacy imposed by such States as Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi—interpretation and understanding tests, good moral character, vouchers—are no more outlawed by the bill as qualifications than is literacy. But there can be no doubt that Federal examiners will be instructed to ignore them entirely. And that is because, unlike literacy, these additional qualifications and tests can be proved, in the process by which they were enacted—many of them quite recently—and in their consistent administration, to have had absolutely no purpose other than to discriminate against Negroes. They are simply not a bona fide exercise of the power of the States to set voter qualifications. Thus only the other day the Supreme Court declared unconstitutional a Louisiana interpretation test (an applicant must be able to understand and give a reasonable interpretation of sections of the State or Federal Constitution as read to him by the registrar), and indicated its readiness to strike down a similar Mississippi test, as well as a good moral character requirement. Moreover, in the Louisiana case, the Court forbade application of a new citizenship test, unless all whites now registered should be purged from the rolls and required to reregister under it. And in December, in a case from Walthall County, Miss., the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit found that whites were regularly permitted to register without complying with the current and increasingly difficult provisions of the voters' registration statutes enacted by the State of Mississippi on a time schedule that coincided with the indications that more Negroes would make the effort to register. The Court therefore ordered that Negroes also be registered without regard to these increasingly difficult provisions, subject only to a simple demonstration of literacy. There was no constitutional difficulty in issuing this decree, and there will be none when Federal examiners are instructed under this statute to do what the court of appeals and the Supreme Court have done. If a State wishes to challenge the registration of one or more applicants (presumably on the ground that State qualifications have not been observed), it may do so before an examiner, and then in Federal court. The facts of discrimination will then be placed on the record, as in the Walthall County case and in the Louisiana case decided by the Supreme Court, and that will conclude the matter. In the meantime, the challenged Negro voter may vote.

With a single exception, which could have been taken care of by a simple amendment, all that this bill will achieve could have been accomplished under the Civil Rights Act of 1960. That act provided for the appointment of referees, as it called them, where a pattern of discrimination had been proved, and empowered them to register Negroes under qualifications no more stringent than had been applied to whites in the past. A significant difference between the function of these referees and that of the examiners now provided for is that the examiners can register all qualified comers, if the Attorney General so desires, whereas each applicant to a referee had first to prove that he had tried and failed to obtain registration from the appropriate State official. Given the forbidding atmosphere of the typical Black Belt county registrar's office and the many inconclusive delaying tactics available, this presented a serious obstacle to the Federal registration of large numbers of Negroes. It was an obstacle, however, that could have been removed by amendment, and in fact things never got far enough for this obstacle to operate. The reasons why the 1960 act did not work are that a few segregationist judges actively obstructed it; that other Federal judges were too busy, or lacked the necessary single-minded zeal, to administer it effectively; and that even under the best of conditions the judicial process on which this act relied exclusively for the appointment of referees, and for control and supervision over them, is sluggish and prone to delay and complications.

MAKES AN END RUN

The essence of the new statute, and the source of its great promise, is that it makes an end run around the judicial process. It takes the Federal district courts in the South entirely out of the voter registration business. Not even the initial test of the constitutionality of the statute as a whole can come up in a Federal district court in the South. That test will have to be made in the Federal courts of the District of Columbia. It is in the District of Columbia courts also that a State or county will have to try to take itself out of the provisions of the statute by proving that it has been guilty of no discrimination against Negro voters. Challenges to the action of an examiner in registering a Negro will go to Federal courts in the South—not to district courts, however, but to courts of appeal, where the incidence and influence of segregationist judges is much lower. And—what is of the greatest importance—the burden of coming forward to litigate will rest on the State or county, not on a Negro applicant or on the Attorney General, and registration and voting will not have to await the outcome of the litigation but will proceed, following the examiner's initial action, while the judicial process winds its way to a conclusion. Moreover, the facts on which the judicial judgment will ultimately rest will be those found by an examiner—expeditiously, fairly, even sympathetically to the Negro applicant—not by such easily self-blinded Federal judges as, say, Cox and Mize of Mississippi. The findings and decision of the examiner—called a hearing officer for purposes of passing on a challenge to a registration—will be conclusive on the court, as in the case of decisions of other administrative agencies, unless clearly erroneous. These provisions spell action. There are stringent provisions also, including criminal ones, to insure that Negroes who have been registered are actually allowed to vote, and that their votes are counted.

One or two possible objections can be taken to the bill, but they do not go to its heart, which is sound. The statistical standard it employs—50 percent of all persons of voting age—will foreclose application in counties where Negroes are in a minority, and a very high percentage of whites vote, but few if any Negroes are allowed to register. Nor will the bill apply in places where discrimination takes other forms than the use of literacy and like tests. Both these points were made in the House Judiciary Subcommittee hearing by Representatives WILLIAM C. CRAMER, Republican of Florida, and JOHN V. LINDSAY, Republican of New York. Attorney General Katzenbach replied reasonably enough that, freed of the enormous burden of trying to achieve a judicial breakthrough in the most difficult areas, he will be able to use the Civil Rights Act of 1960 to good purpose in these atypical cases.

The prohibition against the continued use by State registrars in the region covered of existing tests and devices, including existing literacy tests, is enforced by criminal sanctions. These are not likely to do much good, given the inclinations of Southern juries, and they tend to give the bill the appearance of outlawing literacy as a qualification. They constitute, therefore, the most serious threat to the constitutionality of the bill, and for very small gains. Hence it would be just as well to omit criminal sanctions as a means of preventing the continued use of discriminatory devices. The Federal-examiner procedure is the most effective means anyway.

A more serious objection is the choice of the Civil Service Commission as the agency to share with the Attorney General administration of the statute. This is an old-line agency, accustomed to other concerns. It may lack the necessary drive. It might have been better to create a new agency and make it dependent on the White House, or place it under the Attorney General. This would have lent more prestige and perhaps more authority to the examiners who are to be appointed—it makes a difference to have a commission hanging in your office which recites that the President has placed special trust and confidence in you—and might have provided greater assurance of zeal. But there were, no doubt, adequate political reasons for making the choice that was made. The present head of the Civil Service Commission has the President's confidence and serves also as a special assistant to him, and as long as the President's interest in the problem remains as evident as it now is, adequate zeal may be expected all around.

The Washington Hilton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, among the great assets of this Federal City are the many fine hotels which serve as hosts to our many visitors. Recently the Washington Hilton, a magnificent piece of modern architecture, was added to the Washington skyline.

In his remarks at the official opening, Mr. Percy Uris, chairman of the Uris

Building Corp., explained why it took nearly 3 years to complete this modern hostelry. His remarks brought to mind a line from Robert Browning, "Works done least rapidly, Art most cherishes." I believe my colleagues will be interested in reading what Mr. Uris had to say about the planning and construction of this newest Washington hotel.

SPEECH BY PERCY URIS, CHAIRMAN, URIS BUILDING CORP., AT WASHINGTON HILTON OPENING, MARCH 18, 1965

On June 25, 1962, a groundbreaking ceremony was held, marking the fact that we were well along with our huge excavation, and were about to get started on the construction of the Washington Hilton. Here we are, on March 18, 1965, with this beautiful hotel ready for occupancy.

When we and the Hilton people had arranged financing and had agreed to go forward with the construction of the hotel on this site, our joint idea was to build a middle-of-the-road hotel having about 1,200 rooms, and large banquet facilities, all more or less as shown on the sketch plans prepared by William Tabler. As the Hiltons and ourselves studied the situation, our philosophy changed. We decided to build the finest practical hotel, so that Washington would have a great hotel, of preeminent quality, here on this Connecticut Avenue site. After about 50 studies by the Tabler office, we changed from the straight line building to the curved gull wing design. We changed the aluminum and glass facade to one of precast stone in 1,800 sections. We added additional bedroom floors. We elaborated the swimming pool design and added the special swimmer's elevator. We added the cabana rooms, the entertainment and hospitality suites, and the tennis club. We changed the basic design of the ballroom from rectangular to elliptical, and moved its location west so as to improve circulation. With the increased banquet facilities, the kitchen facilities were greatly enlarged.

It took a long time to work these things out, which explains the fact that the building took almost as long to construct as it did to wage the Civil War, and of course it cost a great deal more than originally contemplated.

An indication of the extent of the changes may be gained from the fact that the original amounts allotted for architectural and engineering have about doubled. I personally feel that upgrading the hotel, and making it the finest of its kind, will in the long run have its economic reward.

I wish I had the time to give all the credits due to the architects, the engineers, the financial people, the construction committee, our construction organization, the subcontractors, the craftsmen who worked to create this fine structure. Suffice it to say that we are very happy with the result and very proud of the finished building.

In having had long years of experience building various kinds of buildings in different parts of the country, it gives me great pleasure to publicly state that the quality of the workmanship in this hotel is superior in every trade. As an example of what I mean, if you were to examine the plastering work in this building and compare it with that which you find in other sections of the country, I am sure you will note the superiority of the work here. Quality in construction often goes unnoticed because most people's eyes are not trained to see that which goes to make up quality. On the other hand, and in the long run, good quality means less maintenance, less trouble and longer survival. For these characteristics we are deeply grateful to the craftsmen who built so excellently.

No matter how well designed, well equipped and appropriate to location and time the hotel may be, it is never any better than the organization and people that run it. So from this point forward, we look to the Hilton organization, our associate. We fully expect that it will provide the quality of management which will make this great building a success—a success not only in the sense that it provides quality shelter and comfort for guests, but also in giving a proper return to those who have spent their time and risked their capital in the creation of this superb hotel.

For this great city, our Nation's Capital, we are trying to achieve an outstanding hotel, one which will become internationally famous. We expect to accomplish our goals.

I am sure you would find it rewarding to spend a little time to examine the hotel. A staff has been provided to guide those who have the time and inclination to do this. They will be very happy to show you through.

Voting Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS M. PELLY
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, the Civil Rights Commission has found wholesale violations of the denial of citizens of the right to vote and that these people are being denied self-government.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish at this time to insert in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the City Council of Seattle, Wash., to which I fully subscribe:

RESOLUTION 20205

Whereas the right to vote under reasonable and easily met regulation is essential to citizenship in any democratic government constituted under the principle of "government of the people, by the people, for the people"; the 15th amendment of the U.S. Constitution makes this clear:

"AMENDMENT XV

"SECTION 1. The rights of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

Whereas there are no laws more important than the laws that preserve and promote self-determination; the very foundation of our Government is built upon quicksand if integrity is not practiced in the drafting and administration of such laws; our inheritance bequeathed to us by our Founding Fathers is thrown away if any form of privileged rule is allowed to exist for too long: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Council of the City of Seattle, That all State and local government be urged to recognize, maintain, and protect the right of every individual to vote; be it further

Resolved, That the Federal Government be urged, after reasonable notice to any local government within the United States that the essentials of self-determination are being abridged, to step in if those abridgements are not corrected within a reasonable time, not to govern but to enforce the right of self-government; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to President Lyndon B. Johnson, U.S. Senators WARREN G. MAGNUSON and HENRY M. JACKSON, and U.S. Representatives THOMAS M. PELLY, LLOYD MEEDS, JULIA B. HANSEN, CATHERINE MAY, THOMAS S. FOLEY, FLOYD V. HICKS, and BROCK ADAMS.

Adopted by the city council this 5th day of April 1965, and signed by me in open session in authentication of its adoption this 5th day of April 1965.

CHARLES M. CARROLL,
President pro tempore of the City Council.

Filed by me this 5th day of April 1965.

C. G. ERLANDSON,
City Comptroller and City Clerk.

Attest:

I concur in the above resolution:

CLARENCE P. MASSART,
Acting Mayor.

"American" Defined

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. BINGHAM] has rendered an important service by noting and criticizing the inappropriate and inaccurate definition of the noun "American" as it appeared in the Oxford Dictionary and the Concise Oxford Dictionary.

Certainly, as Representative BINGHAM has pointed out, the two dictionaries' definition of "American" as "a native of America of European descent" is an insult to the millions of U.S. citizens of Africa, American Indian, Asia, Latin America, and other origins.

I believe our colleagues will find the exchange of correspondence between our able colleague and Oxford University Press, as well as a brief article from the New York Times, to be of interest.

APRIL 2, 1965.

THE EDITORS,
The Oxford English Dictionary,
Clarendon Press,
Oxford, England.

GENTLEMEN: It has come to my attention that one of the definitions given for the noun "American" in the Oxford English Dictionary, as well as in the Concise Oxford Dictionary, reads "A native of America of European descent."

This definition, which may have been appropriate in the 18th century, is certainly wholly inaccurate today. It represents indeed a virtual insult to the millions of U.S. citizens of Africa, American Indian, Asia, Latin America, Polynesia, and other origins.

I hope and trust that in the next edition or supplement of the Oxford English Dictionary and the Concise Oxford Dictionary this egregious error will be corrected, the offending definition will be omitted and the definition "citizen of the United States of America" will stand by itself.

A minor problem remains with regard to the use of the noun "American" in Latin America. Although the Latin Americans do not refer to themselves as Americans, they prefer to refer to the citizens of the United States as North Americans, and this has become polite usage south of the United States-Mexican border. This, however, is a fine point. Throughout the United States itself and the rest of the world, the noun

"American" is commonly used to mean citizen of the United States.

Sincerely yours,

JONATHAN B. BINGHAM,
Member of Congress.

APRIL 2, 1965.

EDITOR,
The Times, London, England.

SIR: It has come to my attention that one of the definitions given for the noun "American" in the Oxford English Dictionary, as well as in the Concise Oxford Dictionary, reads "A native of America of European descent."

This definition, which may have been appropriate in the 18th century, is certainly wholly inaccurate today. It represents indeed a virtual insult to the millions of United States citizens of African, American Indian, Asian, Latin American, Polynesian, and other origins.

I hope and trust that in the next edition or supplement of the Oxford English Dictionary and the Concise Oxford Dictionary this egregious error will be corrected, the offending definition will be omitted and the definition "citizen of the United States of America" will stand by itself.

A minor problem remains with regard to the use of the noun "American" in Latin America. Although the Latin Americans do not refer to themselves as Americans, they prefer to refer to the citizens of the United States as North Americans, and this has become polite usage south of the United States-Mexican border. This, however, is a fine point. Throughout the United States itself and the rest of the world, the noun "American" is commonly used to mean citizens of the United States.

I have also written directly to the editors of the Oxford English Dictionary to call their attention to the error in the present edition.

Sincerely yours,

JONATHAN B. BINGHAM,
Member of Congress.

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS, INC.,
New York, N.Y., April 5, 1965.

Representative JONATHAN B. BINGHAM,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BINGHAM: According to the New York Times of April 3, you are unhappy about the definition of "American" in two dictionaries published by Oxford University Press.

The editing of these dictionaries is done on the other side of the Atlantic, so I won't comment on your point. I am writing rather to send you a copy of a new Oxford University Press reference work that you may find interesting—and soothing? This is the revised edition of "A Dictionary of Modern English Usage" by H. W. Fowler, revised by Sir Ernest Gowers. We are publishing it on May 6. You may find of interest the articles on America and on Americanisms.

I am also sending you some material we put together for book review editors because part of it has a number of items about English attitudes toward the United States and our use of the language.

Sincerely,

FON W. BOARDMAN, Jr.,
Advertising and Publicity Manager.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 7, 1965]

DICTIONARY WILL MODIFY DEFINITION OF "AMERICAN"

LONDON, April 6 (Reuters).—The Oxford University Press has decided to modify the definition of the noun "American" in future editions of its dictionaries following a complaint by New York Representative JONATHAN BINGHAM.

Representative BINGHAM, Democrat, of the Bronx, complained to the publishers that both the Oxford Dictionary and the Concise Oxford Dictionary defined an American as "a native of America of European descent." He thought this was virtually an insult to U.S. citizens of other origins.

An Oxford spokesman said today that in future editions the definition would "make it clear that the various people native of, or resident in, America, are not confined to those of American Indian or of European descent."

He said the basis of the definitions in the two smaller dictionaries that Representative BINGHAM complained about could be found in the original Oxford English Dictionary.

There, a distinction was made between all aboriginals of the American Continent, that is, an American Indian, and a native of America, of European descent.

Social Security Amendments of 1965

SPEECH
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 8, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6675) to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under the Social Security Act with a supplementary health benefits program and an expanded program of medical assistance, to increase benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to improve the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Chairman, it is my very deep and earnest conviction that H.R. 6675 should be overwhelmingly approved.

In a prudent comprehensive design this measure projects three new programs for health insurance and medical care for the aged under the Social Security Act by establishing, first, a fundamental hospital insurance plan to help meet the burdensome costs of hospital and posthospital treatment; second, it establishes a voluntary plan through which doctors' and other medical services are paid for by monthly premiums of $3 matched by an equal Government payment; thirdly, it establishes an expanded Kerr-Mills program for the need which will combine all the existing medical programs for this group into a single new program with greater Federal financial participation.

This measure before us also is designed to more realistically improve our current social security and public assistance programs. The provision to grant a 7-percent increase in social security benefits not only takes into account the advanced living costs that have occurred over the past several years but it will also help to finance the cost of the new voluntary supplementary insurance plan. Indeed a special phase of the bill is to permit an automatic $3 a month deduction from the social security benefits if the individual chooses such coverage.

Other vitally important features of this measure are, in my judgment, the continuation of benefits for children attending school beyond the age of 18 up to the age of 22, as well as the desperately needed liberalization of the earnings limitation, so long overdue.

Mr. Chairman, the most distinguished chairman and diligent members of the House Ways and Means Committee have, after extended hearings and studied deliberations, provided us with a prudent, sensible, modern and acceptable solution to a most difficult and longstanding problem that is of imperative urgency to an increasing number of older citizens and, indeed, younger ones, in this country. This House and this Nation owes them a great debt of patriotic gratitude.

Not the least of the reasons to influence us toward approval of this measure is our common knowledge of the legendary scholarship, prudence and patriotic dedication of the esteemed committee chairman who has presented this measure to us and recommended its passage after so many years of conscientious scrutiny and judgment of this controversial subject. He has told us that he advocates approval of this bill and I quote his words, "with every bit of energy at my command."

Mr. Chairman, the President himself has perhaps summed up better than anyone else the sense and the substance of this measure when he said:

Compassion and reason dictate that this logical extension of our proven social security system will supply the prudent, feasible and dignified way to free the aged from the fear of financial hardship in the event of ailments.

Mr. Chairman, in the firmest belief that this measure is "good for all Americans" I urge my colleagues here to resoundingly adopt this landmark legislation without further delay.

Martin Luther King Would Hurt Negroes in Drive for Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES D. MARTIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it is now evident that Martin Luther King is more interested in power than in the plight of the Negroes. His insistence on demanding that the State of Alabama be boycotted clearly shows his real intent.

The following editorial from the Montgomery Advertiser of April 4, 1965, sums it up with eloquence:

STARVATION WITH LOVE

We cannot begin to fathom the evident madness of the loving Nobelian in sticking with his plan to throttle Alabama economically.

The ruthlessness of his enterprise is no shock. But he has run into a solid wall of opposition, from the White House to the toot-toot liberal press.

Evidently the reverend doctor, his mind hot like that of Dubois before him, has made a very costly blunder. Millions of Americans are now reappraising King, and he is much diminished.

We cannot confidently prophesy it, but Alabama may now have been presented with a windfall opportunity to redeem much of the corroded past. Negro Alabamians and

white Alabamians have more reason than before to ease the problems of living together.

Well-intentioned whites assuredly want to move away from the small but potent element of dynamiters and riflemen and are pleased that their Governor is acting with vigor. And, we should think, well-intended Negroes will want to move away from King, now in the process of being discredited by his willingness to ruin them and by his Communist associations.

The Negroes of Alabama now have more reason to recoil from King than do the whites. King has now demonstrated that he considers Alabama Negroes as expendable troops in his war.

King is urging punitive thrust that would give the Russians the moon by striking Redstone, he would take school lunches from Negro children along with the white, he would cut Tuskegee Institute's budget along with Auburn's, he would wipe out new job openings for Negro and white alike by turning away new industry, he would cause job layoffs for Negro along with white, he would deprive the blind and dependent welfare clients among Negro and white alike and even those in mental institutions.

The parents of King's wife and probably some other of her relatives live in Perry County. Mrs. Lyndon Johnson has relatives and tenants in Alabama. King says to hell with them, too.

It is thus impossible to understand how King can retain the loyalty of Alabama Negroes when he announces a willingness to take their economic life along with that of the whites.

It is evident that King has uniformly shocked the country with this madness. If he could paralyze Alabama, what State would be next? He has grievances against all of them.

Along with the shock of King's proposals, another significant thing is happening. Governor Wallace is no longer being derided for calling the names of the Communists around King. These rosters and estimates of the depth of their penetration have now become objects of competition by even the liberal columnists.

Communism is not the reason for the Negro revolt and it would have occurred in any event. But their acceptance in the movement has suddenly become a matter of competitive revelation. Evans, Novak, Sevaried, Wilson and Pearson—they are now confirming Wallace.

It is right for Congress to investigate the Kluxers. It will seem equally appropriate to extend this to include Communist infiltration.

Tribute to Michael A. Feighan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, with the thought that some may have missed it, I wish to insert into the RECORD at this point the tremendous tribute to our beloved colleague, MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, which appeared in the March 30 issue of Independent Editorial Services, Ltd. The editor, T. A. McInerny is internationally recognized for his wide range of interests as well as his political sagacity. I know that he voices the admiration that we all have for our friend MIKE and it is a privilege to make his remarks a part of the permanent RECORD of the Congress of the United States.

CAPITOL HILL.—One of the really strong figures in the House who has been coming to the fore is Representative MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN, Democrat, of Ohio, the second in command of the powerful Judiciary Committee. Congressman FEIGHAN has been returned to Congress since 1942 by his populous Cleveland district. He is a graduate of Princeton and Harvard Law School and has the kind of class that his Ivy League background confers. He is probably the top man in the United States on questions of immigration and while liberal in his general slant on national policy, he is probably the best informed man on Communists and their tactics in the House. He refuses to compromise with them and is continually at war with the parlor pinks who are trying to get Reds into this country on one excuse or other. FEIGHAN is a strong man nowadays at the White House and in the executive branch. Still young and tireless, he is considered to be on his way to greater things.

Natural Resources Council Proposal

SPEECH
OF
HON. AL ULLMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the RECORD for April 5, Senator MCGOVERN inserted the speech of New Mexico's distinguished senior Senator [Mr. ANDERSON] before the ninth biennial wilderness conference, San Francisco, Calif., April 2, 1965.

Senator ANDERSON'S outstanding record as a great leader in the American conservation movement was cited by Senator MCGOVERN.

Today I wish to join the Senator from South Dakota in noting my admiration of the lasting contribution Senator ANDERSON is making to insure continued progress in this Nation's natural resource endeavor.

I was particularly heartened and gratified by Senator ANDERSON'S endorsement of the establishment of a Council of Resources and Conservation Advisers as proposed in the Senate by S. 938 introduced by Senator MCGOVERN and in H.R. 4430 which I have the pleasure to sponsor in the House of Representatives.

It seems only yesterday that I discussed the need for such a council with our late President John F. Kennedy during his western "conservation" trip. The need for such a council is no less today than then—rather with the perspective achieved with the passage of only a few years we see the need to be more acute today. I heartily subscribe to Senator ANDERSON'S words, and reiterate them to my colleagues, as he said:

We have—as a nation—paid attention to resource problems on a crisis basis. We are alerted to the water crisis, the timber crisis, the pesticide crisis, the strip mine crisis. I have no question that it is the squeaking crisis which gets the oil. But it is the wisest way for a nation to develop and manage its resources for 190 million today and 330 million by the year 2000? I think not.

A council of resource and conservation advisers might help to avoid the potential wastefulness of reaction only in the face of crisis. It might enable decision makers to take more initiative in advance of a severe resource problem rather than after it has ballooned to massive proportions.

The council would be an arm of the executive branch, but it would serve all of Government in much the same fashion as the Council of Economic Advisers. The Council of Economic Advisers does not create national economic policy, but it gathers the information and does the advance thinking essential to the shaping of enlightened policy. It is still up to political leaders to create and implement tax and fiscal policy. By the same token, Members of Congress and Cabinet officers would still be left with the responsibility to make sound conservation policy.

But the council of resource and conservation advisers would help chart the way toward appropriate conservation measures. It would let us know where we stand and where we should be heading.

Address by John A. Baker, Assistant Secretary, U.S. Department of Agriculture, at the National Farmers Union Annual Convention, Chicago, Ill., March 17, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR CALLAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, a recent address by Mr. John Baker, Assistant Secretary of the U.S. Department of Agriculture was such a cogent statement of some of the problems which face agriculture in this country that I commend it to the attention of all Members of Congress.

It was given before the National Farmers Union annual convention, Chicago, Ill., March 17 and I believe it is an excellent summation of the position that many of us hold.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY JOHN A. BAKER, ASSISTANT SECRETARY, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, AT THE NATIONAL FARMERS UNION ANNUAL CONVENTION, CHICAGO, ILL., MARCH 17, 1965

In the last few years there has been a growing chorus of spokesmen who predict that the days of the family farmer are numbered—and the fewer the days, the better.

I have come to this convention of old friends and associates to bring you one message—and that message is this:

The predictors and manipulators of doom for the family farmer are wrong—dead wrong.

Farm family agriculture will survive because there is no more economic and efficient way to till the land and it is in harmony with the democratic tradition of our country.

If the forces of reason and commonsense prevail, farm family agriculture will not only survive, it will expand and prosper as never before in our history.

I deeply believe that a prosperous and expanding farm family agriculture is absolutely indispensable to a healthy democracy, indis-

pensable to a dynamic economy, indispensable to the building of a permanent peace, and indispensable to the creation of a Great Society.

Fortunately, this belief is shared by many people.

Our President believes this.

Your Secretary of Agriculture believes this.

Jim Patton believes this.

And—most important of all—so do you.

And it is organizations like the National Farmers Union that will help make this dream come through.

We are too practical and we have been in this fight too long to believe that the problems of farm families can be solved overnight or even within the next decade. But I wholeheartedly agree with President Johnson that the job must and can be done in this generation.

Some way must be found to turn back the forces who have a vested interest in eliminating farm families.

And finally, the unfortunate consequences of mistaken farm policies of most of the 1950's must be completely undone before we can expect to make any real progress toward a permanent, prosperous and expanding farm family agriculture.

And I submit, there was much that had to be undone during these past 4 years to clean up the debris of previous mistakes in agricultural policy. One has only to recall where we were in 1961 to appreciate where we are now.

In 1960: Net farm income was down to a low of $11.7 billion; gross farm income—the total money farmers receive and spend to sustain main street—was not increasing as fast as farm costs; per capita—personal income of the farm population was only 54 percent that of the nonfarm population; farm prices had been declining and taxpayers were burdened with excess supplies of commodities; Government farm credit—the only hope for survival for most small farmers—was either frozen or cut back; rural electrification was in danger because there were insufficient funds for new generating and transmission projects—the whole rural economy was sick and this being reflected by the third national economic recession in the past 8 years; the problem of migration of 23 million rural people into urban areas since 1950 was being completely ignored; the social fabric of all rural America—its farm families, its rural communities and businesses, its churches and schools—had been gravely and perilously weakened.

I remember all of this—and so do you—all too well.

It would have been a great deal worse for the valiant legislative fight you and your allies fought during those years.

It was not a pleasant problem for Presidents Kennedy and Johnson and Secretary Freeman to inherit, nor an easy one to cope with. But they have done their level best and progress has been made.

We set out to raise farm income, and we have. For 4 straight years, net farm income has been nearly a billion dollars higher than the 1960 level—cumulative realized gross farm income has been more than $12½ billion more than if the 1960 level had been maintained.

I am aware, as you are, that this increase—though sizable and encouraging—is not nearly enough. Parity of income for most farm families is still a long way off. But may I remind you that this increase in farm income for 4 straight years represents a herculean triumph when you consider that it is a complete reversal of the trend that had been observed for years.

At least we now have a better base to start from as we strive for parity. And parity of income for farm families and parity of opportunity for all people in rural America is the announced and declared goal of President Johnson.

We set about to save and to improve our commodity price support programs. And this we did. The feed grain program and the wheat program were all major improvements and are responsible for raising farm income and reducing surpluses. We recognize that further major improvements and strengthening of these and other commodity programs are necessary. We shall see those improvements made and we shall strengthen present programs and devise new ones that are necessary just as soon as farmers and the public recognize the need for them and give their support for them.

While commodity programs are not the whole answer to the economic problem of farm families, certainly the abolition of commodity programs and a return to the free market—as many people still advocate—can mean instant disaster for much of agriculture.

Separate, independent and non-Government studies of what would happen to agriculture if we returned to a free market, generally agree on the following points:

Net farm income would fall from present levels of $12.6 billion per year to between $6 and $7 billion—a decline of 40 to 50 percent; farm prices for crops would fall 25 to 30 percent; livestock prices would fall by 10 to 20 percent; farm production expenses would continue to rise, further squeezing net farm income; finally, there would be no net cash income above costs at all on many farms; two-thirds of farmers with sales of $20,000 or more, would have their net cash income wiped out.

This situation would not only bankrupt most farmers, it would mean economic and social ruin for much of rural America, and a serious economic setback for the whole Nation.

It would seem that no responsible man in public life, no organization could support or advocate a farm program that would lead to such a tragedy, but the voices of unreason persist and they are powerful.

We have set about over the past 4 years to provide more farm credit at reasonable terms. And this we have done, and more. Many of our farm credit programs were expanded to include rural nonfarm people as well; such as housing community water systems, recreation development and, more recently, our economic opportunity program. This we felt was necessary because the total rural problem is part and parcel of the farm problem.

In the Farmers Home Administration, we have increased the volume of credit assistance to 2½ times the level of 1960; have greatly strengthened the support of family farms; have developed special credit for a wide range of rural community facilities—water systems, recreation areas, senior citizens housing projects.

Increases in all our insured loan programs would have been higher had the authorization been higher. President Johnson has asked for increases in our insured loan programs and he has asked for a new insured loan program for rural housing that will double the volume of loan funds that will be available. Insured loan programs are a proper and effective way of expanding credit resources for rural people without imposing additional burden on the budget.

We set about to strengthen our rural electrification program, and this we did by increasing REA credit for generating and transmission loans. Attacks on REA will continue and will be focused, as in the past, on what the opposition believes to be the most vulnerable parts of the program. But I know that reason will prevail to protect this great program and to insure its necessary expansion. Rural electrification is too vital for the revitalization of all rural America for us to allow it to be hamstrung.

We set about to strengthen and make possible the strengthening and expansion of rural cooperatives as a means of providing farm families and other rural people with an effective tool for more bargaining power in the marketplace. This we have done. Secretary Freeman has reactivated the National Public Advisory Committee on Cooperatives and made it into an effective, functioning body. He has directed all Department of Agriculture agencies to coordinate their efforts in helping farmers to expand and develop cooperatives and co-op research has been stepped up and redirected to significant emerging problems. Merger of cooperatives has been encouraged. Credit resources for cooperatives have been increased. Much progress has been made by local people in 4 years in the use of cooperatives for overall rural areas development. Local REA cooperatives, in particular, have played a major and pioneering role in this field. Rural electric cooperatives and the staff of REA have provided technical assistance on more than 1,400 projects since 1961, often assisting businessmen to go to other Federal agencies and private creditors to help them finance new business ventures that will increase power use and boost the local rural economy. Local REA cooperatives have helped launch 1,459 local projects with the result that more than 135,000 new jobs have been created.

The new Economic Opportunity Act provides a co-op loan program under the Farmers Home Administration to help low-income rural people establish small marketing and supply cooperatives.

Not for years—perhaps never—has the climate and the potential for the expansion and development of cooperatives been so favorable as it is now. Now it is up to farmers and rural people to take advantage of this situation. To make the most of this opportunity is a challenge from which I know your organization will not shrink.

One of our major objectives since 1961 has been and still is a more realistic land-use policy. Passage of the historic Food and Agriculture Act of 1962 helped define that policy and we have made solid, major gains in this all-important area.

Loan programs and technical assistance are being provided to encourage and help farmers shift land out of unneeded crop production into more profitable uses such as recreation and wildlife areas, and woodlots. We have initiated two important new pilot programs to revitalize rural areas through comprehensive planning and growth, rural renewal projects administered by Farmers Home Administration and resource conservation and development projects administered by Soil Conservation Service. And we have significantly expanded the successful watershed protection projects and Great Plains conservation programs.

In 35 years, by the year 2000, we shall have almost twice as many people in this country as we did in 1960—more than 330 million. Our burgeoning population is creating a new race for space, not outer space, but land space.

Within this generation we are going to have to find living room, elbow room, walking room for 100 million more people.

In addition to meeting their demands for food and fiber which farm family agriculture can do, we also have to meet the massive demands for recreational facilities; parks, camping areas, water areas for fishing, swimming and boating, hunting refuges, golf courses.

This means new uses for land, and of course, new and great opportunities for rural landowners and rural people.

As farmers, as rural people, we need not be fearful of these new changes. We should welcome them. These changes need not cause disruption in rural America. Rather they portend a new stability, a new prosperity for our rural areas.

We have devised programs to aid rural people and farm families to make the necessary

shifts in land use and to take advantage of the new opportunities of change. Loan programs and technical assistance are available for land conversion purposes, for recreational development, for watersheds and for community facilities. These are available for individuals for private commercial ventures, to cooperatives, and to community or other public agencies. One of the most significant developments of the past 4 years has been the organization by farmers and ranchers with credit from Farmers Home Administration and other assistance from a wide range of State, local, and Federal agencies of cooperative-type grazing associations by which they can build a strong secure basis for stable operation on their own lands in conjunction with grazing lands of Forest Service and other public land management agencies.

This is all a part of the long-range pattern of this administration to help rural people to revitalize rural America—to strengthen farm family agriculture and to provide parity of opportunity for all rural people.

One of the first steps we must take is to eliminate rural poverty. This we are starting to do. Your Department of Agriculture is charged with a large part of responsibility of carrying on the war against poverty in rural America. It has our highest priority. We are regearing our agencies for the job. The Economic Oportunity Act provided for two new loan programs to be administered by the Farmers Home Administration, individual loans up to $2,500 to increase the incomes of poverty-level rural people, both farmers and nonfarm rural people. The other provides loans to establish small cooperatives for low-income rural people.

In addition, all our agencies are cooperating with the Office of Economic Opportunity at every level. Forest Service, for example, is in the process of providing 43 youth Job Corps sites by June 30 of this year. Two are already completed—26 are in the bid and planning stage. Each camp will provide facilities for about 100 to 200 boys.

The work of the Federal-State extension service is being strengthened and reoriented to put much greater emphasis upon work with cooperatives, on community action in the war on rural poverty, and to assist in the organization and operation of local and area-wide efforts to plan and obtain more rapid economic growth and a higher level of rural prosperity.

The rural areas development movement has active local committees in more than three-fourths of the Nation's rural counties with 107,000 people serving on those committees. In the last 4 years, rural areas development activity has created 412,000 new jobs. Federal training programs have retrained more than 90,000 rural people; and helped them find new jobs.

The Department of Agriculture has created a new Rural Community Development Service to be more responsive to local needs. This new agency will help local people make as effective use of other Federal programs as they now do of USDA programs. We already have experience in doing this. Particularly in the last 4 years in the area redevelopment, manpower development and training, and small business programs. But never before in such a formal way, and never before with a directive from the President to carry out such a function. Our objective is to make all of the programs of the Federal Government completely available in rural areas, to provide not only parity of opportunity for rural areas, but parity of opportunity for each person who lives in a rural area.

Rural housing and community facility loan programs will be expanded to provide new economic muscle in rural areas, to create more jobs, to raise living standards and to make our rural communities more attractive.

Just a few years ago, farm family agriculture was at its lowest ebb, and going lower fast. Lack of economic and social opportunity in rural America was depleting it of the vigor and enterprise of its young people who were moving to the cities.

It was and is the objective of this administration to change all of this. It is the declared and avowed policy of President Johnson and his administration to strengthen farm family agriculture, to eliminate poverty in rural America, to provide parity of opportunity for all rural people. This sounds like a massive job, and it is. But is it not an impossible one. With your help we shall do it. We have the tools, we have the will, we have resources to do it.

With people like you to lead the way, I'm confident of the future for farm families and for the people of rural America.

Thank you.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held Tuesday, April 13, at noon.

Committee Meetings

(*Committees not listed did not meet*)

APPROPRIATIONS—PUBLIC WORKS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee continued its hearings on fiscal 1966 budget estimates for proposed rivers and harbors and flood control projects, having as its witnesses Maj. Gen. Ellsworth I. Davis, President, Mississippi River Commission, and Division Engineer, Lower Mississippi Valley Division, and Maj. Gen. Alvin C. Welling, Division Engineer, South Atlantic Division, both of the Corps of Army Engineers.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

ARMY RESERVE—NATIONAL GUARD REORGANIZATION

Committee on Armed Services: The Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee continued its hearings on the proposed reorganization of the Army National Guard and Army Reserve Forces, having as its witness Col. John T. Carlton, executive director, Reserve Officers Association of the U.S.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

OCEANOGRAPHY

Committee on Commerce: Committee held hearings on S. 944, providing expanded research in the oceans and the Great Lakes, and to establish a National Oceanographic Council. Witnesses heard were Representative Hanna; Dr. Harold E. Edgerton, of the firm of Edgerton, Germeshausen & Grier, Inc., Boston; Rear Adm. Denys W. Knoll, Oceanographer of the Navy; Capt. H. A. Arnold, USN (retired), United Aircraft Corp.; Rear Adm. Edward C. Stephan, USN (retired), president of the Marine Technological Society, and former Oceanographer of the Navy; and Dr. Wilbert M. Chapman, a member of numerous National Academy of Sciences' committees and panels on maritime matters.

Hearings were recessed subject to call.

D.C. MATTERS

Committee on the District of Columbia: Subcommittee on Business and Commerce held hearings on the following two bills:

S. 1314, relating to the closing of streets in the D.C. in connection with redevelopment or urban renewal projects, with testimony from Lt. Col. E. C. Adams, Assistant Engineering Commissioner, and Roy C. Hoyle, Surveyor, both of the D.C. Government; and Phil A. Doyle, Executive Director, D.C. Redevelopment Land Agency; and

S. 1316, authorizing D.C. Commissioners to enter into contracts for supplies and services, with testimony from Rexford G. Wessells, D.C. Procurement Officer; and Samuel Humes, Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments.

Hearings were adjourned subject to call.

FOREIGN AID, AND NOMINATIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee continued executive consideration of the proposed omnibus foreign aid authorizations bill, but did not conclude action thereon, and will meet again tomorrow.

Committee approved for reporting the following nominations: Secretary of the Treasury Henry H. Fowler, of Virginia, to be U.S. Governor of the International Monetary Fund, U.S. Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and a Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank; William B. Dale, of Maryland, to be reappointed Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund; Palmer Hoyt, of Colorado, to be a member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information; Morris S. Novik, of New York, to be reappointed member of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information; Morris B. Abram, of New York, to be U.S. Representative on the U.N. Human Rights Commission; and F. Walter M. Kotschnig, of Maryland, to be U.S. Representative to the Twentieth Plenary Session of the Economic Commission for Europe.

Appendix

Senator Wayne Morse Stresses Quality Education in Address to Salem, W. Va., College Alumni—Senator Randolph Commended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the 88th Congress has become known as the Education Congress and no legislator has been more responsible for the enactment of education legislation during the past 4 years than Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon. As a member of the Subcommittee on Education, it has been my privilege, with Senator RANDOLPH and other colleagues, to serve under Senator MORSE's able chairmanship and to work with him in the consideration and passage of vital education measures.

Among the education legislation which became law during the 88th Congress were the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963; National Defense Education Act extension; Vocation Education Act of 1963; impacted areas aid extension; Manpoyer Development and Training Act; and the Library Service and Construction Act of 1964.

And on this past weekend President Johnson signed into law, S. 2362, the Primary and Secondary Education Act. This measure is undoubtedly the most far reaching and needed school legislation in the Nation's history. The thrust of the billion-dollar-plus bill is to aid children who come from families in which the annual income is less than $2,000.

On March 22, Senator MORSE, who guided this bill to passage in our body, addressed the Washington chapter of the Salem, W. Va., College Alumni Association at its annual spring meeting at the Continental Hotel. Senator RANDOLPH, a graduate of that institution and a member of its governing board, presented the Oregon statesman to the attentive and appreciative audience.

Americans of this generation, and the children who will be the leaders of future generations, are and will be indebted to Senator MORSE. His extremely effective leadership in education law ranks him as the "man who was there"—

Said Senator RANDOLPH.

Chartered in 1888, Salem College is a 4-year college of arts and sciences. Enrollment is more than 1,200 students. Among its graduates, Salem claims two Governors of the State of West Virginia, four U.S. Senators, and two presidents of the National Education Association. Dr. Corma Mowrey, a past NEA president, now serves as associate director for lay relations with NEA and was present at this meeting. Dr. Mowrey typifies the concern for higher education embodied in the students, faculty members, and friends of Salem.

The program opened with an invocation by the Reverend George L. Cutlip, alumni director and assistant to the president. William E. Davis, president of the Washington chapter, introduced Salem College President K. Duane Hurley who spoke of the growth and development of the college and its distinctive friendly, personal touch.

Senator RANDOLPH has told me of Senator MORSE's address "Education Legislation and the Small College," in which he gave a thought-provoking admonition against overlooking the major function of the college:

It is not research, but rather, it is the transmission of knowledge, and the drawing forth from the student, so that he may examine and strengthen them intellectually, the basic convictions which comprise his character.

Senator MORSE added:

Knowledge may be value free, but education, almost by definition the matrix of values in which knowledge is embedded. And it is in this realm of matrix formation by the student that colleges such as Salem can function—with greater effectiveness than thre multiversity. At Salem, you will never hear the bitter joke: "Do not fold, mutilate, or spindle the student."

New officers for the Washington chapter, Salem College Alumni Association were elected. They are: Daniel G. Taylor, president; Delbert Flint, vice president; Virginia B. Spicer, secretary; and Lorena Butterfield, alumni news reporter.

Mr. President, it is my understanding that this college is doing an outstanding job of educating young people and preparing them for successful and productive careers. Under the capable administration of President Hurley, Salem College is growing and expanding to meet the ever-increasing demand for excellence in higher education facilities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks by President K. Duane Hurley be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD together with those of Senator WAYNE MORSE which were given at the March 22 meeting of the Washington chapter of the Salem College Alumni Association.

There being no objection, the speeches were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY K. DUANE HURLEY, PRESIDENT OF SALEM COLLEGE, MARCH 22, 1965

Distinguished guests, fellow alumni, and friends of Salem College, the way our chapter chairman, Bill Davis, has organized and conducted this very fine meeting exemplifies the basic spirit of our college: the friendly, personal touch.

It is wonderful to meet again so many friends among the Washington area alumni. When you add to the group a large number of parents of students, parents of prospective students, as well as such students themselves, along with honorary alumni and Govvernment officials, you have an unbeatable combination. Already I sense the family feeling that always exists at Salem.

Also evident is a deep and abiding concern regarding higher education—a determination that our college will continue to serve effectively in its specific ways, not only meeting the special needs of Appalachia but providing educational opportunities for worthy young people from all parts of the country who might otherwise be denied college experiences.

Although still small by design and intent, Salem College has experienced great growth and development during the past half dozen years. Enrollment has increased from about 200 to over 1,200 students. The former Waldo Hotel in Clarksburg has been obtained as a downtown campus and a complete educational unit is now maintained there, unique in that housing, feeding, recreational and educational services are all provided under one roof. A million-dollar capital expansion program has just been completed on the main campus. The yearly operating budget for the two campuses—Salem and Clarksburg—now runs well beyond a million dollars.

Expansion has been made possible only because of teamwork on the part of those people and groups represented at this meeting—alumni, parents, students, friends, corporations, and foundations, as well as Government agencies. Senator MORSE and his congressional colleagues are to be commended for evolving programs of Federal assistance—both loans and grants—which have materially furthered higher education without jeopardizing the freedom and independence of colleges like Salem.

Salem College is especially indebted to people like Dr. Corma Mowrey, National Education Association associate director for lay relations, and Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH. Both of these distinguished alumni have served with faithfulness and dedication for many years on the Salem College board of directors. Through the years since its founding in 1888, our college has produced an unusually large number of serviceminded graduates, including two presidents of the National Education Association (Miss Mowrey being one); two Governors of the State of West Virginia; and four U.S. Senators, including JENNINGS RANDOLPH.

These people have returned full devotion to their alma mater; and our college's ability to continue to meet the educational challenges of the day can be attributed in no small measure to them.

Our hats are off in gratitude to you, Corma and JENNINGS. Like Senator WAYNE MORSE, your commitment to the welfare of the young people of America is exemplary.

EDUCATION LEGISLATION AND THE SMALL COLLEGE

(Address of Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon)

Mr. Chairman, President Hurley, Senator RANDOLPH, alumni, and friends of Salem College, after that most gracious introduction by my very good friend and most distinguished and hard-working associate on the Education

Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I feel I should completely recast my remarks tonight, change my topic to: "What Is the Role of the Small College?" and answer it by saying, "To produce great public servants like JENNINGS RANDOLPH."

It would be a good speech, too. I could relate how he quietly, but effectively, caused a group of very stubborn House conferees to modify a position they had taken, which Senator RANDOLPH knew would doom the bill. I could tell you how in meeting after meeting, executive session after executive session, he kept after the rest of us to see to it that we did not neglect the needs of the small private college, as we marked up our higher education bills. But most of all, I could have told you of the balance he brings to our discussions as he helps us to focus on, not only our immediate problems, but as importantly, on the problems down the road which lie in wait if we follow one course or the other.

It is this quality of balance and commonsense applied to the abstractions of legislation, which in my judgment illustrates the values which come to the student who was as fortunate as you were to have had the opportunity of attending an institution of learning, small in size of student body, but great in the tradition of producing honorable men, who are equipped to take places of leadership in our society; who are able to assume responsibility; and, who are dedicated to weaving Christian ideals into the very fabric of their daily lives.

Many people look upon me as somewhat of a heretic, in some fields. I doubt, for example, that any medal is being proposed for me at the Pentagon tonight for my position on Vietnam. I rather question that there is solid support in the State Department for my constructive efforts to improve our foreign aid bill. So, too, in the field of education legislation, I know that there are those who deplore the emphasis I strive to give to financial aid for the student, and particularly the average college or university student. The "bricks and mortar men" of higher education have pressing problems which demand solutions. I can understand their difficulties and I am willing to do all that I can to help them meet their needs for classrooms, for libraries and laboratories. But I feel that the headlines which tell of the difficulties faced by the gigantic factories of learning on the Pacific coast are a sad; yes, a truly tragic confirmation of the warnings I have given for the past 4 years that we must not overlook the major function of the college.

It is not research, but rather, it is the transmission of knowledge, and the drawing forth from the student, so that he may examine and strengthen them intellectually, the basic convictions which comprise his character.

Knowledge may be value free, but education, almost by definition provides the matrix of values in which knowledge is embedded. And it is in this realm of matrix formation by the student that colleges such as Salem, of which Senator RANDOLPH is both an alumnus and a member of the board, and Pacific University, of which I was once a trustee, can function, I feel, with greater effectiveness that can the multiversity. At Salem, you will never hear the bitter joke: "Do not fold, mutilate, or spindle the student."

That is why I am glad that this year President Johnson in presenting to the Congress his proposals for higher education assistance has given to student aid a very prominent place; $130 million is earmarked, of the total $250 million cost of his program, which Senator RANDOLPH and I have jointly introduced in the Senate as S. 600, for student assistance. Added to that is some $84 million which now appears in the budget request for the work-study program under the Office of Economic Opportunity which will be transferred to the Office of Education. Thus, $24 million can be made available to help young men and women achieve higher education directly—$70 million of this is for scholarships; $15 million is for the new insured student loan program which should generate from private sources some $700 million in student loan funds; and $129 million is for work-study.

The insured loan program is vital, since it can provide a way for the middle-income families which are the stable backbone of America to finance, at a reasonable rate of interest, the education of their children. It is difficult to stretch take-home pay of $6,000 to $10,000 a year to cover the cost of educating two or more at the same time when college costs are running at the rate of $1,600 to $2,400 a year for each. We cannot, and we must not, price the average high school graduate out of the college opportunity. If we do, or if we price the small college out of being in contact with the average student from the average American family, we lose as a nation.

Education is our best capital investment. The dividends which flow from this type of growth, not only repay in a few short years the initial cost, they continue to contribute for a lifetime, returns to our economy. The Treasury of the United States in the coming decades, I suggest to you, will benefit tremendously in terms of individual and corporate returns which otherwise would not be available.

Title II of S. 600 relates to college libraries; $65 million is earmarked for college library assistance and library training.

Boswell, in 1775, said: "Knowledge is of two kinds. We know a subject ourselves, or we know where we can find information upon it. When we inquire into any subject, the first thing we have to do is to know what books have treated of it. This leads us to look at catalogs, and the backs of books in libraries."

Many of us, I fear, still cling to the nostalgic stereotype of the book-lined room with wide and sunny windows as the location of the student's work. We should be aware that the hardbound book which fits so well the hand is only one of the modern library tools.

Edison, Steinmetz, De Forrest, and others have vastly expanded the library bookshelf for the storage and retrieval of information.

The flashing lights of a computer and the photoreproduction of the microfilm master may well be the model of the future library, that the generation of men and women now entering kindergarten in Huntington will hold in their minds as they seek in the electronic stacks of the law library the cases which they will need for their moot-court pleadings within the next short 15 years.

With every passing day, because of the sheer magnitude of the information which is pouring forth, from every quarter of the globe, in every tongue and dialect on every scientific and scholarly subject, the task of the librarian becomes more difficult.

An article in the Sunday New York Times of January 4 points up the magnitude of the job ahead.

It speaks of the establishment at the University of Minnesota of a center for documentation and information retrieval to control what has been referred to, and correctly in my judgment, as the information explosion.

The article cites statistics which have been presented to our subcommittee. There are 30,000 technical journals now being published. Annually 1,000 more are added. Today, of all scientists who have ever lived, 80 percent are now living; 2 million articles, based on scholarly research, are published annually. The article indicates how the new electronically based technology may be able to lend to college and university librarians helpful tools and techniques.

More than ever, excellence in teaching and research depends on an adequate selection of books, periodicals, scientific journals, and documents. Yet 50 percent of our 4-year institutions of higher learning and 82 percent of our 2-year institutions fall below accepted minimum standards in the number of volumes in their libraries.

Moreover, current national statistics show a decline in the number of college and university library books per student. The reason is that enrollments are increasing faster than per student expenditures for books. Today, an estimated $226 million is needed merely to stock the shelves of our universities with the books needed for the present student and faculty population. Meanwhile, rising college and university enrollments are expected to swell from today's 4.8 to 6.9 million by 1970.

Title II proposes a 5-year program to help institutions of higher education acquire library materials needed for their expanded responsibilities in research, teaching, and student use; to encourage new and enlarged college and university training programs to prepare individuals for service in the projects relating to the improvement of libraries and the library and information sciences.

The proposal is divided into two parts. The first would authorize the Commissioner of Education to make grants to colleges or combinations of colleges for the purchase of books, periodicals, documents, magnetic tapes, phonograph records, audiovisual materials, and other related library materials.

Institutions submitting appropriate applications would receive a basic grant of up to $5,000. The Commissioner would also be authorized to make supplemental grants, not to exceed $10 for each full-time student. Supplemental grants would be made on the basis of such criteria as size and age of the library collection, student enrollment, and endowment and other financial resources. Only the basic grant would be matched by the institution. Each institution or combination of institutions would provide assurances that their previous year's expenditures for materials would be maintained.

I am sure that President Hurley will be happy to explain to each of you how the checks you make out for Salem can be usefully applied to this and other matching funds. That particular $5,000 from you for library purposes should be a seed corn from which an abundant intellectual harvest can come. It might not be amiss to compare it to the miracle of the loaves and fishes which fed the multitudes nearly 2,000 years ago.

There are other parts to the President's program for higher education, which are designed to assist developing colleges, as in title III of S. 600. Under this 5-year program, funded at $30 million for the first year, the Commissioner of Education could make grants to pay part of the cost of planning and carrying out cooperative arrangements for strengthening the academic programs of some of our institutions. This could be done in a number of ways, through faculty exchange programs, introduction of new curriculums, visiting scholars, working out cooperative education programs which would permit alternate periods of employment and study as in the Antioch plan, and the joint use of common library or laboratory facilities where feasible.

Finally, in title I of the bill, through an authorization of $25 million for the first year, a program for expanding and developing university and continuing education programs is envisaged.

This progrgam is an expanded version of a university extension proposal, S. 3477, which Senator RANDOLPH and I carried through the Senate in the 87th Congress, but which was not accepted by the House of Representatives at that time. It is our hope

that now that it is part of the administration program, the House will be able to better understand the essential merits of the concept.

Hearings on S. 600 are now underway, and I am confident that after the precise language has been worked out, and after such changes as the Congress deems proper are made, the higher education bill can become a statute.

This has been a rather brief review of a fairly comprehensive program, and in the course of it, I may well have told you far more than you may have wished to learn. I plead guilty to the vice of a teacher. I do get interested in my subject and I get carried away to the point where I sometimes forget to hear the bell at the end of the hour. In closing, I can only once again express to you and to the Senator from the West Virginia, my deep appreciation for your wonderful hospitality and the opportunity you have given time to talk with you tonight.

A Classic of Mass Hysteria

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following column written by Thurman Sensing, which appeared in a number of newspapers across the country:

SENSING THE NEWS

(By Thurman Sensing, executive vice president, Southern Industrial Council)

A CLASSIC OF MASS HYSTERIA

The history of the world is full of indictments which indicate the spread of mass hysteria at particular times. Examples of this were the so-called children's crusades in the Middle Ages in which youngsters were encouraged to march to the East and fight the Moslems. The Abolitionist era in the 19th century was another example. Frenzied promoters of strife overcame the voices of reason, and the Nation was split by a dreadful war—the aftereffects of which America is still feeling a century later.

We have seen mass hysteria in our own time—this very month past. Because certain individuals in Selma, Ala., were alleged to have been denied the right to register to vote, the whole country has been plunged into a strange intoxication. There never really was a problem in Selma that could not have been ironed out in courts of law. If anyone was denied registration who was entitled to it, the laws and the courts offered an abundance of protection. If anyone was unjustly injured, the same courts and laws were their protection.

NOT INTERESTED IN REGISTRATION

But the agitators who masterminded the campaign in Alabama were not interested in securing rights. They were not interested even in registering certain individuals. Their interest, obviously, was in creating trouble—in fomenting strife that, in turn, would spark hysteria from coast to coast. These strategists of hysteria are very skillful, and they accomplished what they set out to do. They produced an electric reaction from Boston to San Francisco. Plane loads of ministers descended on once peaceful communities in Alabama. Two Alabama cities were presented as theaters of war. Students at famous universities were allowed to leave their classrooms, put aside their books, and forget laboratory work, and rush off to demonstrate in Alabama.

In the Nation's Capital, the anarchists had a field day. Only a few months ago the Government and the press were deeply concerned over added security for the President. Mr. Johnson reviewed the inaugural parade from behind a shield of bulletproof glass. But in the scenes of frenzy and beatnik civil disobedience, sit-in artists were allowed to invade the White House. They were permitted to camp out on the sidewalk in front of that famous dwelling. Their supposed "right of assembly" was given precedence over the right of all other citizens. No one else would have been allowed to lie down in a White House corridor or pitch camp in front of a Government building. The normal business of Government was crudely and rudely disrupted by the agitators.

Over all these recent actions is a deep layer of hypocrisy. From Chicago, where the crime syndicates have operated a state within a state for decades, came more than 50 clergymen.

Into Alabama poured clergy from New York State. They went to Alabama to protest the death of a Boston area minister who had gone where he had no legitimate ministry.

In the same week, in New York City, there was a brutal murder of a 17-year-old white youth by four Negro youths in the Manhattan subway. But no one marched in New York City. No students camped outside New York's City Hall. No one demanded that Federal troops be sent to New York or that the New York National Guard be federalized to protect protesters walking through Harlem. The double standard prevailed throughout most of the Nation.

And what was behind the drive in Alabama? Rowland Evans and Robert Novak, senior correspondents for the New York Herald Tribune, candidly reported that the principal agitation group in Selma had been infiltrated by "beatniks, leftwing revolutionaries, and, worst of all, by Communists."

This grim period of national hysteria, which has caused the Johnson administration to try to virtually lynch six Southern States, is a classic of revolutionary warfare. Lenin would smile and approve of what has happened. The greatest country in the world, with important business to transact, has been turned upside down by street demonstrators who know how to create phony martyrs and how to plunge quiet, comfortable communities into scenes from a Russian novel of revolution.

The crisis in Alabama was a synthetic crisis, created for the purpose of promoting strife. The Nation was tricked into stumbling into an emotional trap. Unless it can regain its sanity and prevent future attacks of hysteria, there's no telling what will happen to the Republic.

Winning Essay on "What My Country Means to Me"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON R. YOUNG
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. President, recently the Junior Chamber of Commerce of North Dakota sponsored an essay contest among the schoolchildren of the State. The topic assigned was "What My Country Means To Me."

Winner of first place in this contest, Miss Betty Zettel, of Langdon, N. Dak., has done an excellent job in stating simply and directly what so many of us feel, but often are unable to express.

Miss Zettel, a member of the seventh grade class at St. Alphonsus School, and the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. James Zettel, of Langdon, is a fine example of today's youth. The promise held by such young people makes the outlook for our country's future bright indeed.

Since I feel that this essay expresses so well the sentiments all of us feel, I ask unanimous consent that it be reprinted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT MY COUNTRY MEANS TO ME

(By Miss Betty Zettel)

My country means home to me. I think America is the best place in the whole wide world to live. It offers anything and everything any one of us could ever ask for. We have the right to speak or write our thoughts and opinions freely as long as we do not injure others. We are free to worship in any way we please and at any church we choose. We have the right to vote by secret ballot for the men who are to represent us in the government. We have the opportunity to obtain a free education at least through high school, and a chance to develop our abilities and talents. We can start a business, take up a profession, or work at any job we choose. We have the right to own a home, an automobile—in fact, as much property as we wish or can afford to buy. We can move freely about our own State or country. No American has to ask permission to take his family into any State in the Union.

We are free to join any organization we wish and to attend their meetings except, of course, those that work against our country's welfare. We are free to read what we wish and listen to what we wish. We are free to find the facts on any subject. We believe that every person deserves respect as a human being, no matter who he is. We believe in fairplay and in justice for all. Our swift planes and trains, our many schools, our broad farms and busy cities, our bridges, dams, and factories have grown out of the hard work, skill, and sacrifice of early Americans who lived very differently than we do today.

I want to learn all I am able to while I am going to school so I will better understand what is going on in my country. When I grow up, I want to do my share to keep America the wonderful place that it is to live in. America was founded on the idea that human beings are entitled to live in freedom. We believe that our democratic government and our way of life promises more liberty and happiness to more people than any other system of government. We are proud and thankful to be Americans.

Today a serious threat to democracy is communism. I am glad I live in a country which is free from communism. I pray that it will always stay that way. I will never understand how people can live in a place where God has been shut out, I hope someday soon the leaders of these countries will realize how wrong they are and abolish communism forever.

It is easy for us to take our freedom for granted and to believe that we shall continue to enjoy our democratic way of life. But we Americans must remember that the struggle for freedom never ends.

Let us be proud and grateful that we are Americans. Let us remember, too, that we in

turn must believe in and defend our country if we wish to remain a great and free nation. God bless America.

Utah Prepares for Golden Spike Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, one of the great events in the history of this country took place on May 10, 1869, at Promontory Summit, Utah. This was the ceremony at which the famous golden spike was driven, marking the completion of the first transcontinental railway. Members of the Utah Congressional delegation have joined in sponsorship of a bill for the purpose of establishing a national monument at the spot where the joining of the railroads occurred. The centennial of this event will occur in 1969, just 4 years from now. The State of Utah is already making plans to mark this 100th anniversary. It is to be hoped that Congress will take early action on the bill to create a Golden Spike national monument so that a properly marked area, complete with necesary facilities for visitors, can be ready for use during the centennial events.

An editorial appeared in the Sunday, April 4, 1965, issue of the Ogden Standard-Examiner, of Ogden, Utah, the largest daily paper in the First Congressional District, which sets forth with clarity the hopes of the people of Utah for early action on this bill and likewise for a well-planned and successful commemoration of the 100th anniversary of this historic event.

The editorial follows:

TIME NEARS FOR GOLDEN SPIKE FETE—FEDERAL MONUMENT PLANS SHUFFLED

Five weeks from tomorrow the Golden Spike Association of Box Elder County will conduct its 14th annual reenactment of the historic driving of the golden spike at Promontory Summit.

This traditional event has been drawing increased attention in recent years as interest builds toward the 1969 centennial celebration.

The original spike was driven on May 10, 1869.

Just what form the 1969 centennial will take remains to be seen. But, take our word for it, there'll be a celebration that northern Utah will remember for a long time.

This is not to take any credit or attention away from the Box Elder County folks who will put on this year's pageant at Promontory.

If it were not for Bernice Gibbs Anderson and the other faithful members of her Golden Spike Association, this lonely spot at Promontory Summit would not now even have its modest, battered monument.

The summit would have been taken over by weeds.

As it is, the association has kept alive—with its annual reenactment—the memories that occupy such a rich chapter in Utah history.

But it's time these people had some help.

That's what State and Federal agencies intend to provide.

In the lead soon will be the 11-member Golden Spike Centennial Commission authorized by the recent session of the Utah Legislature.

The commission membership is yet to be appointed by Gov. Calvin L. Rampton. He is taking his time working out the group's composition since the centennial law does not become effective until July 1.

It is hoped that the commissioners will be representative of the many groups in our area who have been active in making sure that the historic site is not neglected.

Meantime, there's also activity in Washington, according to reports to the Ogden Standard-Examiner from Senators FRANK E. MOSS and WALLACE F. BENNETT and Representatives LAURENCE J. BURTON and DAVID S. KING.

What's particular pleasing is that despite their 2-to-2 Democratic-Republican split, the Utah congressional delegates are finally burying partisan differences and showing signs of unity on the Golden Spike project.

A proposal has been before Congress for some time for creation of a Golden Spike National Manument that will include a long strip of the old right of way and space at Promontory Summit for a suitable intepretive museum.

There also has been some support for a plan that would have the national monument created by presidential proclamation.

The proclamation was almost issued last year, in time for the 1964 celebration, but ran into a technical snarl within the Interior Department legal division and one of the House committees involved.

Because of the interest expressed by Senators BENNETT and Moss and Representatives KING and BURTON, the National Park Service recently sent a team from its Santa Fe regional office to take a fresh look at the Golden Spike monument site.

Just what these experts will recommend is not yet known, although their report is expected to be made public soon.

Their suggestions will cover not only what physical form the project should take but just how it should be developed and managed.

There is a possibility that the designation of "national monument" will be changed, in line with a Park Service program to attain uniform nomenclature within its system.

In this case, it would remain a national historic site—but its status would be upgraded.

Whether a monument or a historic site, we don't care—so long as proper attention is secured. In fact, it already is a historic site by proclamation, although on a lowly level.

One consideration by the Congressmen who will study necessary appropriations will be how actively local residents are supporting the Golden Spike Monument and/or Historic Site.

Approval by the Utah Legislature of the Golden Spike Centennial Commission law should be taken in Washington as concrete support among Utahans.

Another way to demonstrate our interest in the long-range plans will be to get behind the Golden Spike Association for the 1965 reenactment on this May 10.

Job Placement Center, Houston, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, in line with President Johnson's equal employment opportunity program, the League of United Latin-American Citizens, in cooperation with the Department of the Navy, has established a job placement center at Houston, Tex. I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the remarks made by Mr. Girard P. Clark, Director, Equal Employment Opportunity Program, Department of the Navy, at the opening ceremonies on April 10, 1965.

I ask unanimous consent that the remarks be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF MR. GIRARD P. CLARK

What we do here today—the dedication of this job placement center for Spanish-speaking Americans—is the product of a year-old dream of the Department of the Navy and the League of United Latin-American Citizens.

We of Navy had long been conscious of the fact that the President's equal employment opportunity program was not for one minority alone, but for all those Americans who are limited in their pursuits by the shade of their skin or the accent of their speech or even by their family names.

The second largest minority group in the Nation is made up of some 5 million Americans with Spanish surnames. The great majority of these Americans live in the Southwest—from Texas to California. Throughout that vast area they suffer the greatest unemployment and underemployment, the least education and the lowest utilization of any group.

Despite these facts, the Federal Government's equal employment opportunity program had practically no meaning for these Americans until 1964. It was little more than a year ago that the Department of the Navy and the leadership of LULAC, working together, pinpointed the problem—the lack of employment recruitment sources—and resolved to do something about it.

The field specialists of the Navy's equal employment opportunity program and the Navy contractors work as a team in implementing the Executive orders. The contractors realize that by recruiting, hiring, and upgrading minority group people, they are not only complying with a Presidential order, they are tapping the greatest unused source of talent and ability in our country. They stand ready to do this—but they cannot be expected to recruit door to door.

It falls then upon our field specialists to give our contractors the advice and guidance they need to do the job. But, until today, there was virtually no agency that our contractors could use that would inform them of any flow of qualified Latin-American candidates for employment.

Now at last, in the city of Houston, we have made our beginning.

The opening of this center is a tribute to the hard work and spirit and vision of the League of United Latin-American Citizens Council—and the other LULAC Councils of Houston. The opening of this center is the climax of a year of planning—it is the beginning of a vital program that, to truly succeed, must spread from the shores of the Gulf of Mexico to the shores of the Pacific—it is the promise of a future where all Spanish-speaking Americans will take their full and proper place in the economic structure of a thriving America.

Whether we succeed in this great endeavor depends on what we accomplish here in Houston. If LULAC, and the employers, and the Federal Government, working together, achieve success with this center—then we really will have made our beginning and we will surely keep our promise.

I could not begin to cite all of the wonderful people who were involved and are involved in making this dream come true. But I do want to pay a special tribute to two men who played a major role in the establishment of this center and are destined to play an even greater role in the future of the Spanish-speaking Americans of the Southwest.

I speak particularly of a leader of great imagination and greater dedication, the national president of LULAC, William Bonilla—and of a leader of the Navy's field program and, for all practical purposes, the field director of Navy's program for Spanish-speaking Americans, Roberto Ornelas.

I am sure many of you heard President Johnson giving his recent speech to the joint session of Congress on the subject of the rights of minorities. In that speech he said:

"My first job after college was as a teacher in Cotulla, Tex., in a small Mexican-American school. Few of them could speak English and I would not speak much Spanish. My students were poor and they often came to class without breakfast—hungry. And they knew, even in their youth the pain of prejudice. They never seemed to know why people disliked them, but they knew it was so because I saw it in their eyes.

"I often walked home late in the afternoon after the classes were finished wishing there was more that I could do. But all I knew was to teach them the little that I knew—hoping that it might help them against the hardships that lay ahead.

"Somehow you never forget what poverty and hatred can do when you see its scars on the hopeful face of a young child.

"I never thought then in 1928 that I would be standing here in 1965. It never even occurred to me in my fondest dreams that I might have the chance to help the sons and daughters of these people and to help people like them all over this country.

"But now I do have that chance and I will let you in on a secret—I mean to use it.

"And I hope that you will use it with me."

Here in this center lies the opportunity for us to do what the President asked—to join with him in helping the sons and daughters of those early students of his and many thousands of others who have perhaps been denied a proper chance.

Let us move ahead, then, with the task that lies before us and with high hopes for the success of this and the other job placement centers which I feel sure will follow.

Farmer Almost Forgotten in Rehash of Old and Present Farm Programs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent to insert in the appendix of the record an editorial appearing in the Huron S. Dak., Plainsman which points out very eloquently the very serious shortcomings of the administration's farm bill proposal.

The editorial follows:

FARMER ALMOST FORGOTTEN IN REHASH OF OLD AND PRESENT FARM PROGRAMS

As many farm leaders had feared, the administration's farm program offers little that is new and practically nothing that is helpful to the farmer.

The revised wheat program will shift the cost of wheat supports almost entirely from the Government to the consumer.

The increase of domestic wheat certificates from 75 cents to $1.25 per bushel—estimated to raise the cost of a loaf of bread one cent—will increase the price paid for domestic wheat to the producer from $2 to $2.50 per bushel. This is roughly 100 percent of parity.

But the increase in domestic price is very nearly offset by the abolition of Government-subsidized export certificates, which will subtract 30 cents a bushel from the price the farmer has been receiving for export wheat. He will now receive $1.25 a bushel, the equivalent of the world market price on the farm.

While this change may be welcomed by some as a step in the direction of removing Government subsidies from surplus crops, it will net the farmer an increase of only about 10 cents a bushel for the wheat he raises, or about one-fifth the 50 cents a bushel he lost last year.

The cropland conversion program appears to be the old soil bank under a new name. It completely ignores a pilot conservation program now in effect in 4 counties in South Dakota which would convert some croplands into grazing lands on a limited subsidy basis, and follows the old soil bank concept that land must be taken completely out of production. While the proposed plan would limit the amount of land to be retired in each county, it would provide for entire farms to be taken out of production.

The President asked for an extension of the present feed grain program, with a few minor changes. As no prices for feed grains have been mentioned, it is impossible to assess the effects of this program.

The only sound progress toward the President's announced goals of raising farm income, lowering Government costs and reducing crop production is made in the new wheat proposal, and that does not give the farmer very much. Otherwise the proposed farm plan is nothing more than a rehash of past programs that have lowered farm income to the present 74 percent of parity.

Judge Wahlstrom Guest at White House Ceremony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article, from Legal Lines, concerning Judge Carl Wahlstrom, who was a guest at a White House ceremony. He was invited to the ceremony because of his knowledge of Abraham Lincoln. We, in Massachusetts, consider him an authority on our great President; and I am glad that President Johnson agrees with us. So I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUDGE WAHLSTROM GUEST AT WHITE HOUSE CEREMONY

(By Carl E. Wahlstrom)

On Monday evening, February 8, 1965, at about 9 o'clock, our doorbell rang. I opened the door and there stood a messenger who handed me a telegram. To receive a telegram was nothing unusual as I receive several of such from lawyers and litigants asking for this and that so I paid no particular attention to this telegram, but finally I did open it. It was from the President of the United States.

I looked into space and then I looked at the telegram and then I sat down. I handed the telegram to Mrs. Wahlstrom. She looked at the telegram and then she looked into space, then she saw me sitting there with a dreamlike look on my face and quickly asked, "Well, you're going, aren't you?" I replied, "It looks like a command, so I'll have to go, I guess, but it upsets my schedule. This is the Lincoln season and I have several speaking engagements.

By tradition I am supposed to be at Classical High School at the birthday, and on Saturday, I am the principal speaker at a meeting of the Lincoln Group of Boston. I wonder how I am going to make it.

Soon I began making plans and made inquiries about planes and trains and found that if I had good luck, I could get out of Washington by plane and take care of my Boston engagement.

However, when Friday night came, all planes were grounded, but in the meantime, being suspicious that something like this might happen, I had canceled my plane reservation and made a reservation to return on the train, the Federal, to Boston which left at 10:20 p.m.

The invitation to dine with the President requested my presence at 1 o'clock. I arrived in due time and joined the others in going to the White House. There were about 100 in attendance. Several I knew and many I knew by reputation, but they were all easy to get acquainted with. After a chance to get acquainted, we were invited to go upstairs. As we did so, we passed the Marine Band dressed in their beautiful red uniforms and playing softly. We were then invited to enter the East Room—that beautifully decorated and well equipped room where so much history has been made.

In that room we found a battery of cameras and sound equipment. Twenty-five cameramen were running around hither and thither. Soon we were on the air. Then everything became quiet and the President and Mrs. Johnson entered. It was a high moment for all of us. There was no applause. The President escorted Mrs. Johnson to a chair and he went directly to the rostrum.

Mr. Johnson spoke in a deliberate, dignified manner. I had seen him in action when he was in Congress when he acted the part of a backslapping, wisecracking politician. That is all gone. The President has made up his mind that he is going to be a good President, a dignified President, a worthy representative of the American people and this he in truth is. His speech was well delivered and was a thoughtfully worked-out address. At the close of the address he was given a great standing ovation and then in a very humbly way he said to us, "After we have dined, won't you join me and we will go down to the Lincoln Memorial together."

We were then invited downstairs to a reception where we all had a chance to shake the hands of the President and our First Lady. Everybody chatted with both of them because they were so easy to talk to. Mrs. Johnson is a short, beautiful woman with a charming smile, very easy to meet. After the reception we were invited to the dining room. Tables for eight were set. I had as my immediate tablemates, first on the right, Gov. Otto Koerner of Illinois, a charming gentleman. We had something in common.

Last year I had visited the World's Fair and was so thrilled with the Lincoln-Illinois exhibit that I visited it 5 times. When I reached home, I wrote a letter to the authorities at the Exhibit complimenting them on

its uniqueness, its beauty and its usefulness. Evidently they were pleased as they sent my letter to Governor Koerner. He, too, I am told, was pleased and ordered it framed and hung at the World's Fair, at the Lincoln exhibit. He remembered the incident and he also spoke of friends of his in Massachusetts whom I also knew. Thus, he and I got off to a good start.

My companion on the left was one Adam Adams, an elderly gentleman representing the Historical Society and the Civil War Commission of Florida. I learned that he had retired from business and asked just what his business had been and to my pleasant surprise he stated, "I used to represent the State Mutual in Florida." I smiled and said that we worked for the same company because I am a director of the State Mutual. That hit him in the right place and we talked about Chandler Bullock, George White and Ladd Plumley, and others. We really became firm friends. There was another judge at the table, a president of a college, and others representing various phases of American life. I had a chance to meet our ebullient Vice President and talked to him on two occasions. I was surprised to find that he was so boyish in his looks and very eager to talk.

At the close of the luncheon, Mrs. Johnson rose and said, "My friends, now that we are together at the White House, let's go together to the Lincoln Room," and we followed her to this famous room, kept exactly the same as it was in Lincoln't day. There was the big oversized bed where prominent guests at the White House have slept. Churchill slept in this bed. It is said that all of them were somewhat disturbed about the Lincoln ghost and Mr. Johnson himself said that he counseled with the ghost as he entered the corridors outside the bedroom.

One story is told of a statesman who was terribly disturbed and could not sleep because he thought the ghost was hovering around. He recalled that he had sleeping pills in his pocket. He took a few and he did not keep the 8 o'clock appointment the next morning with the President. In the room on one of the walls hangs one of the five copies of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address as written by him. He wrote this copy for our own George Bancroft who was born in Worcester and who served as Secretary of the Navy and who was the "father of the Naval Academy." The unique thing about this copy is that it is signed in full—Abraham Lincoln—and dated.

On another wall was a painting of the President done by Douglas Volk, son of Leonard Volk the sculptor, who on the Sunday after Lincoln had been nominated for the Presidency by the Republicans came to Lincoln's home in Springfield and made molds of his face and hands. The mold of the face is the basis of every Lincoln bust which had been made. The story of the hands is rather interesting. When he came to make the mold of the right hand, he found it so swollen that none of the muscles or veins showed and so he suggested to Lincoln that he get a piece of wood or other substance and hold it in a clenched fist. Lincoln went into the woodshed and sawed off a piece of Mary's broom handle, an incident which caused him to get in trouble with Mary later. He held this, the sculptor hoping that it would bring out the muscles and the arteries but it did not. The hand as we have it today shows Lincoln holding a part of the broom handle.

We stayed in the Lincoln Room for quite a time talking and discussing the various pieces of furniture and telling stories about Lincoln. Then we were invited to go out and get into a Marine bus which would take us to the Lincoln Memorial. This was about 4 o'clock in the afternoon. Reaching the memorial we found the place crowded with people. There were a great many Negroes present. We were escorted into the memorial and invited to occupy privileged places near the base of the statue. In due time the President walked down between two lines which we formed. He walked slowly and his face looked as though he was thinking seriously. As he reached the base, a soldier helped him place a wreath thereon.

Then the President did a most significant thing. He stepped back—he raised his head and looked squarely into Lincoln's face.

He spoke not a word, but I knew what he was saying to himself. He was saying, "President Lincoln, you, too, had your troubles. You had your great difficulties but you were a man of patience, vision, courage, and good judgment and you solved the problems of the day. You preserved the Union and at the same time you freed the slaves." Then he dropped his head—he closed his eyes and he was face to face with his God. The President of the United States was praying.

Again he spoke not a word but I knew what he was saying to his God. He was saying, "God, endow me with a portion of Lincoln's wisdom, his intelligence, his patience, his courage and his good judgment so that I, too, can help solve the problems which we face today, so that I, too, can help to make this country and this world a better place in which to live." Slowly he turned—there was a serious look on his face, and slowly he walked out of the memorial and down the steps.

On the steps he was met by hundreds of people who thronged around him. I was sure that he was safe and yet I could not help but think that anything could happen because he was so close to the people. He said nothing but he had a beautiful smile on his face as he reached out both hands and as he shook hands with black and white citizens. We reentered the bus and were told we were going back to the White House but all the ceremonies were over. When we reached the White House and the bus had stopped, we put on our hats and got ready to get off the bus when the door opened and in walked President Johnson.

We removed our hats. He took off his hat and in a most humble manner he said, "My friends, I just came to thank you very much for coming down to Washington to have luncheon with Mrs. Johnson and myself. It has been a memorable occasion and I want you to know that we are very grateful to you." And, then he left. The ceremonies were all over and I prepared to go back home.

I had had a hunch for some reason or other that I might have difficulty in getting a plane. I had a reservation but had canceled it and made a reservation on the Federal, a train which left at 10:20 at night. It turned out that the Washington airport was in a fog. All planes were grounded and everybody rushed to the railroad station. The place was thronged. I was secure because I had my reservation for the homeward trip and I had a room so this gave me a chance to do some reading and writing. There were 15 cars on the train. It was delayed on the way and I did not reach Boston until just 1 hour before the time I was to make my speech.

It's Time the Pendulum Started Its Backswing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Times on April 4, contained a statement by the editor, Mr. Nick B. Williams, which describes the reaction many of us have experienced to a disturbing trend in our national "cultural" life. Under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to commend the following editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

IT'S TIME THE PENDULUM STARTED ITS BACKSWING

(By Nick B. Williams, editor, the Los Angeles Times)

Somewhere around the spring of 1940, I took to reading the plays of Noel Coward, starting with his nearest-to-current stage hit and working backward until I stepped into something he'd written before he found his sense of humor, when he was a very young man.

The play was supposed to be frightfully shocking. I've forgotten most or maybe all of it, but as I recall it, the shocker was that a young man finally learned that his mother was a narcotic addict.

Coming as I did from the jamaica ginger belt, and long after the jake-leg epidemic of the late twenties—a bad batch of the stuff had paralyzed thousands of prohibition era scofflaws—I wasn't as frightfully shocked as a younger Coward had intended, and not nearly as astonished as I was at the awful payoff in Michael Arlen's "The Green Hat," in which an off-stage hero's suicide was attributed to a sense of guilt about a social disease, the medical term for which at the time was taboo, although nowadays it is brandished regularly in every health column in every women's magazine.

And they do tell me, although I am too young to state this categorically, that once upon a time no southern gentleman ever mentioned in the presence of ladies the noun that describes the opposite of cow, unless perhaps he was referring to the celebrated Confederate victory at that creek in Virginia, in which case he whispered the first half of it and ended up strongly by yelling "Run."

The point of all this is that times do change, and moral standards change with them. It is about time for another change, and in an opposite direction.

For in all the arts—stage, screen, painting, literature—varying degrees of depravity have come to be accepted as the prevailing custom of these times. I don't think most of us, or maybe all of us, are any worse morally than we were a few decades ago. But we have grown tolerant of vulgarity and obscenity and filth either on the basis that it amuses or that it is true to life. Or that its technical excellence is justification enough.

It seems enormously debatable to me that being true to life or technically excellent justifies any public display of filth or viciousness. Nor does the emotional impact of such a display make it excusable.

A case in point is the one-act play, "The Toilet," which indeed has been performed in other major cities of the world before it reached Los Angeles. I have not seen it but I have read it—that is, minus the brilliant work of the actors and director—but this play serves no purpose except the titillation of the horribly morbid. True to some pockets of life it well may be, but it is terrible enough that such things do occur, just as Buchenwald occurred, or Selma occurred. But I submit that a public reenactment of the physical details of Nazi bestiality at Buchenwald would be depraving. These are matters for testimony in courts of law, but not for the stage.

Which brings me to a professional issue. I do not think it is enough for critics to explain, however explicitly, that such a play is sordid, and then, in praising the excellence of the acting or the impact of its viciousness, to leave the public with the notion that technical excellence somehow justifies its per-

formance. For that concept could be extended far beyond abnormalities and brutalities, even to the routine alimentary functions that so depressed Jonathan Swift.

Criticism, it seems to me, should be more than the recording of shock power, more than a recognition of skills, more than a recitation of fact. Criticism also should measure comparative worth, as critics have measured Beethoven's or Shakespeare's worth, or Hammerstein's or Steinbeck's, or Michelangelo's or Noel Coward's—and should treat with brief contempt the unworthy.

The ultimate in criticism is silence. And the ultimate weapon of the public should be not censorship or police judgment; it should be the individual refusal to yield to prurient curiosity, and to stay away.

President Johnson's Vietnam Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "President's Vietnam Speech Rates a 'Statesmanlike' Mark," published in the Great Falls, Mont., Tribune of April 8, 1965.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRESIDENT'S VIETNAM SPEECH RATES A "STATESMANLIKE" MARK

President Johnson's speech Wednesday about Vietnam already is being hailed throughout the world as a constructive and statesmanlike address. We think historians will agree with that assessment.

While emphasizing this Nation will not retreat from its obligations to defend South Vietnam from aggressors, the President declared the United States is ready for unconditional discussions of a Vietnam peace.

He stated he would ask Congress to join in a $1 billion American investment in a massive economic development program for southeast Asia. He urged other prosperous countries and especially Russia to join in the effort to raise living standards of those needy nations.

The President invited international cooperation under United Nations leadership in the program to "replace despair with hope and terror with progress." He pointed out that man today has the awesome power to destroy civilization or to take advantage of our technology to eliminate hunger and want from the world.

Stressing that the United States would not grow tired of living up to its Vietnam obligations or withdraw under the cloak of a meaningless agreement, the President said the central lesson of modern times was that there could be no retreat from aggression. If we surrender one area to an aggressor, we will have to prepare in another country for another aggressive move, he maintained.

"We will always oppose the effort of one nation to conquer another," the President declared after he said "no nation had reason to think we want to annex any land or impose our will on another nation."

We hope the talk leads to immediate peace discussions and an end to Vietcong terrorism and United States and South Vietnam retaliatory raids on North Vietnam.

The President's proposal is a realistic approach to a difficult and almost hopeless problem that has involved the United States in the Vietnam jungles since 1954.

The French were forced to leave Vietnam in 1954 after failing to defeat the Vietcong even though France had 300,000 professional troops and superior air and naval power on the scene. The French simply lacked support of the people.

Prospects for our military program to win general cooperation of the Vietnamese, plagued with political instability, endless governmental coups, deep religious differences, and general tiredness after 20 years of war, are not promising.

Our key hope in South Vietnam is to get the people there to want to govern themselves and to raise their living standards and morale to the point they themselves can discourage any aggressive plays by the Vietcong, North Vietnam, and Communist China.

We can accomplish that better, cheaper, and without the loss of American blood by an international economic aid program than by years of reacting to terrorism with bombs and bullets. The President opened the door leading to peace. It's now up to North Vietnam and Communist China to determine whether the war will continue.

The Excise Tax on Communications

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to an editorial which was published on February 25, 1965, in the Mount Dora Topic. I believe that the nature of the editorial, dealing as it does with a tax on communications and a question of congressional review, demands that it have a greater reading public than normally would be available to it.

The editorial follows:

HINGE DECISION ON JUSTICE, EQUITY

President Johnson's budget has made it abundantly clear that the Federal Government has no present intention at least—of giving up the lush proceeds of the telephone excise tax. Uncle Sam's total take on the combined local and toll service tax, at 10 percent, will exceed $1 billion in 1965. This is a lot of money, even in Federal fiscal circles; and when you add to that the fact that virtually escape-proof collection, via the telephone companies, doesn't cost the Federal Government anything at all, it is easy to understand why the Treasury loathes to let go of such a good thing.

But the decision of Congress on whether to repeal this unfair and discriminatory tax on the telephone subscriber does not, and should not, turn on such simple reasons of expediency—the large amount, and the sure and easy collection agency. The decision ought to turn on more objective standards of justice and equity.

The telephone excises were, as we have been reminded many times, established as emergency wartime levies, designed among other things to cut down the unnecessary use of overburdened plants during a period when expansion of such customer services interfered with the war effort. It was put on the tax books along with the higher taxes on liquor, jewelry, furs, cosmetics, and other so-called luxuries, which telephone service certainly is not.

Now President Johnson agrees to cut out the nuisance taxes on jewelry, cosmetics, furs, etc., but nothing is said about the much greater nuisance tax on customer use of a much more essential service—the telephone.

What is the big idea? What became of all the political sweet talk during the presidential election campaign, notably by Treasury Secretary Dillon, to the effect that the telephone excise tax was on the way out?

The plain fact is that the telephone subscriber will be in much worse condition than ever before if the President's budget recommendations are adopted by Congress. It will mean that the telephone subscriber is going to be stuck with the excise tax for the indefinite future, if not forever.

What other meaning can we give the words of the President's budget when, after asking for a total excise reduction of $1.75 billion, he adds the following language: "The proposed legislation also will make permament all the taxes that are continued. It will replace temporary legislation under which excises taxes on * * * general telephone service automatically would be reduced or would expire after June 30, 1965."

Under the present law, in other words, it takes an affirmative act of Congress to extend the general telephone excise tax every year or else it would expire. This at least gives telephone companies the opportunity of reminding Congress and the American people every year that they are still being burdened by a so-called war emergency tax 20 years after the war is over. If the Johnson administration budget, on this item, goes through Congress as requested, then even this safeguard is gone for good. The telephone excise tax is likely to be frozen permanently into the pattern of the U.S. tax structure.

There must be a last-ditch, never-say-die effort to retain the annual congressional review of any telephone tax which survives. The administration is most vulnerable here because it is plainly engaged in political doubletalk if not doubledealing by promising to entertain tax repeal last October, and then not only trying to throw it out in January, but also to lock the door after it and throw away the key.

The telephone companies should be able to win on this at least. Congress in its own self-interest should respond to a united appeal to hold on to its own authority of deciding whether to extend this tax every year.

There has to be agreement between the Bell and independents as to what they really want to do. Then both branches of the industry must go right down to the wire without any foot dragging, or separate negotiations, or second thoughts. The choice is clear for the entire industry. To be or not to be a Federal tax collector forever. This must be decided now. Otherwise it will surely be too late.

War on Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the administration's poverty headquarters here in Washington is now getting organized. Forty-five positions, ranging in annual salary from $18,935 to $30,000, have been established. The top five

positions are noncareer Executive Pay Act positions; and the remaining 40 are under civil service and have been approved by the Civil Service Commission. I ask unanimous consent that a list of these positions, prepared by the Senate Republican policy committee, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	Yearly
Director	$30,000
Deputy Director	28,500
1st Assistant Director	27,000
2d Assistant Director	27,000
3d Assistant Director	27,000
An assistant	24,500
Do	24,500
Do	24,500
Do	24,500
Do	24,500
Do	24,500
Do	24,500
Do	24,500
Do	24,500
Another assistant	21,445
Do	21,445
Do	21,445
Do	21,445
Do	21,445
Do	21,445
Do	21,445
Do	21,445
Do	21,445
Do	21,445
Another kind of assistant	18,935
Do	18,935
Do	18,935
Do	18,935
Do	18,935
Do	18,935
Do	18,935
Do	18,935
Do	18,935
Do	18,935
Do	18,935
Do	18,935
Do	18,935
Do	18,935
Do	18,935
Do	18,935
Do	18,935
Do	18,935
Do	18,935
Do	18,935
Do	18,935
Do	18,935

Wilkins, Master Rights Strategist

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, April 11, Roy Wilkins, executive director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, marked 10 years of devoted, outstandingly distinguished, and progressive service to the making of democracy in America viable and secure for all its citizens.

All Americans of every race, creed, color, and national origin, and all of the nations of the world whose hope is in freedom, liberty, and justice owe to this man a debt incalculable which will live throughout the entire history of man. No words can express our honoring of him and our profound gratitude. On behalf of the 13th District of Michigan, which I represent, a district dynamic and committed to the highest democratic principles, and for myself personally, I say may God bless, preserve, and continue the creative utilization of Roy Wilkins in this vital cause to which he has given his iron commitment:

WILKINS, MASTER RIGHTS STRATEGIST

(By Claude Lewis)

Just as no one man can speak for all Americans, no one Negro can speak for all Negro Americans. But the man who comes closest to representing America's 22 million Negroes is Roy Wilkins, the 63-year-old executive director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Mr. Wilkins, a onetime newspaperman who joined the NAACP staff almost 34 years ago, will celebrate his 10th anniversary as head of the Nation's oldest, largest, and most potent civil rights organization on April 11. And these past 10 years have been the stormiest and most tumultuous in NAACP history.

During a statewide voter registration campaign in Mississippi, for instance, two NAACP leaders of the drive were murdered.

The passage of the first went to Mississippi to address a memorial service, and under his direction the association Civil Rights Act in 82 years came in 1957. That year Little Rock, Ark., made headlines around the world as the NAACP helped nine Negro students gain admittance to a previously all-white school. Mr. Wilkins was in constant consultation with Mrs. Daisy Bates, who as Arkansas State NAACP president was the leader in the successful desegregation effort.

In 1961 Mr. Wilkins, as chairman of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, and Arnold Aronson, the conference secretary, helped to establish the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity, which provided for broader procedures to enforce antidiscrimination provisions.

ARRESTED

In 1963 Mr. Wilkins was arrested while picketing an F. W. Woolworth store in Jackson, Miss., along with the late Medgar Evers, who was shot in ambush just 12 days later.

"The entire staff of the NAACP has worked very, very hard," Mr. Wilkins said in his office last week. "We've had to. There was a great deal to be accomplished and I believe we've been unusually successful."

Of particular significance is the growth of the NAACP itself. During the last decade, when more civil rights groups emerged than in any other period, NAACP membership nearly doubled, from 240,000 in 1954 to the current 455,150. Over the same period the number of branches in 50 States increased from 1,350 to 1,948.

Although the NAACP's income climbed from $466,065 in 19544 to $1,116,565 in 1964, its work is still hampered by a lack of necessary funds. "We have never had enough money," Mr. Wilkins says with a smile, "but I don't know anyone who has."

"I am especially proud of the youngsters," he goes on. "They have brought a selfless determination and an unusual amount of imagination and energy to the cause. They have become an important part of the movement all over the country."

Under Mr. Wilkins, the NAACP staff has frown from 68 persons in 1954 to 125 now. The organization's official publication, Crisis, has almost quadrupled its circulation to 112,000 over the last decade.

Jim Hicks, editor of New York's weekly Amsterdam News, says Mr. Wilkins' success over the last 10 years stems mainly from the fact that he grew up within the organization. "On balance," says Mr. Hicks, "Roy Wilkins is perhaps the most important civil rights leader in America. He possibly slowed down the tempo of the NAACP during the last 10 years, but he never slowed the pace. I think Roy is running the organization with a cooler motor."

STRATEGIST

"I am convinced that violence is not the answer to the racial problem," says Mr. Wilkins. "The Negro has to be a superb diplomat and a great strategist. He has to parlay what actual power he has along with the good will of the white majority. He has to devise and pursue those philosophies and activities which will least alienate the majority opinion. And that doesn't mean the Negro has to indulge in bootlicking. But he must gain the sympathy of the large majority of the American public. He must also seek to make an identification with the American tradition."

On many occasions during the past 10 years Mr. Wilkins has been discouraged. "There was a time not long ago," Mr. Wilkins says, "that the organization seemed to be attacked from all sides. It was like being on center stage with darts coming at us from every conceivable angle. Some people said we were too moderate, others said we were too militant, some said we weren't doing enough, and still others said we were moving too fast. It almost appeared as though we weren't accomplishing anything. I've got to admit, a couple of years ago I was down in the dumps."

Mr. Wilkins isn't in the dumps too often. But the death of Medger Evers in 1963 had him at an all-time low. "Many of our people have been lost in the battle," Mr. Wilkins said last week, "but some how I was particularly close to Medger. And part of the impact came because I had been to see him less than 2 weeks before his death." Mr. Wilkins paused, then picked a piece of lint off his handsome dark blue suit. "Just like that," he said, dropping the thread into a wastebasket. "Medger was gone. He was a great fieldworker, and a wonderful human being."

Roy Wilkins is proud of NAACP successes. "I think the two incidents which stand out in my mind most during my 10 years as executive director is the success of the Little Rock fight, and the day a few years ago that 24 Negro teachers in Ellery, S.C., listed their NAACP membership when they knew it would cost them their jobs. I have never been more proud of anything in my life. Those teachers showed they believed in the NAACP and they didn't care who knew it. This kind of dedication keeps us going."

MARTYR

Another kind of encouragement came this past Friday after Mrs. Viola G. Liuzzo, a 39-year-old white mother of five children was shot to death on an Alabama road. Mrs. Liuzzo, a member of the Detroit NAACP, was aiding Dr. Martin Luther King's march to Montgomery, when a bullet ended her life.

Mr. Wilkins was deeply grieved at Mrs. Liuzzo's death, but he was impressed with President Johnson's immediate response to the incident. "Like so many of our friends of freedom, Mrs. Liuzzo joined the lengthening list of martyrs in the fight for equality," Mr. Wilkins said. "She earned martyrdom on a lonely Alabama road."

Mr. Wilkins sent a telegram to Mr. Liuzzo offering the deep sympathies of the NAACP and another to President Johnson expressing appreciation of his call to the FBI to work around the clock to apprehend Mrs. Liuzzo's slayers.

Roy Wilkins would like to write a book on civil rights. "There are so many myths circulating that I would like to set the record straight," he says. But he admits that he doesn't know when he'll find the time to write. Someone suggested that perhaps on his retirement he could find time.

"Retirement?" snapped Mr. Wilkins. "How do you retire from freedom?"

"Voting Bill: The Abuse of Power"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Voting Bill: The Abuse of Power." The article was written by the Honorable Henry J. Taylor, and was published in the April 12, 1965, issue of the Roanoke Times.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VOTING BILL: THE ABUSE OF POWER
(By Henry J. Taylor)

The intelligent attack on President Johnsons' voting rights bill is based on a fundamental:

Good labels do not constitute good legislation. Neither do good objectives. Any conscientious citizen must want to see voting rights protected, and they certainly need a great deal of protecting the way things stand in our country today. That fact shouldn't even be argued. But finally we must live with the actual law.

The broad and impressive complaint is that the terms of this bill, as written, represent a foray into the jungles of autocratic government.

Whoever the Federal Attorney General may be (and the current one admittedly wrote this bill) becomes of himself the law. Yet our Nation's fundamental intent is to have a government by law and not men.

The problem of fairness to minorities and equal fairness to the majority goes on forever. But autocratic government does not mean a balance of legal rights. It means a confrontation of pure power. And it spreads like a wasting disease.

In time, some sort of protection becomes necessary for everybody. We all need more and more help just to be left alone. More and more people must rely on political friends and accomplices. All life becomes a question of "Who do you know?"

The result is a political paradise, but it is also tyranny's playground.

The bill appears to contradict its own antidiscriminatory claims. Its terms discriminate against about 10 of our 50 States and, in effect, limits its enforcement to these.

It doesn't contend that the other 40 States are pure. Nor are they pure by the bill's own terms. It merely zeroes in on the 10 for reasons so flagrantly political and discriminatory that even Chairman Emanuel Celler of the House Judiciary Committee has called the bill "a hash."

For example, Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach exempts New York State by condoning the State's eighth grade education test. Why? He declares that educational qualification is discrimination in some other States.

Texas, likewise, escapes neatly. Mr. Katzenbach personally exempted it; easy as that. He testified: "Texas is out for the reason that it does not have a literacy test."

Other States among the 10 under attack have no literacy test—but the Attorney General selects Texas for exemption. Why?

Then the Attorney General, Mr. Johnson's appointee, again exempts Texas in applying another provision:

The Supreme Court is supposed to interpret our Constitution. Yet in this bill the Federal Attorney General may (or not, as he chooses, and he chose to exempt Texas) indict a whole or any part of a State as "violating the Constitution of the United States" if 50 percent of the area's people of voting age were not registered to vote on November 1, 1964.

In fact, if 50 percent didn't choose to vote in the last presidential election the Attorney General can make the area automatically guilty of his indictment.

This lets him send in Federal registrars. Attorney General Katzenbach testified that he'll extend his authority to all elections—Federal, State, local—as well as all primaries and even to voting on bond issues, school projects, etc.

The Attorney General (not a court) interprets what he thinks should be the voting laws, ordinances, and practices in the State, county, township, or community. The Federal registrars are there to enforce his interpretation. And they're there indefinitely. What a gold mine for Federal payrollers and campaigners. Racial discrimination, of course, need not even be proven.

Can you imagine a sweeter setup for State and local bosses who are in bed with the administration? How hard will it be for them to keep the Federal registrars out? And imagine the pressure available against political opponents by threatening to send registrars in.

Space doesn't allow disclosing dozens of additional subsurface features buried in the bill—the strange way it treats poll taxes in one State compared to another, property qualifications in one State compared to another, etc.

The trappings of the White House can create their own intoxications. The population explosion may be the problem elsewhere but the power explosion is our problem in Washington.

"Lynching" the States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, a brief but penetrating analysis of the proposed Voting Rights Act of 1965 appeared in the April 12 U.S. News & World Report. Written by David Lawrence, this editorial properly observes that the proposed new law would "bypass the customary judicial process of proving guilt and then imposing punishment, and would set up instead of blanket indictment and punish certain States on the basis of an arbitrary formula of presumptive guilt."

And, as Mr. Lawrence further notes:

The proposed measure does not apply uniformly to the States of the Union. It selects certain States and uses arbitrary yardsticks to punish such States and their subdivisions.

This article is well worth reading by friends as well as foes of the proposal:

"LYNCHING" THE STATES
(By David Lawrence)

Senator SAM J. ERVIN, JR., Democrat, of North Carolina, a former associate justice of the supreme court of his State, was interrogating Charles A. Bloch, a noted constitutional lawyer, before the Senate Judiciary Committee on March 29. Mr. Bloch, who was testifying in opposition to the proposed voting law, was asked the following question by Senator ERVIN:

"Now I would like to ask you this: The only reason we hear for this bill—which would nullify or suspend section 2 of article I of the Constitution and the 17th amendment and the provision reserving to the States the rights not vested in the United States by the Constitution—is that it requires time to litigate a case in court.

"I will ask you if that is not exactly the same argument, or rather the same 'justification,' a mob uses when it lynches a man? It says: 'We know this man is guilty, and we're not going to waste any time trying him because it will take some time.' Is that not exactly the argument of a mob?"

"Yes," replied Mr. Bloch. "This ought to be called a State lynching law—a law to provide for the lynching of certain States. And that is what it does."

Senator HARRY BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, in a statement on April 2, pointed out that Attorney General Katzenbach recently testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee as follows:

"The judicial process, upon which all existing remedies depend, is institutionally inadequate to deal with practices so deeply rooted in the social and political structure."

Like the court-packing scheme of 1937, the proposed Voting Rights Act of 1965 seeks to do indirectly what cannot be done directly. It would bypass the customary judicial process of proving guilt and then imposing punishment, and would set up instead a blanket indictment and punish certain States on the basis of an arbitrary formula of presumptive guilt.

Today a large majority of Members of both House of Congress are said to be in favor of the bill, which flagrantly violates the Constitution in many respects. For the proposed measure does not apply uniformly to all States of the Union. It selects certain States and uses arbitrary yardsticks to punish such States and their subdivisions.

Thus, the Attorney General would be able to abolish literacy tests in States or localities in which less than 50 percent of the voting-age population was registered or voted in the 1964 election. But the mere fact that there was such a voting or registration percentage does not constitute any proof or racial discrimination.

The administration's proposed law also violates the long-established doctrine that a statute passed by a State is presumed to be constitutional until its enforcement is tested in the courts. States and counties which fall within the 50-percent category of voters and have literacy or other tests would in the future have to go to a special court to get approval of any new voter-qualification law before it may be enforced. This procedure is unique in legal history and disregards the constitutional principle that the courts can decide only actual cases or controversies under specific laws.

The bill, moreover, permits—without a hearing—an arbitrary withdrawal from the citizen of the right to vote, and thus breaks down what is known as "due process of law." A person might have been ill or out of the country and yet, in certain States, he could lose his right to vote if he hasn't voted once in 3 years.

If the new bill becomes law, an illiterate in one State could be permitted to register and vote, while in another State an illiterate could not.

Under the American system of law, a person is presumed innocent until proved guilty by a court or jury. But under the new bill, the Federal Govenment would not have to prove that there had been denial of voting rights before imposing the penalties of the law. The State or its subdivisions would instead have to prove before a special court in the District of Columbia that, in the previous 10 years, there had not been a single

instance of abridgment or denial of the right to vote for reasons of race or color—something that would be virtually impossible to prove anywhere.

The Constitution explicitly gives to the States the right to establish voter qualifications. It does not grant to Congress any power to disregard other articles of the Constitution just because the 15th amendment says that no State shall deny or abridge the right to vote on account of race or color.

The Supreme Court can declare unconstitutional State laws which violate this provision. The courts can punish officials who administer voting laws on the basis of racial discrimination. But can Congress abolish State laws which are constitutional on their face?

So the whole procedure is a roundabout way to avoid customary judicial processes. Instead, certain States in the Union, adjudged in advance to be guilty, must be punished according to capricious devices.

This is truly a system of "lynching" the States.

Importance of the Soil Conservation Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the State, of Columbia, S.C., has printed in its April 5, 1965, issue a most eloquent and sound editorial against the administration's proposed cutbacks in the Soil Conservation Service. I concur wholeheartedly in the comments in this editorial, which is entitled "Saving the Soil." There is no more important resource to protect and preserve in our country than our soil. The fight against soil erosion in this country, which has been very successfully waged by the Soil Conservation Service, has been one of our Nation's most effective weapons in the war against poverty. It is, indeed, strange that the administration, now sailing under the colors of fighting poverty, attempts at this time to cut back on a program which has done so much to preserve one of our most important natural resources, both for today and for many years in the future.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the State, Apr. 5, 1965]

SAVING THE SOIL

The ways of Federal finance frequently are beyond our comprehension, and the current plan to cut back on allocations for the Soil Conservation Service is a case in point.

Of all the agricultural programs adopted by the National Government, soil conservation seems to us the wisest and most deserving. In the long run, viewed from the standpoint of the Nation's needs, it may prove to be one of the most efficient and most economical ventures ever made in the field of land management.

Only a few inches of topsoil stand between humanity and starvation, and it's plain commonsense to preserve, or conserve if you please, that invaluable resource. When the erosive effects of wind, rain, and flood eat away at the land, the damage is not only to the farmer but to his community and to the country at large.

For 30 years now, the Soil Conservation Service has been battling the forces of nature in an unending struggle to curb the ravages of erosion, and to stabilize (or improve) the land of America. To an unparalleled degree, the work has been carried forward as a partnership between Government technicians and private farmers.

The greatest contribution made by the Soil Conservation Service has been in providing the technical skills and scientific planning which lie beyond the reach of the ordinary farmer. The program itself is largely controlled by farmers and landowners who have banded together in soil conservation districts for their mutual benefit—and that of the entire district.

Multiplied as they are throughout the entire country, these districts have made and are making notable contributions to proper land use and water control. The SCS program does not involve crop controls, Federal grants, or subsidies, or even retirement of farmlands from production. It aims solely at conserving the soil and water resources of the Nation, repairing the damages of yesteryear, improving the land resources of today's farmers, and insuring the availability of farmlands for the future.

If the program can be administered more economically, or if the total costs involved can be reduced, we stand ready to applaud any sensible efforts in that direction. But it seems strange that the services now being offered American farmers as part of the national goal of conservation should be curtailed at the very time that the administration is appropriating new millions for the avowed purpose of "helping the farmer" and overcoming rual poverty.

We get the feeling that there are some loose connections in the thought processes of the agricultural braintrusters of Washington.

Time To Look at the Lemmings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, Columnist Eric Sevareid recently noted the rising incidences of physical turmoil between urbanized mankind, and prophesied:

Other things being equal, lack of space is very probably doing more harm to physical and mental well-being than lack of leisure, and once this proposition is more fully accepted, sociologists are going to redirect their energies and doctors are going to sit on city planning commissions as they now sit on sanitation commissions.

I find much of interest in Mr. Sevareid's hypothesis. It gives added justification to the calls of America's conservationists for better water pollution control, expanded park and public lands programs, outdoor recreation, realistic zoning, planning, and land use programs, and other activities to improve the qualities of our land for a satisfactory life.

Mr. Sevareid's article follows:

TIME TO LOOK TO THE LEMMINGS

(By Eric Sevareid)

A writer who comes directly to his typewriter after fighting a traffic jam is not entirely to be trusted; his ego, superego, and id are tangled up, their bumpers locked. What follows may therefore be circular (I do my driving in Washington), hence both inconclusive and slightly dizzy. The chief ingredients in my mental compote of the moment are French drivers, lemmings, and March hares; they need some sorting out.

With total lack of surprise I read in the Paris correspondence of my old friend, Waverley Root, that Paris autoists no longer commit merely oral assault on one another but have taken to fist fighting, usually at the end of the day and usually in competition for a parking space. There has been at least one deliberate murder.

French psychiatrists are debating the phenomenon in the public prints; their guesswork was predictable. One suggests it is the overweening sense of power and the intolerance that comes with captaincy of a powerful vehicle. Another reverts to the anthropological theory of territoriality—a car is like a man's home and he will fight for it and from it more quickly and more fiercely than would normally be the case.

Both are possible elements, but surely marginal elements, not fundamental causes. We would wager that the pugilistic drivers are ill—physically, measureably ill—and that laboratory tests would show it. They are ill of the disease that has no encompassing name but may as well be called spacelessness.

There is no particular reason we can think of why lack of parking space, in today's world, could not produce the same symptoms as lack of apartment, subway, bus, sidewalk, or office space is pretty surely producing.

Other things being equal, lack of space is very probably doing more harm to physical and mental well-being than lack of leisure, and once this proposition is more fully accepted, sociologists are going to redirect their energies and doctors are going to sit on city planning commissions as they now sit on sanitation ocmmissions.

The mysteries of the March hare and the Scandinavian lemming seem fairly well understood now, from much recent work by biochemists, among others. Every few years the population cycle produces intense crowding among North American snowshoe hares as they burrow in the snow of the long winter. Around March they can be seen bursting from their confines, leaping in contortions, then falling dead. The March hare is indeed crazy, made so by overcrowding.

It is the same with the lemming horde. Under the snow, their population doubles and triples. The search for food becomes insense. They are unable to sleep. Their sex instinct remains but not the strength to fulfill it. The varied frustrations, the lack of rest begin to produce alterations in liver functions and blood pressure. The central nervous system is directly affected.

Finally, the lemmings by millions break out and begin running. They are not running for the sea, as legend has it; they are not running for anything. They are running away.

Essentially, they are running away from themselves. They are having a mass nervous breakdown, they are sick with the diseases of stress and strain brought on by spacelessness and they run until they die.

Before they break out in their collective, contagious convulsion, they do many abnormal things, including fighting each other far more than usual. Apparently, the blood and glandular changes as measured in the lemmings in their progress toward breakdown are not fundamentally different from those registered by human beings in conditions of anxiety and strain.

Allegedly civilized, urban societies have only recently begun to think about the consequences of crowding in simple terms of the human body. The subtleties of psychiatry may be more irrelevant than we have thought. The human body requires an envelope of space as it requires its skin; exactly how much space we do not know.

Of course thousands and thousands of human beings in a city like New York are ill. They can scarcely walk, drive, sit or stand without an extra effort; they cannot set out for a given destination without some measure of anxiety about their prospects; they can rarely find quiet. They are unintentionally torturning one another simply by existing and there is little they can do about it.

The remedy of higher and higher apartment and office buildings, of more and more highways, tunnels and bridges, to accommodate the increase of people and vehicles is a palliative, not a cure. It merely magnifies the number of the eventual victims in a wider and deeper trap. When we follow this course we are looking to the rainbow when we ought to be looking to the lemming.

County Leadership in Recreation Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MAURINE B. NEUBERGER

OF OREGON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, county officials throughout the United States are spearheading programs for recreation development and preservation of our scenic outdoors. On April 2, the Outdoor Recreation Congress for the Pacific Northwest held sessions in Wenatchee, Wash., under sponsorship of Mr. Wilfred R. Woods, publisher of the Wenatchee Daily World.

This regional meeting was an outgrowth of a proposal which was made by a former president of the National Association of Counties, the Honorable M. James Gleason, commissioner of Multnomah County, Oreg. During his term as president, Gleason focused public attention on the problems, potential, and public responsibilities for outdoor recreation through sponsorship of a county recreation congress.

At the recent meeting, the executive director of the National Association of Counties, Mr. Bernard F. Hillenbrand, delivered an address with some suggestions for control of billboards. This subject has been of great interest to me over the years, and I ask consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD some excerpts of Mr. Hillenbrand's speech.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOME SUGGESTIONS TO CONTROL BILLBOARDS

(By Bernard F. Hillenbrand, executive director, National Association of Counties, Washington, D.C.)

This outdoor recreation congress is a triumphant occasion. Happiness is everywhere. Thanks to the leadership of the men and organizations participating in this program and thanks to the vision of men like Publisher Wilfred R. Woods of the Wenatchee Daily World, we have come to this beautiful place to rejoice. Later, many of you will begin the happy task of developing the recreational resources of the great Pacific Northwest.

After long effort, we now have the prospects of the tools we sought to get the recreation job done. If we are fleet of foot and can get there before the States, we may get some Federal dollars to acquire new recreation facilities. We have the wilderness program. President and Mrs. Lyndon Johnson are providing national attention and direction to a real America the beautiful program. For county officials and Americans everywhere, prospects were never brighter.

BILLBOARDS

Let us now begin a new battle.

While we are still fresh and spirited and flush with victory, let us now direct our attention to the hideous billboards which continue to stink up nearly every highway in our country.

Nearly every American agrees that billboards generally are a blot on America the beautiful. But many more Americans argue that efforts to control them might interfere with property rights or the rights of private business, or even the rights of free speech.

In this battle, our mission should be to prohibit all new billboards and to eliminate existing billboards over a period of years. We would like to open the public debate by suggesting some proposals that could be effective without hardship to the billboard industry.

STATE CONTROL

The regulation and control of billboards under our Constitution quite properly is, and should continue to be, the responsibility of the respective States. The obvious way to curb billboards is through the State legislature on a statewide basis. The billboard industry, quite naturally and quite appropriately, is well organized and well financed. They certainly have, in the past, strongly opposed any effort to curb or regulate billboards. It is equally apparent, however, that the acceptance of billboards by Americans is wearing thinner by the hour. It seems to us that the more we, as a people, develop the recreational potential of our community, the less we will tolerate billboards.

Hawaii has paved the way and is the only State that prohibits all billboards. This was the result of the organized efforts of women's groups, such as the League of Women Voters, and conservation groups.

It would seem to us that the more sparsely settled Western States would be an ideal place to seek direct statewide action. The number of billboards is fewer than in large urban States, and often Western States have been more progressive and willing to enact constructive legislation than have legislatures generally.

Ideally, statewide action should include a program of both prohibition and elimination. Perhaps the States could do at least some of the job by prohibiting billboards along any new highway right-of-way.

FEDERAL BRIBES

Our second suggestion still envisions statewide action and is directed at Federal aid highways. In 1956, Congress showed great courage and leadership by including in the Federal Aid Highway Act of that year a section providing a small financial reward for any State that banned billboards within a prescribed number of feet from the interstate highway. For various reasons, these bribes have not been too effective. We would suggest that the amount of the Federal bribe be increased and that it be extended beyond interstate highways to include all federally aided highways.

LOCAL OPTION ORDINANCES

In the typical State legislature, it has been the practice to transfer controversial problems back to the localities in the form of allowing them to enact local ordinances. Therefore, our third suggestion is that if statewide action fails, counties be authorized to enact billboard ordinances.

County officials in Merced County, Calif., have shown the way with a May 1959 ordinance which reads in part:

"Any sign, billboard, commercial advertising structure, or statuary which is lawfully existing and maintained at the time this ordinance becomes effective may be continued, although such use does not conform with the provisions hereof;

"*Provided, however,* That no structural alterations are made thereto, and provided further that all such nonconforming signs, billboards, commercial advertising structures or statuary, and their supporting members, shall be completely removed from the premises not later than 15 years from the effective date of this ordinance."

It seems to us that Merced County's approach is completely reasonable. It recognizes that there is a large investment in billboards and that many people make their living through this part of the advertising industry. It allows the investors to gradually, over a 15-year period, to phase out their investment. It allows those who are employed in this line of work to move to other activities in the advertising industry. It also aids the present investors by completely prohibiting new competitive billboards from appearing along the county's roads.

Our first three suggestions are based upon regulation and control. Our fourth and final suggestion envisions special billboard taxes.

The States should enact special taxes on existing billboards, the proceeds of which should be earmarked to acquire new recreation facilities.

Perhaps the theory here is that if the public must endure billboards, they ought to be compensated in the form of additional recreation facilities.

CONCLUSION

In the past, some people who might otherwise favor eliminating billboards have argued that elimination, or even taxation, of billboards might somehow threaten free speech. This argument doesn't seem to me to have merit. We have newspapers, television, radio, and direct mail privileges open to everyone. We can rent halls, address meetings, or write letters to advertise, inform, or persuade.

As a matter of fact, I think that with each of the other means of exercising freedom of speech, we recognize the corresponding right not to hear or read. We do not have to read an editorial, attend a meeting, or listen to radio or television.

With billboards, however, this right not to listen is severely curtailed. For example, there is a billboard in my county that says we should impeach Chief Justice Earl Warren. I am forced to see that every time I pass that road and I have no protection of my right not to see.

Perhaps what is happening is that we are growing up as a nation. We expect more from America and we are getting it.

Many people are pessimistic about eliminating billboards, but all of us who have helped make the recreation dream a reality never believed 5 years ago, or even 1 year ago, that we would succeed so fast.

If we as groups acting in assemblies such as this one—will reason together, we can start in motion responsible efforts to control a blight that is a direct threat to our entire effort to make this "from sea to shining sea," America the beautiful.

Thank you.

Boycott: A Step Toward Anarchy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to bring to the attention of my colleagues the timely article written by Thurman Sensing, executive vice president of the Southern States Industrial Council:

SENSING THE NEWS—BOYCOTT: A STEP TOWARD ANARCHY

(By Thurman Sensing)

Of all the weapons in the arsenal of the social and political agitator, none is more dangerous—for the user—than the economic boycott. Those who seek to employ it to their advantage often are surprised to discover that it is a two-edged weapon, inflicting injury on whoever picks it up and wields it. Moreover, it is a weapon that, when used or threatened, frequently antagonizes the American public.

The Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., who has proved himself a master of organizing conflict where there previously has been peace, order, and gradual progress, unquestionably overstepped himself when he urged a boycott of Alabama products. His call almost immediately brought an unfavorable response from some of his strongest supporters. The New York Times, for example, which has helped create the King myth as the Gandhi of America, found that it could not go along with a boycott. Indeed the national response has been generally disapproving.

Well it might be, for a boycott is a weapon that can only increase bad feeling in this country and multiply the divisions that already exist as a result of revolutionary street action bordering on civil insurrection. Nor has it escaped the attention of responsible citizens in all sections of the country that a boycott would do severe economic damage to the very group of citizens that Reverend King says he wants to help. How anyone could believe that his effort in behalf of civil rights is sincerely helpful, rather than coldly political, is hard to understand after his boycott proposal.

The boycott proposal is a cynical political deed, for Reverend King surely must know that such an effort could engender counterboycotts—and the trouble would be compounded. Suppose all Americans were to settle their differences in this manner. The pitting of State against State, region against region, and special interest against special interest would produce unprecedented hostility and economic chaos in the United States.

The truth is that the American economy is profoundly interrelated. Alabama's cotton and steel, for example, go into scores of products finished in other States and across the oceans. Alabama could not be made the subject of a special economic attack without attacking the whole framework of the American economic system. The wiser heads in the metropolitan centers, even if they usually praise the street demonstrators and riot specialists, know that this interrelationship is a fact of American economic life. They see the peril in any grave disruption by means of a boycott.

Knowing that his proposal must surely produce dissent from around the country, why did the organizers of the synthetic crisis in Alabama persist in calling for a boycott? The fairminded citizen can only conclude that the people attempting to reduce Alabama to conditions of permanent strife and chaos want to reproduce those same conditions from coast to coast. In short, the fomentors of strife have a vested interest in enduring social conflict in the United States.

It can be seen from examining the case study represented by the Alabama troubles that those who plan marches and seek to produce a huge publicity yield are not interested in securing rights or winning real improvements for any group. They have an interest in producing trouble for trouble's sake. They don't want a specific grievance to be settled. Instead they wish to substitute disorder for order wherever possible.

Some people have wondered why a so-called "dirty word" campaign was started at the University of California last fall. They also have wondered why some of the Alabama marchers engaged in lewdness. These acts undoubtedly were premeditated. They had a purpose; namely, to shock people, to break down established customs, and to promote chaos. What has happened in Alabama—and what is happening in Martin Luther King's boycott proposal, which he persists in going ahead with—cannot be understood apart from a nationwide effort to create a powerful anarchist movement in the United States. The boycott is a key device used by anarchists to shatter a working economy. Every responsible citizen in the United States needs to understand how the boycott plan fits into the overall scheme of breaking down American capitalist society.

Internal Revenue Service Abuse of Tax-Exempt Status

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Washington Daily News has printed in its April 5, 1965, issue a column by Mr. William F. Buckley, Jr., pointing up the leftwing bias of the administration in its operation of the Internal Revenue Service. The column is entitled "It All Depends." It shows how the Internal Revenue Service is harassing conservative organizations with tax-exempt status, while it is giving leftwing organizations free rein to engage in political activities and still maintain their tax-exempt status.

I ask unanimous consent that this excellent article be printed in the appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT ALL DEPENDS

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

H. L. Hunt, most easily identifiable as the richest man in the world, has "lost his tax exemption," as they say. Specifically, a gift to his pet activity, Life Line Inc., can no longer be listed as tax deductible by the donor. This means Mr. Hunt will have to use aftertax dollars instead of pretax dollars, and the latter, in this case, are nine times as plentiful.

Internal Revenue Service has ruled that Life Line does not qualify as an educational and nonpartisan activity. Why? Because, IRS contends, Life Line's radio broadcasts—that is what it specializes in—are tendentious, and the typical listener gets the message: vote for this guy, against that measure; back this policy, oppose the other.

Internal Revenue has been engaged over a considerable period in cracking down on such organizations as are not in fact "educational" in the sense to be "educational" requires nonpartisanship.

Several months ago, a spokesman of IRS was quoted in the press as saying: "We've done a good job of weeding out the leftwing organizations, now we're going to clean up on the rightwing organizations." And there followed a list of suspect rightwing organizations among which, sure enough, was H. L. Hunt's Life Line, on which the ax has now officially fallen.

I called on IRS at the time and asked politely for a list of the leftwing organizations that had been weeded out of the tax-exempt list. I was politely informed that records of such a character are not maintained (that's PR for are "not made generally available"). However, I was told that I was perfectly free to take the current issue of listings of tax-exempt foundations, compare it with the listing of any previous year, and draw my own conclusions. I thanked the gentleman kindly (and he was, do not misunderstand me, the soul of courtesy), turned the assignment over to a colleague—who advised me that inasmuch as there are over 60,000 listings in the current volume, any cross check would require several hundred hours of research.

In other words, it isn't easy to tell, by citing comprehensive figures, whether Internal Revenue is applying standards of strictness against the right which it is not applying against the left. One is driven to look at individual organizations and wonder out loud why IRS hasn't done something about them.

For instance that great fiasco of 1964, the National Council for Civic Responsibility, whose principal accomplishment, it appears in retrospect, was to make a public ass out of its chairman, Dr. Arthur Larson.

The National Council for Civic Responsibility was founded splashily last summer to make war against the radical rightwing. Two things about it soon became plain:

First, that it was a partisan organization being run not by its flossy public names, but by insiders.

Second, that it sought to have a direct influence on the national election by suggesting that Goldwater was a creature of the kooks.

Sure enough, although the committee had pledged itself to labor on and on, for years and years until the last American who wants to impeach Earl Warren is driven from the American temple, it quietly folded up in January, Lyndon Johnson having been safely tucked into the White House.

Meanwhile, it was sustained by an antirightwing front called the Public Affairs Institute, which, what do you know, is tax exempt. And who should have given the money to Public Affairs with which to pay for Mr. Larson's political committee? The Democratic National Committee's book fund, it transpires.

When will we have an investigation of the Public Affairs Institute, which is prohibited by law from engaging in partisan political activities, but receives money from the Democratic Party?

There are others that come to mind, for instance the American Committee for the United Nations, which pleads for the admission of Red China into the U.N. on tax-exempt dough, even while the Committee of One Million Against the Admission of Red China is denied tax deductibility. A congressional committee should look into the question.

Who knows, maybe there will be enough money left in Congress, after we restore Appalachia and land on the moon, to check the 60,000 names in the current directory against

the names in a previous directory, and tell us whoever lost a tax exemption for dabbling in left politics?

Social Security Amendments of 1965

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 8, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6675) to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under the Social Security Act with a supplementary health benefits program and an expanded program of medical assistance, to increase benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to improve the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I observe the House today considering legislation to provide for hospitalization through the framework of the social security system and for payment of other medical, surgical, and auxiliary services from the general fund. I know this legislation is going to pass, and it is my principal regret that my beloved, deceased father, former Congressman John D. Dingell, is not with us today to see the House of Representatives take this great step. It was he who joined with the beloved late Senators Wagner and Murray in sponsorship of the first legislation to accomplish this end in the 78th Congress back in the year 1943.

What we are doing today is adequate proof that high pressure lobbying tactics and huge expenditures of funds cannot prevail against the will of the American people where the need is as clear as that which cries for enactment of H.R. 6675.

Our senior citizens have the highest incidence of medical need in every category. Their hospitalization is over twice as long and vastly more frequent than other segments of the society. Their bills for payment of doctors and surgical care and for hospital stays are far in excess of that faced by the usually more affluent younger members of our society. Their ability to meet this crushing burden of health care is less than any other segment of the society. Their median income, per capita income, and liquid assets are far below that of other segments in the society. They fear illness, but they live more in fear of being pauperized by the high cost of illness.

Their circumstances jeopardize their slender savings every time they go to the doctor or to the hospital.

The aged are often preyed upon by predatory and unscrupulous sellers of relatively valueless health insurance. Often, responsible insurers will not accept them. They often find premiums of worthwhile health insurance far beyond their limited means. Where they are able to maintain a policy of health insurance they ofttimes find the policies canceled at the first real evidence of heavy medical need.

I rejoice at the other features of the bill. It is most desirable that we participate in the education of the children of our social security beneficiaries; it is vitally important that we permit earlier retirement at age 60 for widows who might otherwise agonize in a limbo of unemployment and deprivation while awaiting that milestone of age 62 to qualify for benefits.

The social security increases are of great importance; the moneys for liberalization of other parts of the Social Security Act are greatly needed. However, Mr. Chairman, nowhere in the history of the whole amendatory process since the original enactment of the Social Security Act has there been a measure so desperately and vitally needed by the senior citizens of this Nation as that providing for Federal payment of hospitalization and medical care for the aged.

Our whole society and whole economy will benefit.

Our aged will have an opportunity to have adequate hospitalization and medical care. Our young people will know that the health needs of their parents and loved ones are adequately cared for in retirement.

Our private insurance plans, like the great Blue Cross-Blue Shield system and many of the other fine private plans, will be able to offer all a better standard of health, hospitalization, and medical-surgical protection at a lesser cost. They will no longer need to subsidize the high risk cost of the aged, who cannot afford decent insurance.

Doctors and hospitals can eliminate now for the first time a large portion of their so-called charity patients. Ratepayers and beneficiaries of hospital and doctor and nursing home benefits will know that their payments do not go, in large part, to subsidize the cost of some unfortunate age person cared for as a part of the regular charity load of the individual or institution.

My old dad would be proud that the legislation that he fought for since the original H.R. 2861 of the 78th Congress is well on the way to enactment. My dear dad reintroduced that measure in each Congress until his death. This partial realization of his dream means protection of our aged from the most desperate need faced by them.

Communist Infiltration of the Negro Movement and Demonstrations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Times and Democrat, of Orangeburg, S.C., has printed in its April 11, 1965, issue an editorial which points up a concern that I have been expressing in the Senate for the past few years; that is, Communist infiltration of the Negro movement and demonstrations. The editorial is entitled "Beginning To See the Light."

I ask unanimous consent that this excellent editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BEGINNING TO SEE THE LIGHT

Questions are arising in the minds of some newspaper and radio columnists and commentators as to whether the Reverend Martin Luther King is still the actual leader of the so-called civil rights movement or whether he has become a pawn in the hands of fanatical groups which have little or no interest in the advancement of the Negro race but seek to capitalize on increasing national unrest.

Three such commentators are Eric Sevareid, William S. White, and the team of Rowland Evans and Robert Novak.

In one of his commentaries, Sevareid said: "A new chemistry is working in this movement [civil rights]; otherwise so steady a man as Martin Luther King would never have defied a Federal court order as he did in Selma. He did so because he would have lost his leadership had he not done so."

In his column, White wrote: "There are cynical tricksters within the civil rights movement whose interest in true civil rights could not be less, but whose interest in enfeebling us before the world could not be keener."

And Evans and Novak wrote: "Martin Luther King surrendered valuable ground to leftist extremists in their drive for control over the civil rights movement * * * the civil rights movement faces an agonizing internal crisis."

All three have warned, just as we feared, that Communist and fanatic revolutionaries are taking increasing control of street demonstrations and planning for the future.

It is a travesty that the movement in which such groups have become so active and influential has received the blessing of the Federal Government, misguided members of the clergy of all faiths, and other do-gooders. They have all become dupes and aid and abet the extremists in stirring up resentments that will not soon be forgotten.

President Johnson, instead of representing all of the people, has chosen to take sides with a vocal and active minority group. He has encouraged the blatant violation of State laws through so-called peaceful demonstrations that, in reality, were dynamite kegs waiting for some minor incident to light the fuse. And in so doing, he has violated the rights of peaceful, law-abiding residents of the State of Alabama. Martin Luther King has snapped the whip and the President has jumped.

And by sanctioning the lawbreaking, the President has given moral support to Communist and other radical and extreme groups to flock to Alabama where they whipped tension to a fever pitch using the aforementioned clergy and student groups, both white and colored, as their tools.

That even three well-known columnists and commentators are beginning to realize that all is not open and above board in the civil rights movement is encouraging. Perhaps their viewpoints will change even more to the right through the unpopular proposal by King that an economic boycott be imposed nationally on Alabama and its products. That suggestion fell with a dull thud on most of the Negro leaders, not only nationally but in Alabama itself. Could it have been inspired by Communist infiltrators in his movement?

If the national press, television, and radio are beginning to realize what is behind the civil rights movement, if they begin to question why demonstrators are employed rather than legal court action, there is some hope

that normalcy will return to the Negro's fight for civil rights. The national news and communications media has been largely responsible for the hysteria that has gripped the country—it can just as easily remove it by reporting fact for fact and ignoring propaganda. We hope that time will come soon.

Needed Comments on Barzini's Defamatory Book, "The Italians"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure and privilege to call attention to an article written by one of America's truly great scholars, Justice Michael A. Musmanno of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania. This article makes for interesting and enlightened reading to anyone concerned with the subject it covers, but it will be of particular interest to 21 million Americans of Italian origin.

Justice Musmanno was a judge at the international war crimes trials in Nuremberg; he is a retired admiral in the U.S. Naval Reserve; he was a member of the Pennsylvania Legislature; he is the author of 11 books, 2 of which were made into motion pictures. Although born in America and a graduate of four American universities, he also studied at the University of Rome where he acquired the degree of doctor of jurisprudence. He served as naval aide to Gen. Mark W. Clark during World War II in Italy and, for a time, was military governor of the Sorrentine Peninsula. He thus can speak with authority on Italy and Italians.

In this article Justice Musmanno takes to task Luigi Barzini, who has written a book called "The Italians," in which he libels his own countrymen. It is incredible that a member of the Italian Parliament, as Barzini is, would come to America to cast slurs on his own country and countrymen, spreading propaganda which could do damage to the excellent relationship existing between America and Italy. Under unanimous consent, I wish to have Justice Musmanno's article, which appeared in the Unione in Pittsburgh and Il Popolo Italiano in Philadelphia, printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEEDED COMMENTS ON BARZINI'S DEFAMATORY BOOK, "THE ITALIANS"

(By Justice Michael A. Musmanno)

The time has come for Americans of Italian lineage to raise their voices against a current book which defames, insults, and vilifies the Italian people, as they have never been defamed, insulted, and vilified before. The name of the book is "The Italians" and the author is Luigi Barzini. The book portrays the Italian people as deceivers, cowards, and brutes.

Barzini, the author, says that in Italy it is considered wholly proper to kick a man while he is down. He makes it even stronger. He says that Italians will support that shameful proposition by arguing, "Why shouldn't a man be kicked when he is down? When else, if you please, should one kick a man more advantageously? When more safely and effectively?" Of course, this is an outrageously false statement on the part of Barzini because the world knows that as a general thing Italians have a sympathetic nature and are opposed to cruelty. Naturally, there are exceptions. There are bad people in every nation, but Barzini seeks to generalize all the people in Italy into a mold that does not conform to fact.

He says that the Italian people are "fundamentally bitter, disenchanted and melancholic," that they are a "pessimistic, resigned, and frightened people." Untrue, of course.

Now, Barzini happens to be an educated man, he happens also to be a member of the Italian Parliament. In this book he happens also to be very unreliable, but not every one knows that. Non-Italians assume that Barzini knows what he is talking about. They assume that he speaks with a scholar's analysis, and therein lies the great peril of his book. Eventually, unless his egotistic irresponsibility is exposed, college and high school professors will be quoting him in the schools as an authority on the character and the makeup of the Italian people, and, in consequence, children with Italian names will suffer.

Barzini's book has now been on the best seller list for 27 weeks. One of the reasons for this is that advertisements incorrectly describe the book as one which praises Italy and Italians, because no one could possibly believe that an Italian would betray his own people. But Barzini does exactly that.

Over 20 million tourists go to Italy every year, but Barzini practically calls them idiots for doing so. He says that Italy's climate is bad, that her scenery is second rate, and her historical ruins unexciting. He says further that the food and wines in France are much better. Everyone in the world is enchanted with Venice, whether he has been there or not, but, according to Barzini, this magical city, during certain seasons, "smells of rotten cabbage and stagnant waters."

Now, all this is obvious nonsense and no one would pay the slightest attention to Barzini's disparaging remarks on Italy's scenery. People from all parts of the world would not continue to go to Italy for their vacations if Italy were as described by Barzini. An illustration of Barzini's asininities on the subject of scenery can be gleaned from his criticism that Italy does not have a river as long as the Nile or the Amazon. How would it be possible to lay a 3,500-mile-long river in a country which is only 700 miles at its longest point?

But, I repeat, it is not Barzini's inanities on climate and scenery which damage the Italian name, it is his remarks on Italian character. Barzini portrays Italians as cowards. The history of Italy's wars for independence and for unification is one long eloquent refutation to that base accusation. I served as an American liaison officer with the Italian Army at the front in World War II and I know from personal observation of the Italian soldier's bravery in battle.

There could be no more convincing proof of Barzini's unfairness than the fact that, although he speaks of World War I, he does not mention the Battle of Vittorio Veneto, one of the greatest battles in world military history. It was this battle, in which the Italians defeated Austria and knocked her out of the war, which caused the collapse of the German Army on the western front, hastening the Armistice which brought to an end World War I. Nor does Barzini speak of the staggering sacrifices of Italy in World War I. She contributed to the Allied victory 500,000 dead, and over a million and a half wounded.

Among the absurdities which abound in Barzini's book is his discussion on crimes of passion. He says that the number of people killed in Italy because of love exceeds the number killed in all of Italy's earthquakes, plagues, avalanches, tidal waves, plus all those killed in the wars. From Barzini's description of Italy, one would expect to see massacres in that country which would exceed in ferocity and scope the slaughter of the whites by the Indians in American pioneer days. He says that dismissed employees kill their employers, employers kill themselves, taxpayers kill the tax collectors, students kill their teachers, rioting workers kill policemen, immoral girls are found dead at dawn, drowned in a few inches of water, and so forth and so forth. He says that the automobile wrecks in Italy are the most devastating and spectacular car crashes in the western world and he leaves this bath of blood with the declaration that table manners in Italy are bad.

Barzini writes of Italy as if it were some strange exotic place in a mythical land in seas scarcely even navigated, or even off in untraveled space. The Italy which Barzini describes is a caricature. He says that there is no law in Italy, ignoring that the Roman law, which is the basis of all the law of the Western World, was formulated in Italy.

He ridicules Italian mothers by saying that their manifestation of love for their children is play-acting. He says that when Italian mothers are alone with their babies they treat them with matter-of-fact solicitude, but when somebody enters the room the mother will put on an act, summoning tears to her eyes, crushing the baby to her breast, singing to it and making up poetic pet names. Of course, anyone who has the slightest knowledge of Italian mothers, which Barzini ought to have, knows that they usually are timid about demonstrating love for their offspring when strangers are close by, but will shower uninhibited affection on them when alone.

Another reason why Barzini's book is on the Best Sellers List is that Italian-American doctors, lawyers, engineers, professors, teachers, and students who can afford $6.95 for a book, buy it to learn more about their forebears. They naturally assume that a book on "Italians" will speak of the great figures in Italian and world history. There must be, they assume, a fascinating chapter on Leonardo da Vinci, perhaps the greatest universal genius who ever lived. They are amazed to find that Barzini's treatment of da Vinci is limited to listing his name in a footnote with other illustrious immortals such as Guglielmo Marconi, Amerigo Vespucci, Galileo Galilei, Giuseppe Mazzini.

Instead of reading of virtues and valor which made a Roman empire and created discoverers and explorers which gave to mankind a new world, instead of reading of scientists, poets, artists who conquered the world with the works of their genius, the Italian-American reader reads fictional anecdoes, gross exaggerations, and distortions of reality, all put together by Barzini in order to produce his overall picture of the Italians, as brutes, cowards, ignoramuses, and deceivers.

There is nothing the disappointed Italian-American reader can do to get his money back. The sale has been registered, it is added to the sales in other stores and in other cities, and they all total up to the number which continues to keep a title on the best sellers list.

Then the non-Italian-American reading public, observing that the Italian-Americans are making no protest about the book, assume that the Italian-Americans approve the book as being reliable—and so the great deception goes on and on.

Italian-Americans, who have children and who have been disgusted with Barzini's book because of its untruthfulness, but have not voiced their resentment, will have only themselves to blame if in time their children will

be told in school that Italians are deceivers, cowards, and brutes.

We, who were born in America of Italian parents, owe it to them, if to no one else, to condemn this book which calumniates their character. But we owe also a duty to our brother Americans of other ethnic origins to acquaint them with the facts so that they will not be misled.

The American reading public must be made aware that "The Italians" by Luigi Barzini is not an account of Italians, as they are. It is, on the contrary, a diatribe, a caricature, an irresponsible, vicious attack on an honest, courageous, peace-loving, and God-fearing people.

The Increasing Trend Toward Big, Centralized Government in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have been impressed with a broadcast editorial by Harry C. Weaver, president and general manager of radio station WOKE, in Charleston, S.C. The editorial is concerned with the increasing trend toward big and centralized Government in Washington.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDITORIAL BY HARRY C. WEAVER, WEAVER BROADCASTING CORP. (WOKE), CHARLESTON, S.C.

We are always filled with amazement when we consider the immense grasp of freedom which the Founding Fathers held.

These men of vision limited government as no government ever before in history had been limited. The government had nothing for these men, but their freedom. That was the way they planned it. No one turned to the Federal Government for old-age benefits, medicare, price supports, aid to education, urban renewal, welfare, pensions, public works, or transportation. None of these things were expected, because, the Federal Government had nothing with which to give them false prosperity. To whom did our forefathers turn for these items that are considered today to be most important? Our forefathers turned to themselves, which isn't a bad idea for Americans to consider right now. Today, we Americans have found our way to the public treasury through our elected officials. It is hard to believe but today half of the American people who voted in the last election receive either a regular or an occasional check from the Great White Father in Washington. This means that we citizens of the 20th century have exactly reversed the attitude of the Founding Fathers of our beloved country toward government in the 18th century.

We Americans cannot point our fingers at our neighbors for we will suddenly realize that our neighbors are pointing their fingers at us. It is staggering when we stop long enough to look at the facts and figures: 16 million schoolchildren get lunches; 2½ million civilians are on the Federal payroll; 4 million workers depend on Federal military expenditures; over 2 million farmers get price support or conservation payments; almost 9 million persons get Federal food handouts.

The average age of the world's great civilizations has been 200 years. These nations progressed through the following sequence: From bondage to spiritual faith, from spiritual faith to great courage, from courage to liberty, from liberty to abundance, from abundance to selfishness, from selfishness to complacency, from complacency to apathy, from apathy to dependency, from dependency to fear, from fear back again to bondage. In 11 years, our United States of America will be 200 years old. What happens to our 20th century civilization depends on you.

There must be an end to the increase in big government, if we hope to be free. Our Government, which was designed to give nothing but freedom to the people, now has 50 million Americans on the payroll—one way or another. We are all voters so we are voting for this expanding bureaucracy by electing Congressmen who will give us back our own money, less the cost of Washington administration. A government that is no longer limited in its power can take as well as give. Our Founding Fathers chose capitalism and freedom. We Americans of today are chosing socialism and the loss of freedom. The twin brother of socialism is communism. The miracle of limited government, as established by our forefathers, can and must be reborn—in our beloved United States of America—if we Americans ever hope to stem the tide of big government that threatens us with more, more, more controlling power from Washington.

Resolution in Support of the Voting Rights Message of President Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that a great tidal wave of public opinion is mounting behind the pending voting rights bill. Last week, I was visited by leaders of two labor organizations, Christopher Jackman, secretary of Local 300 of the Paper Box Makers Union, International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite & Paper Mill Workers, AFL–CIO, representing 4,500 members in the State of New Jersey, and Winfield S. Chasmar, president of Local 284, Laundry Workers, Cleaners & Dyers Union, AFL–CIO, an organization with some 5,000 members in the Garden State.

Mr. Speaker, both of these great unions have gone on record in support of the voting rights message of President Johnson. I am proud to insert at this point in the RECORD, resolutions endorsed by the membership of these two effective labor unions. The resolutions follow:

RESOLUTION OF LOCAL 300, PAPER BOX MAKERS UNION, INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF PULP, SULPHITE & PAPER MILL WORKERS, AFL–CIO

Whereas the State of New Jersey enjoys the distinction of having originally sponsored the open primary voting system advocated by President Woodrow Wilson during his tenure as Governor of our great State; and

Whereas this achievement established for New Jersey a reputation for affording its citizens the ultimate in voting rights and aspiration to elected public office; and

Whereas the highest law of our land, the Constitution of the United States, has been systematically and flagrantly violated and disobeyed in most Southern States during the 95 years since the adoption of the 15th amendment, which reads as follows:

"SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or any state on account of race, color or previous condition of servitude.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

Whereas it is our national shame that racists in the South, and particularly in Alabama, have resorted to clubs, electric cattle prods, guns, tear gas, whips, forced marches, and mass jailings to thwart the Negro citizen when he seeks to exercise his constitutional right to vote; and

Whereas no one knows better than the racists themselves that their days are numbered; that a tidal wave of black and white votes will soon sweep out of office every fanatic and replace them with progressive legislators from both races, thus brushing aside this last ditch attempt by racists to stave off a fight for freedom which ultimately cannot be stopped; and

Whereas President Lyndon B. Johnson has recommended new voting rights legislation to the Congress, thus fulfilling his state of the Union message promising to submit such proposals to help Negroes gain this precious right to vote, wherever it is denied to them because of race; and

Whereas these proposed new laws would revolve around forceful Federal action and, if adopted, would be enforced by Federal registrars appointed by and responsible to the President; and

Whereas the brutality of southern law-enforcement officers makes it absolutely clear that only massive Federal action can bring democracy to the embattled Negroes and their white allies in the South: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the membership of Local 300, Paper Box Makers Union, International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite & Paper Mill Workers, AFL–CIO (representing approximately 4,500 members in the State of New Jersey), That our union does hereby go on record to wholeheartedly endorse and support the objectives outlined by President Johnson in his voting rights legislation submitted to Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That the membership of local 300 hereby empowers Winfield S. Chasmar, business manager, to make necessary arrangements to personally appear in Washington, D.C., before members of the New Jersey delegation in Congress for the purpose of presenting this resolution as an expression of our appeal to our elected representatives to support and vote in favor of the proposed voting rights legislation.

RESOLUTION OF LOCAL 284, LAUNDRY WORKERS, CLEANERS & DYERS UNION, AFL–CIO

Whereas the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States, adopted in 1870, guarantees to every citizen the right to vote, as follows:

"SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any state on account of race, color or previous condition of servitude.

"SEC. 2. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

Whereas it is our national shame that the Constitution of the United States, the highest law of our land, has been systematically and flagrantly violated and disobeyed in most Southern States during the 95 years since the adoption of the 15th amendment; and

Whereas racists in the South, and particularly in Alabama, have resorted to clubs, electric cattle prods, guns, tear gas, whips, forced marches and mass jailings to thwart the Negro citizen when he seeks to exercise his constitutional right to vote; and

Whereas no one knows better than the racists themselves that their days are numbered; that a tidal wave of black and white votes will soon sweep out of office every fanatic and replace them with progressive legislators from both races, thus brushing aside this last-ditch attempt by racists to stave off a fight for freedom which ultimately cannot be stopped; and

Whereas President Lyndon B. Johnson has recommended new voting rights legislation to the Congress, thus fulfilling his state of the Union message promising to submit such proposal to help Negroes gain this previous right to vote, wherever it is denied to them because of race; and

Whereas these proposed new laws would revolve around forceful Federal action and, if adopted, would be enforced by Federal registrars appointed by and responsible to the President; and

Whereas the brutality of southern law-enforcement officers makes it absolutely clear that only massive Federal action can bring democracy to the embattled Negroes and their white allies in the South: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That Local 284, Laundry Workers, Cleaners & Dyers Union, AFL–CIO, comprising approximately 5,000 members in the State of New Jersey, does hereby go on record at a general membership meeting held on March 25, 1965, at Continental Auditorium, Newark, N.J., to wholeheartedly endorse and support the objectives outlined by President Johnson in his voting rights legislation submitted to Congress; and be is further

Resolved, That the membership of local 284 hereby empowers Winfield S. Chasmar, president, to select a committee of three members of our union to personally appear in Washington, D.C., before members of the New Jersey delegation in Congress for the purpose of presenting this resolution as an expression of our appeal to our elected representatives to support and vote in favor of the proposed voting rights legislation.

The Situation in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the April 7, 1965, issue of the State, of Columbia, S.C., has reprinted in a brief editorial a very succinct and profound statement by one of the most respected military writers in the country on the subject of the situation in Vietnam. The editorial, entitled "Our Involvement," quotes from an important statement by Hanson Baldwin, military editor of the New York Times.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the State, Apr. 7, 1965]
OUR INVOLVEMENT

Hanson W. Baldwin, the military editor of the New York Times and a man well respected in the field of national defense and mutual security, has reduced the Vietnam situation to its essentials in this single paragraph:

"U.S. global prestige and power are intimately bound up with the outcome of the Vietnamese struggle. In Vietnam, we are attempting to formulate an answer to the Communist strategy of creeping aggression, of subversion and insurgency, of what Khrushchev called wars of national liberation. If the might and will of the United States cannot evolve a victorious answer to such tactics, we are undone; the map of the world will gradually become red. And if we will not fight in Vietnam, where—after the series of Communist conquests in the past 20 years—will we fight? Where will we draw the line?"

The Flight of Gemini 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DON EDWARDS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, all America was proud and pleased with the accomplishments achieved recently in the successful orbiting of the *Molly Brown* Gemini capsule, piloted by Maj. Gus Grissom and Lt. Cmdr. John Young. This milestone in America's efforts to explore outer space would not have been possible without the investment of resources—physical, mental, and monetary.

One of the cities in my congressional district, Hayward, Calif., has seen fit to adopt a special resolution in a city council meeting to commend the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and Astronauts Virgil Grissom and John Young for their endeavors. Although Hayward is now in my congressional district, its citizens can take great pride in the dedication and support of the space program of their former Representative, George P. Miller, chairman of the House Science and Astronautics Committee. I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of this resolution:

RESOLUTION 65–127

(Resolution of commendation to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and to Astronauts Virgil I. Grissom and John W. Young for their historic flight of Gemini 3)

Be it resolved by the city council of the city of Hayward that said council does hereby congratulate the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), the many technicians required for the space program, and in particular Astronauts Virgil I. Grissom and John W. Young for their historic flight of Gemini 3 involving unprecedented orbital maneuvers, a pioneering demonstration of orbit-shifting techniques which will be used by space pilots for landings on the moon; that without the tireless and dedicated efforts and cooperation of all connected with said project this greatest of scientific achievements could not have been attained.

In council, Hayward, Calif., March 23, 1965.
Attest:

EDWARD K. STANTON,
City Clerk of the City of Hayward, Calif.

The Pattern of Coming Events in Southeast Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALLEN SMITH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, Dr. William S. McBirnie, of Glendale, Calif., has prepared a report based upon a series of interviews he had in southeast Asia in March 1965, and which he has requested I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is as follows:

THE PATTERN OF COMING EVENTS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

It is rather a sobering experience to know that something of great consequence is going to happen, and to know that your own country's Government does not know it.

The odds are all against the likelihood of a private citizen, however careful a student of foreign affairs, pitting his interpretation of coming events successfully against the opinions of the most powerful government on earth, with all of its superb intelligence sources upon which to draw. And to do so might seem presumptuous, or preposterous, to say the least.

Yet that is the position in which this program finds itself. I know, or to be more restrained, I believe I know the pattern of future events in South Vietnam. Evidently the Government does not know. A conference of historic proportions is underway, right now, in Washington. Ambassador Taylor is there for reports, recommendations, and consultations. You, the listeners, may judge for yourselves, or wait for history to prove the accuracy of our analyses and predictions—but this is what this program believes is now to come.

As James Reston writes: "The immediate question is clear enough. The President's decision to bomb North Vietnam has not achieved its objective. It has not persuaded the Communists to stop their infiltration and military subversion in South Vietnam.

"It has committed the prestige and power of the United States in a war against the North Vietnamese Communists, without success, and the question now is whether to increase the military pressure or withdraw.

"The British explored the prospect of a Vietnamese settlement with the Soviet Foreign Minister, Andrei A. Gromyko, in London, but he brushed them off. The Johnson administration has made many more private inquiries about a negotiated settlement than it cares for political reasons to admit, but these have been rebuffed.

"President Johnson has been in touch with Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson, of Canada, who has a representative on the International Control Commission in Vietnam, on the prospect of useful negotiations, but Pearson has had to report to the President that the North Vietnamese are not interested, at least for the present.

"Even the French, who have been leading the campaign for a negotiated settlement in Vietnam, concede privately they received no

encouragement either in the North Vietnamese capital of Hanoi nor in the Communist Chinese capital of Peiping.

"The issue, therefore, is not whether President Johnson is ready for negotiations. The North Vietnamese Communists have been rejecting a negotiated settlement for months.

"The issue before the President and his associates, including General Taylor, is, therefore, much mare complicated than the national argument about negotiations would make it seem. In fact, the North Vietnamese insist on seeing the struggle in southeast Asia not as a local war, but as a test of the cold war all over the world" (Los Angeles Herald-Examiner, Apr. 1, 1965).

Look carefully at the chain of events:

1. The Vietcong had driven us to the wall, because we were fighting on their terms—not ours. They were expecting a negotiated settlement as the result of their growing victories in their native jungle warfare, fought as it was on their own ground.

2. The President made the right decision, temporarily, to shift the technique of fighting the war on our terms; not theirs—to turn our big weapons on the Vietcong war-related targets in North Vietnam. The Reds did not expect this, and it threw their hopes and plans for negotiation on terms favorable to them back several months. The United States, in effect, had been willing, even anxious, to come to the bargaining table, but armed with much more strength than the Vietcong expected.

3. At this point the United States of America has made a strategic error—too obviously our intention and goal was negotiation, not victory. But there is really nothing to negotiate; not now, at any rate. For the Reds won't negotiate at present on terms unfavorable to them, since we cannot accept less than their retreat. They therefore will not relax their program of terrorism in South Vietnam, nor will they (presently) negotiate, for this would cause them to lose face in the eyes of the world Communist movement.

4. The Reds were all set to announce a big victory on March 10, at the Afro-Asian conference in Algiers, but our atack on North Vietnam upset their timing. So they quietly canceled the Afro-Asian conference, postponing it until June 19, when it is rescheduled. This means that they expect to have a new plan in operation by that time. What plan? This is what I believe that I know, and that the U.S. Government, I fear, does not.

5. The Red Chinese must find a way to get us to the negotiation table when their strength again becomes relatively greater than ours. They never negotiate to make concessions, as we almost always do. This simple principle has not yet penetrated widely into liberal Washington thought, because Socialist liberals are evidently unable to face communism realistically and comprehend its nature and methods. For example: Communism never negotiates differences. It always seeks victory in negotiations, either in part or in whole. This is unvarying Communist procedure. So now they are unwilling to really negotiate on South Vietnam because the increased U.S. strength there gives them no advantage, and they must always find an advantage before they will enter into serious negotiations on any issue, particularly one so important as this.

6. The plan is to wheel large land armies, from China into position, to threaten to flood South Vietnam with waves of soldiers, inundating the South Vietnamese and Americans by sheer numbers. But to make this threat viable they must also demonstrate atomic capability, and have maintained a propaganda campaign in the press expressing their professed willingness, at whatever cost to themselves, to bomb South Vietnam with atomic bombs, as well as to invade in great ground army strength. Then the Reds are counting on the unwillingness of the United States to fight an atomic war, and also knowing the public outcry in the United States over annihilation of all Americans in South Vietnam, they will then have their bargaining cards.

7. Therefore we must expect an atomic development, testing of bombs, the announcement of a surprising stockpile of ready bombs, and the means of delivering them, all, I would think, before June 19, 1965, though the date again may be postponed if the Reds feel it necessary.

8. So the Reds are preparing to shake the world by a two-faceted thrust, and then, confronting us with this thrust, they are counting on world pressure, and public opinion expressed in this country, to get us ready to negotiate from a position of relative weakness.

Of course we are not really weak, just unable to bring ourselves to risk the death of all our troops in Vietnam, and to engage China in an atomic war. Leftwing opinion molders are now softening up public sentiment in this country, hence the ads in newspapers emanating from leftist groups appeals for peace by abandonment of South Vietnam.

9. It will be Russia that will, at the moment of highest tension in the approaching United States-Red Chinese confrontation, step in, offering to negotiate. Red China does not really want war, but they are determined to drive us out of southeast Asia by this threat. Furthermore, they wish trade concessions for all Communist lands, since all are in economic and agricultural trouble. It is, therefore, to get America out of South Vietnam, and to open the West for trade with Red China, that the Russians and the Red Chinese have plotted together the coming confrontation.

As mediator, Russia knows she will get, in return, much in trade concessions for Red China, and in gratitude for bringing about a peaceful settlement she will be granted the relaxation of our trade barriers with the Soviet Union herself.

So now you know what we believe is in the wind. Many things can upset this whole scheme of the Communists, but I believe this is the way their immediate Communist planning is headed. And so I look for: First, the massive threat of war; second, the mediation of Russia, followed by the conference table; third, the resulting sizable trade concessions for both Red China and Russia; fourth, a seat at the United Nations for Ghina—which means the end of free China, since it will involve diplomatic recognition by the United States; fifth, then, a great going out of the tide of war threat, a period of false security based upon the illusion of peace; sixth, and what will this have cost the Soviet Union and China? Just some planning, some propaganda words against each other, to make us believe they are enemies and that Russia is inclined toward friendliness with us as a result of their "phoney split," all of which is a preposterous bluff.

That is all it will have cost the Red bloc, and they will receive everything they want from us and will be in a much stronger economic position to continue the war of subversion and revolution around the world. And most deplorable is the fact that we seemingly do not realize we are being drawn into this Red trap. We are very likely to end up paying for the strengthening of our enemies and underwriting the advancement of communism from its Russian and Chinese bases.

The President's Statement of American Policy and Objectives in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, on the night of April 7, at Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore, President Johnson delivered an elqouent, clear statement of American policy and objectives in Vietnam. The President made it undeniably plain that a prescription for peace in Vietnam does exist. This prescription contains the promise of economic cooperation on a scale that can only lead to the improved social and economic well-being of millions of southeast Asians now embroiled in wars and feuds with their neighbors.

The President challenged the countries of southeast Asia to join together in a massive common development effort in the Mekong River Basin, and promised increased U.S. cooperation and assistance. The Mekong Basin covers 381,000 square miles and touches the lives of 48 million people. The river rises in China and flows 2,600 miles to a large delta below Saigon. The Congress has been authorizing and appropriating funds for feasibility and hydrological studies preliminary to development of this area for nearly 7 years. The foreign aid bill currently being studied by the Committee on Foreign Affairs contains fund authorizations to continue these studies.

This proposal was no "bribe" for peace—it was offered as an alternative to war.

The President made it equally clear that our objective is the independence of South Vietnam and "we will do everything necessary to reach that objective." I fully support the President in his determination that the United States will not be defeated, will not grow tired, and will now withdraw in South Vietnam.

I also support his proposal for a cooperative effort in the Mekong River Basin and other development activities which will "replace despair with hope and terror with progress."

Mr. Speaker, with permission, I include an editorial from the Miami Herald of April 10, "Support for LBJ's Logic," and an execllent article by Bert Collier, Herald editorial writer, concerning "The Mekong Project—What It Means." I direct the attention of my colleagues to both of these fine articles that reflect a clear understanding and support of the President's proposals.

The articles follow:

SUPPORT FOR L.B.J.'S LOGIC

More men and nations evidently like President Johnson's Vietnam proposal than dislike it.

The President's peace bid was "full of lies and deception," says Red China. Senate Re-

publican Leader DIRKSEN wonders whether the Johns Hopkins speech simply sounded "retreat."

These seem to be minority views—the one expected, considering the nature of the animal; the other a dutiful observance of the opposition role in Congress.

Otherwise, Mr. Johnson has many with him. They include Japan, Britain, and France, among other allies or part-time friends; United Nations Secretary General U Thant; neighbor Canada; 17 nonalined nations who asked on April 1 for some such move, and most of Congress. Typical of the latter perhaps is the apt reaction of Senator GEORGE SMATHERS who described administration policy as "the iron hand in the velvet glove."

What it is, of course, is a policy at long last. While we have reservations about some of the phrasing, we welcome the world's general response. For the first time since 1954 when the southeast Asia adventure began, it is clear beyond any doubt where the United States stands.

Yesterday fresh accent was added to Mr. Johnson's promise that "we will not be defeated." North Vietnam, which is the storehouse but not the sanctuary of Communist subversion below the 17th parallel, again felt the sting of American air power interdicting its supply lines.

Even so, the soft glove remains on the iron hand. If North Vietnam will only concede the futility of war and subversion, the whole of southeast Asia can be developed prosperously in peace.

It is a little-known fact that the very countries which have been at one another's throats openly in this area of the world have been working together quietly toward the very goal which Mr. Johnson finds as an alternative to war.

For the last 7 years South Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, and Thailand have been cooperating in the lower Mekong Basin in the building of powerplants, irrigation systems, and pilot farms.

Quite literally southeast Asia could beat its sword into a plowshare should it pursue the course to which Mr. Johnson has called attention so dramatically. His logical plan has found response where logic yet prevails, and this is good.

IT COULD DWARF EVEN OUR OWN TVA: THE MEKONG PROJECT—WHAT IT MEANS

(By Bert Collier)

President Johnson's suggestion that the United States is ready to "invest" $1 billion in the peaceful development of southeast Asia is the most widely discussed feature of his Vietnam policy statement.

Some consider this the proffer of a bribe to the Vietcong if they stop fighting. Some see it as an unwarranted extension of foreign aid which is already in difficulties in Congress.

Actually it is only the enlargement of a program that has been underway for more than 7 years, in which the United States and a score of other nations are cooperating.

The plan has been mentioned before as the means for a just and honorable settlement of the Vietnamese conflict and the start of a new era in the territories that once made up French Indochina.

The President was not specific about the proposal. It was contained in two short paragraphs of his Baltimore address.

"The task," he said, "is nothing less than to enrich the hopes and existence of more than a hundred million people. And there is much to be done.

"The vast Mekong River can provide food and water and power on a scale to dwarf even our own TVA."

Planning to develop the Lower Mekong along these lines has been underway since 1957 under auspices of the United Nations Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East. This is the project to which the President offered all-out support, once peace and stability are restored.

The Mekong is one of the world's great rivers. It rises in the Tibetan highlands of China and flows 2,800 miles to the sea southwest of Saigon.

Born as a brawling mountain stream in the rugged Chinese hinterland, it outlines the border between Laos and Burma. Then, after watering all of northwest Laos it separates southern Laos from Thailand, flows through the hearts of Cambodia and builds a mighty delta on the coast of South Vietnam.

A system of dams and water-shortage basins along the river would, according to the plan, transform the economy of the region.

It would improve farming by irrigation and make possible a second crop during the dry season. Controls would eliminate spring floods that take immense toll in life and property. Shipping would be improved.

Most important of all, cheap electric power would allow industrial development.

While Laos, Cambodia, Thailand and South Vietnam would be the principal beneficiaries, Burma would also be helped and Red China and North Vietnam could become customers for power to fuel their own industries.

This is the vision. A great deal of work already has been done. There has been more international cooperation in this program than any other ever undertaken by the U.N.

The U.S. Bureau of Reclamation helped make original reconnaissance studies. A former chief of the U.S. Corps of Engineers headed a team which recommended further investigations.

France gave direct financial assistance and Canada flew aerial photographic missions. Australia and Japan provided engineering teams to locate damsites and make geological surveys.

Others that lent a hand included the Philippines, Netherlands, Pakistan, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Britain, and New Zealand.

International agencies in the picture are the International Labor Organization and the World Health Organization.

Even private philanthropy, such as the Ford Foundation, is making contributions.

A fascinating account of the Lower Mekong project was published recently by Dr. Gilbert F. White, professor of geography at the University of Chicago, a consultant on the program.

"If the Lower Mekong program in its present form does not prove a complete way out of the southeast Asia dilemma," he says, "it at least suggests a route that is challenging.

"This is a way calling for international collaboration in advancing the welfare of peasants who long months ago had enough of terror in the night.

"In such a venture the United States could with honor and deep conviction invest its men, experience, and capital as a member of an international team.

"It is just barely possible that out of this most incredible of places—the swirling political caldron of southeast Asia—may come a new pattern for international action in harnessing nature's riches to achieve peaceful change."

Evidently President Johnson agrees with this premise. He has opened the way for the United States to provide a tremendous assist "as soon as peaceful cooperation is possible."

A Proposal To Insure That the Limits of the U.S. Constitution Are Respected Within the Borders of the State of Alabama

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, on March 31, 1965, Arch E. Roberts, major, U.S. Army Reserve, addressed the State Legislature of Alabama on the subject "A Proposal To Insure That the Limits of the U.S. Constitution Are Respected Within the Borders of the State of Alabama." Several of my constitutents thought that Major Roberts' speech ought to appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and therefore I ask that it be printed at the close of my remarks.

The speech follows:

A PROPOSAL TO INSURE THAT THE LIMITS OF THE U.S. CONSTITUTION ARE RESPECTED WITHIN THE BORDERS OF THE STATE OF ALABAMA

(By Arch E. Roberts, major, U.S. Army Reserve)

Mr. President, Governor Wallace, members of the Alabama State Legislature, ladies and gentlemen, thank you for the privilege of speaking to you today on matters of the utmost gravity to the sovereign State of Alabama and to thoughtful Americans everywhere.

My talk will constitute a proposal to insure that the limits of the U.S. Constitution are respected within the borders of the State of Alabama.

I believe that the Alabama syndrome reveals our sister States in the South comprise the target area for a centrally directed revolution which is intended to eventually engulf the entire United States.

I believe that we must determine the causes for this revolution.

And, I believe that "we the people," must do whatever is necessary to "* * * insure domestic tranquillity."

It is no accident that Montgomery, Ala.—former capital for the Confederacy—is the focal point for today's anarchist. In fact, Dr. John A. Morsell, assistant executive director, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, declared in Denver on March 20, that 1965 has the "potential of a real revolution."

Ladies and gentlemen, under the guise of a crusade for minority rights Dr Martin Luther King and other trained revolutionaries are engaged in a plan of enflame Americans to a point where our citizens defy legally constituted authority, flout private property rights, and, finally, generate violence, bloodshed and murder

These are techniques of subversion familiar to everyone who has studied the Spanish revolution and other examples of Communist control of populations by mass terror.

It is now apparent that certain agents provocateur, acting in consonance with a master plan, are attempting to create an atmosphere of crisis in the South which will favor the declaration of a state of national emergency.

It can be predicted that a state of national emergency will lead to the implementation

of a series of Executive Orders now in readiness to place control of all phases of our society in the hands of a few "elite directors" in the Federal Government.

We begin to see the emerging outline of a Soviet America.

Within the next few minutes the master plan for this Communist-style revolution will be identified.

More important, I hope to place in your hands a weapon with which to defend the sovereign State of Alabama, a procedure for arresting this incipient revolution, and the legislative act needed to insure that the limits of the U.S. Constitution are respected within the borders of the State of Alabama.

Our examination of the rise and progress of revolution in Alabama, however, must be prefaced by a word on a contributing factor to this terror.

This peril may be attributed, in part, to a false economy in the affairs of our State governments.

Americans have long failed to recognize the responsibilities to preserve Constitutional liberties which were placed in the hands of our State legislators by Constitutional compact. We have, in fact, condoned a system which denies just compensation for public service and which places a "part-time" sentry on the ramparts of freedom.

The preservation of our Constitutional republic now, as never before, urgently demands the attention of full-time legislators. And these spokesmen for the people must receive financial compensation commensurate with their responsibilities.

State legislators must place themselves on a par with Members of the Congress. They must vote themselves a salary of not less than $20,000 per year. And they must convene in the same manner and for the same period of time as does the U.S. Congress in Washington. The State legislatures, being the reservoir of all true political power (as the States are the reservoir of all true national wealth) may thus defend the Constitution and protect the freedoms guaranteed to the people by this Constitution.

Now—let us identify the master plan which has spawned a generation of anti-Americans—a plan which has entrapped our people in a silent revolution and which now threatens the South (and eventually the entire United States) with violent insurrection.

Permit me to quote from Senate Document No. 87, "Review of the United Nations Charter." On page 289 of this Senate report there appears this amazing statement:

"The charter (of the United Nations) has become 'the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or the laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding.' "

And they flaunt the United Nations banner.

Your attention is further invited to an address by the late John Foster Dulles, former Secretary of State, made before the American Bar Association in Louisville, Ky., April 12, 1952.

"Treaties," said Mr. Dulles, "make international law and also they make domestic law. Under our Constitution treaties become the supreme law of the land. They are indeed more supreme than ordinary laws, for congressional laws are invalid if they do not conform to the Constitution whereas treaty law can override the Constitution."

Then Mr. Dulles spelled out the new legal posture which members of the American Bar Association would be expected to assume in future interpretation of the United Nations Charter as the "supreme law of the land."

"Treaties," he said, "can take powers away from the Congress and give them to the President; they can take powers from the State and give them to the Federal Government or to some international body, and they can cut across the rights given the people by the constitutional bill of rights."

And they flaunt the United Nations banner.

The record of usurped governmental power, which Mr. Dulles presumed to sanction, is dramatically demonstrated in the record of hundreds of U.N.-enforcing "treaties" which were surrepitiously "ratified" by as few as two or three U.S. Senators convening in secret during the months immediately following passage of the United Nations treaty agreement.

This astonishing information was initially reported by the Chicago Tribune on December 8, 1952.

In at least one instance, said the Tribune, one Senator convened himself at 6:30 p.m. on the empty floor of the Senate; ratified a "treaty" binding upon every citizen in the United States, and then adjourned himself at 6:31 p.m.

That man was Senator JOHN P. SPARKMAN, of Alabama.

This abuse of privileges prompted Senator Bricker and 53 other alarmed Senators to propose Senate Joint Resolution 1 (the Bricker resolution, June 15, 1953) in an attempt to contain by constitutional amendment the treatymaking powers of the Senate and the Executive agreement powers of the President.

Assurance by the President that such questionable action would be terminated led to the defeat of the Bricker amendment by one vote.

A recently conducted search for these secret treaties, however, has revealed that the total now stand at 3,000 U.N.-implementing treaties.

And they flaunt the United Nations banner.

Ladies and gentlemen, these interrelated events confirm a chilling fact: The United Nations Charter is the master plan for a Communist-style revolution in America.

Let us expose the fiction that the United Nations is some kind of debating society. The United Nations is not a "debating society"—and it was never intended to be a "debating society."

The United Nations is a subversive organization. Its objective is to overthrow the constitutional governments of the United States (including the State of Alabama), by peaceful means if possible; by force and violence if necessary.

These subversive objectives will not surprise those who know that the United Nations Charter was written by Communists and traitors including Alger Hiss, Leo Pasvolsky, and Phillip C. Jessup.

And they flaunt the United Nations banner.

The so-called United Nations Treaty is no treaty within the meaning of that word. The U.N. Charter is a constitution for one world government and its aim is to abrogate the U.S. Constitution and to erect in its place the United Nations Charter as the "supreme law of the land."

The United Nations now overtly and arrogantly proclaims its preeminence in the affairs of our State governments. Dr. Ralph J. Bunche, U.N. Undersecretary, marches in the vanguard of defiant mobs who assault your State capitol.

And they flaunt the United Nations banner.

Of course, the pro-Communist leanings of Mr. Bunche, best-known Negro in the world, are well advertised. In fact, on August 9, 1948, after Alger Hiss had been exposed as a Communist agent, Bunche assured Hiss by letter that, "I want you to know that I am in your corner."

It is now clear that Federal agents acting under what they assert to be a legal use of the limited powers enumerated in the Constitution, have negotiated with foreign governments so as to coerce these United States into a United Nations Treaty agreement. This U.N. Treaty actually constitutes a surrender to these foreign governments of the powers of government and affects a surrender of the rights and liberties assured to the people under the U.S. Constitution.

The extent of this duplicity can now be directly assessed by example.

We have witnessed Supreme Court decisions which overturn the sovereignty of State governments: Example—the reapportionment decision.

We have been burdened with congressional legislation which directly attacks the constitutional premise of private property rights: Example—the Civil Rights Act.

And, now we are confronted by the arbitrary use of Presidential power to override the constitutional guarantees of universal suffrage: Example—the proposed voting law.

These acts by judicial, legislative, and executive agents violate specific articles in the U.S. Constitution, and in the constitutions of the several States, and they are in contradiction to the intent of these constitutions.

These acts are not, however, in contradiction to the United Nations Treaty agreement. They are, in fact, demanded by the articles of the United Nations Charter.

The conclusion is inescapable.

Since its ratification by the U.S. Senate on June 26, 1945, the United Nations Charter has been the "supreme law of the land," and our elected and appointed agents in judicial, legislative, and executive office have conducted our affairs in consonance with the provisions of the U.N. Charter.

And they flaunt the United Nations banner.

Furthermore, the agony in Alabama promised that the technique of "silent revolution" to change our Government from one of limited and delegated powers to a centralized, totalitarian regime, is to be reinforced by planned violence which will expedite the changeover.

Significantly, the subversion of freedom's bulwark has been accompanied by a thrust to redirect the allegiance of our soldiers to the United Nations banner so as to immobilize U.S. military resistance to the United Nations takeover. The employment of Federal troops in the South is but one example of so-called "counterinsurgency" training to facilitate the invasion.

American soldiers are now trained to control American citizens. Our sons in uniform suppress resistance to United Nations tyranny and aid revolutionary forces which seek to destroy our constitutional republic.

The planners intend to transfer our entire Military Establishment into a United Nations army so as to force all of the nations into line and to deliver them up to a one-world government.

And they flaunt the United Nations banner.

Now pending in the United Nations is a single plan for redistributing the world's trade and industry, approved in Geneva in 1964 by the solid vote of "emerging" nations. They look at it as a way to guarantee their prosperity.

Seventy-seven "emerging" nations voted in Geneva in 1964 to lay the burden of their welfare upon the industrial member nations while the industrial nations sat on their hands in disbelief. This action of UNCTAD (the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development) will be voted on this September in the United Nations General Assembly and probably will pass because of the "emerging" nations bloc vote.

Gentlemen, do you realize that when this action is taken, steel mills in Birmingham and Gadsden, Ala., could be forced by the United Nations to cut back production and even risk the loss of this industry in order to comply with the charter and build the economy of another member nation. Think of it. Your own people forced in the lines of the unemployed because of the articles of

the United Nations Charter. This is no dream, gentlemen, this will happen in every major industry of our country.

The American Legion asks that you be cognizant of this terrible condition within the United Nations structure.

And they flaunt the United Nations banner.

Americans, of course, have been assured that the constitutional legality of the United Nations treaty agreement is found in article VI of our Constitution. Secretary of State Dulles, remember, stated that, "Treaty law can override the Constitution".

A treaty, however, cannot authorize what the Constitution forbids.

No Federal agent has the power or the authority to modify or to dissolve the constitutional compact.

This fact was affirmed in positive terms in *Reid* v. *Covert*, 1957, in which the United States Supreme Cout declared:

"It would be manifestly contrary to the objectives of those who created the Constitution, as well as those who were responsible for the Bill of Rights—let alone alien to our entire constitutional history and tradition—to construe article VI as permitting the United States to exercise power under an international agreement without observing constitutional prohibitions. In effect, such construction", said the Court, "would permit amendment of that document in a manner not sanctioned by article V. The prohibitions of the Constitution were designed to apply to all branches of the national government and they cannot be nullified by the Executive or by the Executive and Senate combined."

Our Federal Government, however, has clearly demonstrated that the Constitution has been amended, "in a manner not sanctioned by article V".

And they flaunt the United Nations banner.

It must be said, too, that the Supreme Court cannot declare a statute of Congress "unconstitutional". The court can exercise only the judicial power conferred upon it by the Constitution. It can no more "unmake" a legislative act that it can make one.

To strike down a legislation act requires legislative power. No court has such power.

The ordinary citizen also lacks the power to overturn breaches of the Constitution.

Only a State, acting in its highest sovereign capacity, can repudiate unauthorized acts of its agents.

Therefore, the proper party to now challenge the validity of the United Nations Treaty agreement is a party to the constitutional compact, a sovereign State—the State of Alabama.

The reason that the people and the States have been burdened with the acts of Federal agents in their surrender of the powers of government to the United Nations is because the State has not repudiated the attempts of its agents to act beyond their authority. These acts had the effect of "law", not by reason of any nonexistent authority of the Federal agents, but because of the authority the State gave to these acts by failing to challenge the attempts of its Federal agents to exceed their authority.

The power to correct these excesses by Federal agents is found in the Constitution.

"We the People of the United States," declares the preamble to the Constitution "in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

The preamble thus clearly defines the sovereignty and the authority of the parties to the constitutional compact.

"It is in this sense of the term 'States' that they form the constitutency from which the Federal Constitution emanated," said Martin Van Buren, our eighth President, "and it is by the States, acting either by their legislatures or in convention that any valid alteration of the instrument can alone be made."

As we have seen, however, it is a matter of historical record that the Constitution of the United States has suffered, not merely alteration, but complete abridgement by the passage of the so-called United Nations Treaty.

And they flaunt the United Nations banner.

This emasculation of our Constitution most certainly was not authorized by the parties to the constitutional compact.

In this respect, State officeholders have a positive duty to enforce the provisions of the Constitution. It is a continuing obligation and may not be met merely by an empty oath taken upon accepting public office.

The language of section 3, article VI, U.S. Constitution, "* * * shall be bound by Oath or Affirmation, to support this Constitution," imposes a continuing duty upon these officeholders as long as they continue in office.

In like manner, the State at the time of its admission into the Union assumes all obligations to the people of that State, and to the people of the several States which are parties to the same agreement, to insure that all provisions of the Constitution are respected and enforced within the boundaries of the State.

Therefore, in conformity with these duties and obligations, I propose that the legislators of the State of Alabama now do what is necessary to defend the Constitution and to protect the rights of the people.

Events in Washington and in the State of Alabama disclose that we have lost the liberties and the freedoms guaranteed to the people under this Constitution. And we have lost control of the Federal Government.

And they flaunt the United Nations banner.

I, therefore, suggest that the legislators of the State of Alabama appoint a special committee comprising members of the house and senate to investigate the legality of the action of Federal agents with regard to the United Nations and to provide means for the enforcement of the Constitution of the United States in relation thereto.

I suggest that such committee be authorized and directed to investigate the question of whether the United Nations Treaty agreement entered into by Federal agencies acting as representatives of these United States and of the State of Alabama be within the power and authority granted to said agents under the Constitution of the United States.

I suggest that this committee be further authorized and directed to investigate the question of whether this purported U.N. treaty agreement affects the State of Alabama, or relates to the relinquishment of any of the laws or rights affecting the State of Alabama or its people.

This committee must determine whether there is any change proposed to be made under this United Nations treaty agreement which would deprive the State of Alabama or its people of rights and privileges, or would involve any change in any of the provisions of the Constitution of the United States without the consent of the State of Alabama or of the several States.

And, I suggest that this committee inquire into what measures may be taken by the State of Alabama to enforce the Constitution of the United States and to punish any infraction thereof that may appear to be indorsed by any unlawful use of authority by any agency not sanctioned by the Constitution of the United States.

Upon determining that the United Nations treaty agreement is beyond the authority granted to Federal agents by Constitutional compact, I propose that the legislators of the State of Alabama introduce, "a bill to provide for the enforcement of the Constitution of the United States with regard to the so-called United Nations organization."

I suggest that this statute declare that the agreements relating to the United Nations organization are beyond the authority granted to agencies purporting to make these treaties and agreements, and are, therefore, null, void, and of no effect within the jurisdiction of the State of Alabama, and that any attempt to enforce the provisions of any said treaties or agreements within the State of Alabama is unlawful.

And, lastly, I suggest that any person who shall commit an act in violation of the provisions of this statute shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction thereof, shall be fined not more than $100,000, or be confined in the State penitentiary not more than 20 years, or both.

In providing criminal penalties for attempts to enforce acts that have no authority under the U.S. Constitution, the State Legislature of the State of Alabama is not asked to declare "unconstitutional" a treaty that is made with regard to the United Nations. The Alabama legislature is requested to first inquire into the question of whether there was authority to enter into such a treaty. Upon finding that there was not, the Alabama Legislature is asked to provide criminal sanctions for attempts to affectuate in Alabama that which was never in legal existence.

The Legislature of the State of Alabama, by adopting this proposed statute, will clarify and make definite the law in the State and will discharge the State's obligation to insure that the limits of the U.S. Constitution are respected within its borders.

Ladies and gentlemen, the United Nations stands indicted as a subversive organization. Its objective is the destruction of our Christian, constitutional, Republic.

Americans must now join together to expose this evil.

To initiate the action I am prepared at this time to offer to the Alabama State Legislature drafts of the two implementing statutes described in this presentation.

I am prepared to offer into evidence the names and backgrounds of 16 U.S. Government employees, all agents for international communism, who contributed to the authorship of the United Nations Charter.

I am prepared to offer into evidence the listing of 42 Senate reports which detail the subversive activities of the United Nations organization, its agencies, and its personnel.

I am prepared to offer into evidence my 10,000-word documented study of the men and the system which has transferred our Military Establishment to the United Nations.

And, at such time as the Alabama Legislature commissions a committee to investigate the United Nations treaty, I will be pleased to suggest qualified witnesses to offer testimony regarding the usurpation of governmental powers and the surrender of our liberties to the United Nations organization without the consent of the people of the State of Alabama or of the several States comprising the Union.

These witnesses will include constitutional attorneys, general officers of the U.S. Military Establishment, civilian experts on the subject of U.N. subversion, and U.S. Senators.

We must destroy the United Nations banner.

I respectfully await your decision.

Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the poverty program has been examined in a series of articles written by Jo Ann Hardee, of the Detroit News. The fourth article in this series follows:

POVERTY WAR STRATEGY: SPUR LOCAL AGENCIES INTO ACTION

(By Jo Ann Hardee of the Detroit News staff)

WASHINGTON, March 17.—The promise of the $257 million community action phase (CAP) of the antipoverty bill is that it will nudge localities into revamping their existing agencies to better serve the poor.

Its perils are political porkbarrel use of the funds or that Federla officials will succumb to political pressures to "get the money out," granting funds to existing agencies with no guarantees of better service.

SHAKE UP AGENCIES

Sargent Shriver, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), candidly admits that the purpose of CAP is to "shake up" the structure of existing services. He also admits that, in some localities, the effort is meeting resistance from agencies that are reluctant to change.

"Certainly, we're having trouble," he said. "But if we weren't, we wouldn't be getting the sort of reshaping of institutions that we seek."

A community action program is determined by a local board under minimal standards set by the OEO. Grants can be made to cities, counties or groups of counties such as the 15-member upper peninsula community action program.

DETROIT AN EXCEPTION

They can be made to a single private agency, such as the United Planning Organization here, nonprofit boards with representatives from existing agencies and the community, or, in rare cases like Detroit and Wayne County, a local governing unit.

The OEO's brightest hope is New Haven, Conn., which launched the urban model community action program in 1962 with $2.5 million from the Ford Foundation.

The city recognized that poverty, unemployment, educational lacks, health needs, juvenile delinquency, and poor housing were interrelated and could only be fought on a coordinated basis.

One answer was the neighborhood service center, offering a wide range of social services within walking distance of the poor. This concept has become a model for urban community action programs.

Detroit, for example, will have four such centers.

RIVALS COMPETE

Examples of the difficulty in establishing community action programs are Philadelphia and Washington where there are still struggles between private agencies over which should administer the program.

The political perils are illustrated by the Harlem program where one director was ousted and replaced by an aide of Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, New York Democrat, and chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, which clears antipoverty legislation.

Privately, OEO officials are concerned about Detroit's program, which they believe is too closely tied to the mayor's office and lacks sufficient active involvement of the public schools and private agencies.

PROGRESS REPORTED

But one stated: "Even where we have problems of real involvement by all the pertinent agencies, we've made progress.

"In some cities, there are agencies that haven't spoken to each other in years. It's progress to get them at the same table. We can work from there.

"We have a choice. We can use our own limited resources trying to get community action programs into rural areas where they've never even heard of a community chest.

"Or we can work with communities where there are rivalries between agencies.

NEITHER WAY EASY

"Either way it isn't easy. But with 175 people, we're taking the applications as they come in. We are in no position, right now, to go out and solicit business."

Another OEO official was less optimistic.

"We're failing in CAP," he said. "I'm not saying the CAP programs won't help people. But our goal was a revamping of agencies and the political pressures to get the money out is forcing us to put funds into existing agencies that will go on doing what they've been doing for years.

"After all, the whole point of the Economic Opportunity Act isn't the $727 million in our budget, it's getting better expenditure of the billions that are already going into antipoverty efforts."

GIVES OTHER SIDE

CAP Director Richard W. Boone, formerly with the Ford Foundation, countered: "We are demanding a representative board in each community with members of minority groups and representatives of the poor.

"Our best safeguard against a pork-barrel operation is a representative board that will demand sound use of existing services and Federal funds.

"Some people complain that we are not getting the money out fast enough.

"Since so much depends on the quality of the board in each community, no matter how strong the pressures are, we will not approve a program unless we believe the board is representative."

THIRTY-ONE MILLION DOLLARS GIVEN OUT

Those who complain the CAP is moving too slowly cite its own statistics. Of its $272 million budget, only $31 million has been allocated. Nearly 75 percent of this has gone into technical assistance (planning) grants.

Of the operating programs, most are located in large cities with previous planning experience in coordinated services either through the Ford Foundation or the Juvenile Delinquency Control Act of 1962.

Boone admits that "planning sophistication is naturally further advanced in major urban areas. But we expect those communities that now have planning grants to be coming in with operational programs before July 1. We should have 300 operating programs announced by then."

GOP KEEPS WATCH

The importance of "getting the money out," is shown in the statement of Representative MELVIN LAIRD, of Wisconsin, chairman of the House Republican conference and a member of the Appropriations Committee.

"We gave them too much money last year," he said today. "We'll hold them up as much as possible on their appropriation while we see what they've done with the money. They don't know it now, but we're going to send our staff in to investigate their expenditures about May 15.

"They wanted $900 million last year and we cut them to $700 million. This time they want $1.8 billion and we should cut them back to $1 billion."

SPUR RURAL ACTION

While relying primarily on State governments to develop rural community action programs, the OEO and Department of Agriculture recently announced a special task force to spur action in rural areas.

Also speeding action in an area the OEO considers most promising is Project Headstart, aimed at placing 100,000 children from culturally deprived backgrounds into preschool programs this summer.

The program, now budgeted at $17 million, is to be absorbed in community action programs in the fall and allocated $150 million.

It aims at identifying the problems of 3- to 5-year-olds that might inhibit learning. This information is to be passed on to school authorities in an attempt to prevent such children from dropping out of school in later years because of a repeated record of failure resulting from health, emotional, or family problems.

URGE TOUGHER RULES

Some advocates of the Economic Opportunity Act privately state that CAP could achieve better results if Federal demands were more stringent, if the OEO demanded that certain programs, like Project Headstart, be included in all local plans.

Boone disagrees.

"We might achieve more rapid change," he said.

"But it would be presumptuous for the Federal Government to insist it knows more about the needs, priorities, and capacity to meet them than the local community does.

"We don't have all the answers.

"In the second place, stringent Federal demands would cut down on local initiative and there too many Federal programs doing that now."

No Denial of Voting Rights in Alaska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH J. RIVERS
OF ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, Alaskans are proud that Alaska is free of racial discrimination. The laws of the State make plain that the people believe that all citizens before the law are equal. Just as in all of its actions regarding its citizens, the State makes no distinction, open or hidden, among citizens on election day on the basis of color. There is no denial of voting rights in Alaska.

Newspaper discussion of proposed voting rights legislation, indicating that Alaska would be among the States affected, is based upon erroneous calculations of the percentage of eligible Alaskans who vote. Because Alaska has no State law requiring preelection registration, all those who are 19 and older (voting age in Alaska) are presumably eligible voters. However, this age group includes some 30,000 military personnel, most of whom are not legal residents of Alaska and cast absentee ballots in their home States, instead of being voters in Alaska. Subtracting from the eligible total those who cast ballots elsewhere, then, permits a realistic estimate of the percentage of Alaskans who vote.

In the 1964 election, Alaska's secretary of state, Hugh J. Wade, estimated

that at least 60.7 percent of Alaska's eligible voters did vote. This is a very good record.

Alaska's voting record and liberal voting provisions are very well outlined by Alaska's Gov. William A. Egan in a recent letter to Senator JAMES O. EASTLAND, chairman, Committee on the Judiciary. In order that those provisions may become known to my colleagues and others, I insert here that letter:

STATE OF ALASKA,
Juneau, April 4, 1965.

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for the opportunity to be heard on S. 1564, entitled "A bill to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States." S. 1564 is a tremendously important legislative proposal. I wholeheartedly support its passage. However, due to the press of the current legislative session here in Alaska, I will not be able to appear before the committee, nor will we be able to have others than members of Alaska's congressional delegation at our Nation's Capital at this time.

While it appears from the transcript of the testimony of the Attorney General of the United States, presented to the House Judiciary Committee on H.R. 6400, that the terms of the bill apply to the State of Alaska, the committee will surely be interested to know that by no stretch of the imagination could the bill apply to Alaska.

In the first place, the State of Alaska did not maintain any "test or device as a qualification for voting" on November 1, 1964, nor at any other time. (To "maintain a test or device as a qualification for voting" would be a clear-cut violation of article V, the suffrage and elections article of Alaska's constitution. Article V, in its entirety, follows:

"SUFFRAGE AND ELECTIONS

"SECTION. 1. Every citizen of the United States who is at least nineteen years of age, who meets registration requirements which may be prescribed by law, and who is qualified to vote under this article, may vote in any State or local election. He shall have been, immediately preceding the election, for one year a resident of Alaska and for thirty days a resident of the election district in which he seeks to vote. He shall be able to read or speak the English language as prescribed by law, unless prevented by physical disability. Additional voting qualifications may be prescribed by law for bond issue elections of political subdivisions.

"SEC. 2. No person may vote who has been convicted of a felony involving moral turpitude unless his civil rights have been restored. No person may vote who has been judicially determined to be of unsound mind unless the disability has been removed.

"SEC. 3. Methods of voting, including absentee voting, shall be prescribed by law. Secrecy of voting shall be preserved. The procedure for determining election contests, with right of appeal to the courts, shall be prescribed by law.

"SEC. 4. The legislature may provide a system of permanent registration of voters, and may establish voting precincts within election districts.

"SEC. 5. General elections shall be held on the second Tuesday in October of every even-numbered year, but the month and day may be changed by law."

I personally doubt that the constitution of any other State in our great Nation contains more liberal voting provisions than the constitution of the State of Alaska.

As a practical matter, the American citizens of native and Eskimo ethnic origin in Alaska probably come closer to having a 100-percent voting record among those who are of voting age than does any other specific group of citizens of our 50 States. There are no voting impediments whatsoever placed in the way of Alaska's 8,000 to 9,000 fine American citizens of Negro origin. All that is required for anyone to vote in Alaska's State elections is that the voter be a citizen of the United States who is at least 19 years of age, a resident of Alaska for 1 year, and able to read or speak the English language as prescribed by law.

Secondly, Mr. Chairman, Alaska's secretary of state, the administrator of Alaska's elections, calculates that at least 60.7 percent of the citizens of voting age who were qualified to vote and who claim Alaska as their voting residence, voted in the November 1964 presidential election.

Most of the military population of Alaska, of course, maintains voting residence in other States of our Union. And there are certain reasons why a far greater percentage of other Federal employees in Alaska maintain voting residence in other States than is the case elsewhere.

State of Alaska voting records reveal that there have been very few challenges of prospective voters at the polling places over the far-flung voting precincts of the vast area that is Alaska.

There are no prior registration requirements in Alaska for State or national general elections. In Alaska's larger communities, prior registration is required for local municipal elections.

I have no doubt that the State of Alaska can establish, to the satisfaction of the United States Attorney General, that Alaska has never maintained a "test or device." Further, I am confident that we can establish, to the satisfaction of the Director of the Census, that a far greater percentage than 50 percent of the qualified voters claiming residence in Alaska did indeed cast their ballots in both the presidential election of 1964 and in the 1960 presidential election.

I note, in section 4(b) of S. 1564, that the determination of the U.S. Attorney General or of the U.S. Director of the Census is "final and effective upon publication in the Federal Register." I hope these determinations have not already been made and that the State of Alaska will have opportunity to present evidence to the U.S. Attorney General and the U.S. Director of the Census proving that Alaska does not in fact constitutionally, by law, or in practice exercise any voting "test or device." We will also prove that the percentage of Alaska voters participating in the only presidential elections in which we have ever been privileged to take part, numbered far in excess of 50 percent of those persons of voting age and claiming voting residence in Alaska.

Discrimination or denial of voting or other civil rights to any resident of Alaska is prohibited by Alaska's constitution and by strong, effective, implementing statutes of this State. Strong penalties are provided in Alaska law for violation of such statutes.

Therefore, a great injustice has been visited upon our State through the erroneous inclusion of Alaska in press releases on the wire services which have implied that Alaska may not met some of the standards for voting procedures proposed in the provisions of S. 1564.

The official view of the executive branch of the goverment of the State of Alaska is that it is quite likely the provisions of S. 1564, as originally submitted, are not broadly inclusive enough to insure total compliance with the intent of the proposed legislation.

It is obvious from public statements of a number of Members of the U.S. Senate that amendments will be offered to your committee which would accomplish the broadening of authority that may be necessary.

I want to express my sincere appreciation of your kindness in permitting me this opportunity to explain the State of Alaska's position with respect to S. 1564 and H.R. 6400 and in allowing me to present through this communication to your committee the facts regarding Alaska's voting requirements, which are either the most liberal of all the great States in our Union, or at least are among the most liberal voting provisions of all our sister States.

Kindest regards.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM A. EGAN,
Governor.

A Responsible Position on Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial written by Milburn P. Akers of the Chicago Sun-Times.

The editorial follows:

[From the Chicago Sun-Times, Apr. 9, 1965]

A RESPONSIBLE POSITION ON ASIA

(By Milburn P. Akers)

It is now up to the Communist bloc to determine whether the rapidly escalating war in Vietnam is to be continued or if peace is to be the lot of southeast Asians, and, perhaps, of the rest of the world. President Johnson's statement that the United States is willing—without preconditions—to try to negotiate peace (a switch in his previously declared position) creates some hope that the conflict can be ended. If the Communists are unwilling to negotiate, or if, in such negotiations, they are their usual intransigent selves, the responsibility for continued war in southeast Asia and its likely enlargement will be theirs alone.

It required a lot of political courage for the President to switch his position. He gains stature as a consequence. Only a week earlier he had repeated his declaration that North Vietnam must abandon its assaults on South Vietnam before negotiations would be worthwhile. That observation may still prove to be correct. Negotiations do not assure a termination of the conflict. Neither do negotiations imply retreat or surrender. Negotiations are merly an effort to determine whether a formula acceptable to both sides can be evolved and peace restored. To decry negotiations is to assert that differences can be settled only by force. Mr. Johnson has taken the responsible position which any reasonable statesman must take in a world living under the continuing threat of atomic war.

He has made it known that peace in southeast Asia "demands an independent South Vietnam, securely guaranteed and able to shape its own relationship to all others, free from outside interference, tied to no alliance, a military base for no country."

If, as may be likely, North Vietnam and its Communist allies, whether in South Vietnam or elsewhere, can't accept peace on such terms, all their prattle that imperialist America is intent only on war becomes a proper description of their aims.

Mr. Johnson has restored America's moral position. He has regained a position of strength from which to conduct negotiations. America's role in the world requires that position of moral strength.

The ultimate reaction of Hanoi and Peiping to the President's statement is conjectural,

of course. Both are likely to continue the hypocritical pretense that peace, if it comes, must be made with the Vietcong. That is partly true, but it is far from the whole truth.

The Vietcong, bereft of manpower replacements and supplies from North Vietnam, will ultimately wither. They can't long survive a viable government in Saigon, especially if that government (which, unfortunately, most of them have not been) devotes itself to the welfare of the South Vietnamese people.

Soviet Russia, whose leaders profess to believe peaceful coexistence is possible, will be even harder put to reject Mr. Johnson's new position than Red China, whose leaders frequently assert that coexistence isn't possible. If Mr. Johnson has now further isolated Soviet Russia from Red China, as may prove to be true, the responsibility for continuing the conflict, with all that such continuance entails, becomes that of Red China. For Ho Chi Minh, who heads the Communist hierarchy in Hanoi, has had a good sample of the devastation that can be visited on his country so long as it lacks adequate air cover. That can be given him only by Soviet Russia.

The American air strikes against North Vietnam did not cause Hanoi to seek peace, as some had expected. It is possible, however, that they will be instrumental in causing Ho Chi Minh to take advantage of Mr. Johnson's expressed willingness to negotiate. Another advantage obtained by the President in his newly declared position is that many Americans who have been critical of the extension of the war in South Vietnam with its ever-increasing possibilities of resulting in a major conflict can now fully support his course. He has made a reasonable offer to explore the possibilities of a peaceful settlement. He has regained a moral position from which to conduct come what may. So long as the United States can negotiate from a strong moral position, as well as a strong military one, there is a chance of bringing peace to southeast Asia.

That peace, fortified by the development of the Mekong River Valley, as outlined by Mr. Johnson, is essential if the world is to step back from the brink on which it now totters.

The End of the Civil War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERNARD F. GRABOWSKI
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, 100 years ago, on April 9, 1865, the Confederate Army of Northern Virginia laid down its arms at Appomattox, a small village not far from Lynchburg, Va.

The Confederate Capital had already fallen. Jefferson Davis and nearly all his cabinet had left Richmond on April 2, and the city had been occupied by Union troops under Weitzel on the following day. On the afternoon of April 2, General Lee had given the order for the evacuation of Petersburg, which was accomplished that night. Lee managed the escape well, getting away with most of his artillery; but his objective, a junction with Confederate forces under Gen. Joseph E. Johnston in North Carolina, was blocked by Union columns. The dwindling Confederate Army was not only trapped but it was almost without food. General Lee rejected a suggestion by some of his officers that the army break into small bands and attempt to slip through the surrounding lines, on the ground that such groups would become mere bands of marauders, would carry the war into areas that had escaped the ravages of war, and would create a situation from which it would take the country years to recover.

On April 7, 1865, Lee, sharing Grant's desire to avoid the useless shedding of blood, asked for terms. On Palm Sunday, April 9, the opposing commanders met in conference in the McLean House in the village of Appomattox Courthouse. Lee and his party arrived first and when Grant and his officers arrived the two generals shook hands in the middle of the room.

These two great soldiers presented a strange contrast. General Lee was immaculate in dress uniform. General Grant had come straight from the field, in the uniform of a private with the shoulder straps of a lieutenant general.

After some preliminary conversation about the Mexican War and the old Army days, Lee turned the conversation to the business at hand. At his suggestion Grant wrote out the terms of surrender. The officers and men of Lee's command were to be released as paroled prisoners, all materials of war were to be turned over to officers designated by Grant, except the sidearms, horses, and personal baggage of the officers. Although he did not include the provision in the written terms, Grant, in response to his opponent's unspoken wish, generously offered to instruct his parole officers "to let all the men who claim to own a horse or mule take the animals home with them to work their little farms." After Lee had read the terms, Grant gave his rough draft of the terms to Colonel Parker for copying in final form, and Lee requested Colonel Marshall to write an acceptance. The signing of the two letters and their exchange completed the negotiations.

With the exception of Abraham Lincoln, the two great generals who met at Appomattox were perhaps the finest figures to emerge from the war. And at no time was their greatness more apparent than on that quiet Sunday afternoon. Lee, "a foe without hate, a friend without treachery, a soldier without cruelty, and a victim without murmuring," in adversity showed a quiet dignity and courtesy that deserves our admiration. Grant, in his hour of victory, evidenced a restraint, a magnanimity, and a fine consideration that have hardly been surpassed.

After Appomattox, several Confederate armies remained in the field. The final terms of capitulation of Johnston's army, similar to those accorded Lee, were signed near Durham Station, N.C., on April 26; Gen. Richard Taylor surrendered on May 4 at Citronelle, Ala.; and on May 26, at New Orelans, Kirby Smith surrendered the Confederate forces beyond the Mississippi. But for practical purposes Appomattox marked the end of the war.

Thus closed our great struggle for national survival. Because of the lack of reliable and comparable records, it will never be possible to assess accurately the cost of the war in life and property; but we know that we paid a fearful price.

If wounded and dying men can be reduced to statistics, it appears that the struggle between the two sections cost a million casualties. Probably more than 200,000 of these were killed or fatally wounded in battle.

Other costs of the war include almost incalculable amounts in direct war costs, pensions, retardation of economic development, ruined homes, fields, roads, buildings, and bridges. Property in slaves was wiped out, the merchant marine was shattered, and we were left with a heritage of hate, extravagance, corruption, truculence, and intolerance. The inability of our leaders to manage the crisis of 1860 and 1861 had borne bitter fruit.

Perhaps no finer words have ever been included in a state paper than words in Lincoln's second inaugural address:

> With malice toward none; with charity for all * * * let us strive to finish the work we are in; to bind up the Nation's wounds; * * * to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace.

These words are the true measure of his greatness. A reconstruction in this spirit could easily have changed our history. Tragically, Lincoln was struck down by the assassin's hand. Our Nation was left to pass through the difficult years ahead without the benefit of his wise guidance. Other leaders determined reconstruction policies with a bitterness and vindictiveness entirely foreign to Lincoln's hopes and to the spirit of Grant and Lee at Appomattox.

At last reunion was achieved. In the war with Spain, two World Wars, the Korean war, and the years of peace that have intervened, we have gone forward as one Nation, united by a common heritage. Across the Potomac, in Arlington National Cemetery, thousands of men from both Union and Confederate armies lie buried. Perhaps their best epitaph was spoken by Lincoln in his first inaugural address, when that mighty host was yet alive:

> We are not enemies but friends * * *. Though passion may have strained, it must not break our bonds of affection. The mystic chords of memory, stretching from every battlefield and every patriot grave, to every living heart and hearthstone in this broad land, will yet swell the chorus of the Union.

Grade School Band Captivates Canadians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT McCLORY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, again this year the Waukegan Grade School Concert Band has brought honor and distinction to the Waukegan and Lake County, Ill., community as well as to our great Nation. Recently this group of 84

young musicians—ranging in age from 10 to 14 years—participated in a Canadian tour, presenting concerts in Waterloo, Toronto, Brantford, and the Canadian Capital of Ottawa.

The success of this year's Canadian tour matches, in many respects, the fine concerts which the Waukegan Grade School Concert Band presented last year here in Washington.

The concert presented in Waterloo, Ontario, was part of the Waterloo Instrumental Clinic for 1965 held at the University of Waterloo as a part of the spring convention of the Canadian Bandmasters Association. The host for this program was the Waterloo Music Co., Ltd. The selection presented during this musical tour included compositions of Rimsky-Korsakoff, Mendelssohn, Wagner, and other renowned composers. Each of the Canadian concerts, of course, included a rendition of the Canadian national anthem, "O Canada," as well as our national anthem, "The Star-Spangled Banner."

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend initially the talented and inspiring director of this musical organization, Mr. Bernard H. Stiner, whose patience and painstaking attention to detail and to the individual part played by each of the young musicians culminated in the finished performance which distinguishes the artistry of the Waukegan Grade School Concert Band.

Mr. Speaker, in its issue of March 30 the Ottawa Citizen newspaper had this to say:

Eighty-four young musicians from Waukegan, Ill., thrilled a large crowd at Glebe Collegiate Monday night with a program ranging from Rimsky-Korsakoff to Sousa.

In the March 31 issue of the New York Times the following report was carried:

U.S. School Band Group Wins Applause in Ottawa

Eighty-four grade school musicians of Waukegan, Ill., won hearty applause from a large Ottawa audience last night. The young bandsmen, completing a goodwill tour of four Canadian cities, played a program highlighting two American composers, Aaron Copland and John Philip Sousa."

Following the band's performance in the Canadian capital, Ronald G. Moxness, press attaché at the U.S. Embassy in Ottawa, stated:

I have the feeling that the band left following a most successful visit to Ottawa. * * * I thought the band was excellent and I must admit that I marvelled at their skill considering their extreme youth. The phrase used by the Journal 'the precision carried into the band's music' rather summed up their Glebe performance.

Mr. Frank A. Daley, manager, educational services department of the Waterloo Music Co., Ltd., Waterloo, Ontario, stated:

The impression and the impact made by both the deportment and musical excellence of the Waukegan band was tremendous. I am sure you realized how much the audience enjoyed their concert, and I can assure you that the comments received afterwards were most favourable. You will be interested to learn that we broke all previous attendance records this year—and I am sure that the visit of the Waukegan band had some large part to play in this.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the good public relations and the promotion of international good will which the Waukegan Grade School Concert Band has achieved through this tour. In addition to the opportunities to present fine musical concerts, these young performers from Waukegan had occasion to foster good public relations through their individual contacts with many Canadian citizens. Also the opportunity to visit at the Canadian capitol in Ottawa, to see Niagara Falls, Toronto, and other points of interest in Canada helped to provide memorable and lasting impressions and experiences for these young people.

I want to extend my praise and congratulations to each of the young students who performed as part of the band. In addition, I want to express appreciation to our U.S. Department of State for the facilitative services which were rendered and to the Honorable W. Walton Butterworth, our U.S. Ambassador to Canada, Mayor Don Reid and Deputy Mayor Ken Fogarty of Ottawa, Mr. Nicholas Volk of the U.S. Information Agency at Toronto; to the officers of the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., the Seagram Co., and Johns-Manville Corp., for the generous contributions of these companies to the expenses and entertainment of the Waukegan Grade School Concert Band during its Canadian tour.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I want to extend hearty congratulations to and thanks to the Band Parents Association, its president, Raymond Runge, to Richard Cummings, and to the tour chairman, Donald M. Lonchar, Jr. A Canadian official whose assistance was invaluable was the Honorable R. Alan Eagleson, member of the Ontario Parliament. An accolade belongs to my good Washington friend, Mr. Edward Maginnis. Of course, close cooperation was provided by the principal figure in our cultural exchange program, Mr. Charles Ellison, Under Secretary of State for Cultural Affairs.

A word of praise also belongs to Robert Sabonjian, mayor of Waukegan, who with his wife accompanied the band throughout the Canadian tour; and to the Waukegan News-Sun who staff writer, Karl Luomala, reported faithfully on the success of the band as its Canadian tour proceeded.

Mr. Speaker, I am indeed proud to bring news of this important cultural event to the attention of the Members of the House and to the Nation.

Air Pollution Knows No Boundaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY H. McVICKER
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Clean Air Act of 1963. The purpose of this measure is to meet the problems of air pollution which all areas of our country find to be an increasing problem.

Much has been written to alert us of the health hazards from exposure to normal pollution conditions and there is a plethora of statistics available on the number of persons who have died from heavy concentrations of pollutants.

As of this writing we have the Clean Air Act of 1963, which provides grants to State, local, and interstate air pollution control agencies for abatement programs.

However, the present act is insufficient to meet and overcome this urgent health hazard. Moreover, in addition to assisting in the health problems caused by pollutants legislation is needed to assist our cities and States to remove the soot and grime which mars the enjoyment of our ever-expanding urban centers.

Last year when I was serving as a member of the Colorado State Legislature, State Senator Roland Mapelli and I introduced an air pollution bill which was designed to put real teeth into an air pollution control program and to make its requirements regional in scope, a provision necessary to its practical operation.

At that time we noted with great pride that a number of companies which we investigated, were, on their own initiative, spending their own resources for installations of air control systems.

We stated, at that time, that we felt that a special tax incentive was in order inasmuch as these efforts in a great majority of cases were not inurring to the benefit of these companies nor adding directly to their operations but were essentially contributions to the welfare of the community.

It is a real pleasure for me, therefore, to include in this bill this tax incentive provision which in my opinion will operate to the advantage of both industry and the public. However, I feel now, as I felt then, that unless all companies were subjected to State and regional regulations the fact that some companies took air polution control steps on their own initiative would not solve the problem if other companies would refuse, and I feel there is still an absolute necessity for this provision in order to get teeth into such local acts. I am delighted with the efforts exerted in the State of Colorado at this time to make this bill a reality.

While I realize that the tax incentive provisions to industry for installation of pollutant control systems has been before the Congress several times I am hopeful that the climate is ripe for passage in this Congress, partly because we are considering tax reductions generally and partly because it would be a giant step to solving the critical air pollution problem we have been avoiding too long.

The other major provision of this bill is the requirement that all automobiles sold after November 1, 1967, will be equipped with a blowby system to limit emissions from crankcases.

We had occasion in Colorado, last year, to view an exhibit of these control devices which have been made mandatory by the California Legislature for instal-

lation on all 1966 models sold in California.

Obviously, the best way to make meaningful the control of air pollution by automobiles is to have devices installed on all cars. This is especially important in a tourist state such as my own where local control of local automobiles would be fairly meaningless if out-of-State automobiles were allowed to continue to clog the air with uncontrolled combusted pollutants.

The hearings in this Congress on this matter have pointed out very clearly that although there is much to learn, control measures are needed now. It is even greatly to be hoped that the automobile industry will voluntarily give the clean air systems an immediate tryout by installing them on their new models before the 1968 models are on the market, as required in my bill.

It is my fervent hope that an all-out attack on this problem from the Federal Government through enactment of the proposals in my bill to provide, first, tax incentives to industry, the private sector, second, control systems imposed on new automobiles, and third, by increasing State and local responsibility, will result, not only in the alleviation of the air pollution control problem that is increasingly infesting our urban areas but in its elimination in the foreseeable future.

I include herewith a more detailed analysis of the principal provisions of my bill:

AUTOMOTIVE EMISSIONS

1. Contract research on gasoline-powered vehicles to reduce emissions of oxides of nitrogen and aldehydes from the crankcase and exhaust and also hydrocarbons from gasoline evaporation in carburetors and fuel tanks.

2. Conduct research to reduce emissions of pollutants from diesel-powered vehicles.

3. Conduct research to reduce pollutants emitted from jet aircraft and missiles.

4. Conduct research for development of efficient and low-cost methods of collecting and disposing of municipal solid wastes.

5. Carry out program to inform and advise eligible air pollution control agencies and eligible persons of the provisions of this act.

6. Establish a Federal Air Pollution Control Laboratory within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

7. Provide that Secretary shall appoint a technical committee to encourage development of improved low-cost techniques to remove sulfur from sulfur-bearing fuels and reduce emissions of oxides of sulfur produced by combustion of sulfur-bearing fuels.

8. Provide that Secretary shall set standards for allowable emissions from gasoline-powered vehicles and require all new automobiles to be equipped with blowby systems from crankcases not later than November 1, 1967.

9. Require imported gasoline-powered vehicles to be so equipped with a blowby system.

10. Set penalties for violations at not more than $1,000 or 6 months' imprisonment or both.

11. Provide controls over air pollution from the exhaust of federally owned automative vehicles.

12. The Secretary will establish criteria for allowable emissions from diesel-powered vehicles.

13. To insure proper inspection and maintenance the Secretary will enter into agreements with and make grants to State agencies to carry out these standards.

14. Provide that Secretary may establish potential pollution sources for Federal agencies and departments having jurisdiction over any buildings, and authorize inspection of such property.

15. Permits appropriations for control devices, where required, on buildings and installations over which the Federal Government has jurisdiction.

16. Permits training of Federal personnel necessary to assure appropriate maintenance and operations of such devices installed on buildings under Federal jurisdiction.

17. Require a thorough study and report by Surgeon General of the Public Health Service to determine effects of air pollutants from all sources on human health. Report to be submitted not later than 2 years from enactment.

TAX INCENTIVES

18. Amends Internal Reveue Code by adding a new section to afford a substantial tax benefit to individuals or private indsutry who would acquire, construct, or install, certified air pollution control devices. The same treatment would apply to water pollution control devices. Amends Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by adding a new section 183 relating to expenditures for such devices. Taxpayer could elect to treat such expenditures as having been paid or incurred in any of the 3 taxable years preceding, or in any of the 5 taxable years following, the taxable year in which such expenses were paid or incurred. A deduction with respect to any air or water pollution control device would not be allowed unless the State or interstate air pollution control agency had certified to the Secretary that such device had been acquired, constructed or installed in conformity with State requirements. This amendment shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1963. Allowance is made if the taxpayer realizes income from the operation of any certified air or water pollution control device.

Defenders All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN E. WILLIS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, last night I had the privilege of addressing the opening session of the annual general assembly of the National Society Daughters of the American Colonists here in Washington, presided over by the national president, Mrs. John Y. Richardson.

Many fine, short reports were presented at the assembly by past and present officers of the society.

There was also a special address which I thought truly outstanding because it embodied so much of what we have great need for today. It was a speech expressing the highest ideals, dedication to country, the finest type of patriotism, true appreciation of the duties of citizenship and a marvelous assertion of firm and quiet courage in these times of danger and stress.

This address was made by Mrs. Herbert Ralston Hill, chairman of the society's national defense committee.

Under unanimous consent, I insert her inspiring address at this point in the RECORD and commend it to the general membership:

DEFENDERS ALL

We, Daughters of American Colonists, are of bloodlines that have been nurtured by the very soul and substance of freedom. That freedom was not a gift, but was dearly purchased by our ancestor—men and women of daring and courage—of fierce patriotism and a loyalty often manifested in heroism and other amazing expressions of the human spirit.

These colonial founders of our present federated Republic were confronted with challenges and crises which brought forth the most valorous action and which developed in them a veneration for liberty that has never been surpassed.

They were worthy, and of high character. They stood for principles above life itself.

With such a heritage, why should we not believe unwaveringly in the United States of America, cherish its distinguished history, support its Constitution, obey its laws, respect its flag, and defend it against all enemies?

We love our country and we love the good life which it affords us—the peaceful life which come with achievement and progress, and abiding confidence in our national destiny.

It is the duty of the National Defense Committee of the Daughters of the American Colonists to alert the members of the society to the dangers involving our country's precious security.

The committee attempts to create greater interest in the Government of our Republic.

It encourages a careful study of the Constitution, and seeks greater effort in the support and preservation of this famous document. It calls for special observance of the anniversary of the Constitution in September as well as that of other national holidays.

The national defense policies of our society are enunciated each year in the resolutions adopted at the general assembly.

National defense, in brief, is the protection of that forthright aim which the Declaration of Independence so nobly expresses: "Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

The national defense is as important in time of peace as in time of actual hostilities. It is particularly vital in these turbulent years when the world is still half slave and half free.

We who meet here tonight have ancestors who escaped from the old world tyrannies generations ago. But among our newer citizens are those who in their own personal experience have known the horrors of serfdom, and of tragic life behind that curtain where no man is free.

The complexity of the many world events in which our country is involved is truly staggering. Problems are mountainous, and solutions are very hard to come by.

As our horizons have widened, our obligations and commitments have become far greater. The limits of the Monroe Doctrine have been extended to the Baltic, to Berlin, to the Bosporus, and to the China Sea.

This country's most important role abroad in recent years has been to encourage and defend freedom and responsible self-government wherever they are permitted to exist.

The world is changing day by day, however. The watch is around the clock. Those natural devices of air, land, and water are no longer barriers against lunar landings, intercontinental rockets, and global propaganda attacks by the enemy.

Perhaps we grow weary at times of the long-standing ideological conflict with communism, and even more impatient in those areas where the conflict is one of actual

hostilities and aggression. We are baffled and frustrated by the many guises of this insidious force, which wears entirely different faces in the various parts of the world in which it pursues its subversive plots.

We sometimes become discouraged with our role as a great nation which seems to be surrendering its peace by installments for a so-called security which in fact is nothing more than an uneasy armistice, and which usually culminates in another advance of the barricades of Red imperialism.

Too often it seems we have been maneuvered into the position of being compelled to decide whether to yield or not to yield, when to yield would mean complete retreat and to refuse might fatefully escalate our involvements.

We dare never forget that one major Communist outpost is now well-established in Cuba, only 90 miles away. We dare never forget that many, many American institutions have been infiltrated by a Red fifth column.

This is truly an explosive era, and we pray that fears of total annihilation will govern the kind of ultimate decisions which will be made by any groups of leaders, in any country, who are aware of the awesome and terrible power that reposes in the hand which can write our release or signal our doom.

World diplomacy is hard put to maintain the peace, and American leadership is mandated as never before to sustain our respect among nations.

To be worthy of that respect—to be recognized everywhere as a people with the highest of purposes and the purest of principles—we must show the world an inspiring example: a nation that is a model of the good and bountiful life—a nation that has learned how to keep and enjoy the fruits of freedom, and that has tried zealously to help preserve the dignity of man.

Such a nation—based on justice and human understanding, and accepting divine guidance—is certain to survive.

Such a nation—rewarding individual achievements and recognizing superiority wherever it appears—is certain to progress and prosper.

History has demonstrated that it is very difficult to defeat the nation which is strong. Only a strong America can be a secure America. Only a productive America can be strong.

Each member of the Daughters of the American Colonists should have a keen personal interest in our Government, and become an astute observer of its form and functions.

Thomas Jefferson has reminded us that our machinery of government is nothing more than the instrument by which citizens convert their will into action. Therefore he urged an intelligent and enlightened citizenry.

We deem it the duty of every American to have a better understanding of today's national defense problems and their possible solutions.

Of supreme importance in a republic is the intelligent exercise of the franchise. It is a solemn expression of individual choice and authority.

Each citizen, by his own thinking and doing, is the real guardian of America's security.

It is your responsibility as a citizen of the United States to be an instrument of service—willing, ready, and prepared to help combat such defense perils as confront us now.

The world is moving at so fast a pace that we no longer can rely entirely on dusty files or library shelves for adequate information and enlightenment. Our reading must include current periodicals, newspapers, and radio and television broadcasts for comprehensive and reliable understanding of what is happening now.

This year each DAC chapter received a basic reading guide and general directives from the national defense committee. And as your chairman has been studying and compiling the reports from the various chapters, it is evident that numerous informed sources of information have also been found in other reading material as well as from your many topflight speakers.

There is nothing static about the national defense programs of DAC chapters. They demonstrate a lively interest in the world as it is today, and an enlightened evaluation of the efforts of our country to maintain a steadfast watch on the several functions of freedom.

I discern neither despair nor false optimism in the present attitude of the various chapters toward these fearsome times. Their attitude is that of realism and it is idealism, and certainly it is neither defeatism nor is it overestimation.

Recorded history demonstrates that each age has had its wishful thinkers as well as its Jeremiahs. Also it has been blessed with its prophets and its sentinels.

Standing in old St. John's Church at Richmond as the Second Virginia Convention opened on March 20, 1775, Patrick Henry declared:

"If we wish to be free; if we wish to preserve inviolate those inestimable privileges for which we have been so long contending; if we mean not basely to abandon the struggle in which we have so long been engaged, we must fight. * * *

"They tell us that we are weak. But when shall we be stronger? Shall we gather strength by irresolution and inaction? Shall we acquire the means of effectual resistance by lying supinely on our backs and hugging the delusive phantom of hope, until our enemies shall have bound us hand and foot? * * *

"There is no retreat but in submission and slavery. Gentlemen may cry 'Peace, peace,' but there is no peace. The war is actually begun."

Crucial problems call for crucial remedies. We today—190 years after Patrick Henry's memorable "Liberty or Death" speech—must be prepared for them.

There is an innate spirit of freedom in every true American. There is also an abiding faith in that God in whom we trust.

When Americans are on guard, their homes and their loved ones are as safe as anything can be in this challenging era.

Have faith and courage, defenders all, to meet the unforeseeable tomorrow.

Medicare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD RUMSFELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, an excellent editorial in a recent issue of the Christian Science Monitor emphasizes the far-reaching effects of the medical care program passed by the House, which the general public should realize, and reiterates the conviction of many Members of Congress and individual citizens that any medical care program for the aged should be based on need and not on universal coverage. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including this significant editorial in the RECORD:

MEDICARE

The administration's bill for medical care for the elderly, along with the antipoverty and the education bills, is considered a key measure in the Johnson program for the Great Society. It expands the role of the Federal Government in providing hospital and nursing home care for all over 65, regardless of need. It represents a far-reaching revision and extension of the social security system.

Like other measures in the Great Society program, medicare would take the Nation further down the road to big government and socialization of responsibilities formerly left to the individual. It may well prove to be a turning point in the American approach to social needs; its consequences will be far reaching, and the public should realize this.

The popular impulse which lies behind this measure is clear. There is no doubt that many elderly people in need of assistance simply cannot afford adequate health coverage. The costs of medical service and especially hospital care have been rising more rapidly than even the cost of living. This has placed a grievous burden on many elderly people.

But with the growing inclination to encourage the Government to assume more and more responsibility for an ever-wider range of what were once private obligations, we believe that there is an increasing need for the United States to consider just where such expanding Federal control will lead.

Much hard and conscientious work has been done on the bill by the Democrats and Republicans of the House Ways and Means Committee. Faced with the necessity of drafting a bill on a difficult and controversial subject, the committee has done a workmanlike job. The bill has the merit of providing an exemption for those who object on conscientious religious grounds to participating in any way in the social security program. The bill also makes provision for those whose religious convictions would not permit them to conform to certain aspects of the program.

The medicare program points squarely in the direction of a socialization of medicine. This, in turn, opens the door to a vast increase in Federal intervention in the private life of the American citizenry.

Experience, particularly in Great Britain, has shown that government-run medical programs grow more and more costly. Medicare would be financed by raising the social security tax rate. Total Federal payments during the first year of operation have been estimated at $6 billion. It is certain that the individual's social security tax, due to go up as much as $69.90 next year without medicare contributions, will go up more as time goes on. If the bill should be amended later on to include free doctors' bill, drugs, and so on, for all over 65, or if the age limit should be reduced, say, to 60, costs could skyrocket.

We still believe that the answer to the problem to which the bill addresses itself is to handle this challenge on th basis of need, rather than through an effort to achieve universal coverage.

The First Prayer Made in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALLEN SMITH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Clifford L. Bartlett, of Pasa-

dena, Calif., has requested that I place in the RECORD the first prayer made in Congress. It was made by the Reverend Jacob Dutche and is as follows:

THE FIRST PRAYER MADE IN CONGRESS

In Thather's Military Journal, under date of December 1777, is found a note containing the identical "first prayer in Congress" which was made by the Reverend Jacob Dutche, a gentleman of great eloquence. Here it is, a historical proof to the essay published in the last issue of the Bulletin, which was written by Capt. P. A. (Dick) Horton:

"O Lord, our Heavenly Father, high and mighty King of kings, and Lord of lords, who dost from Thy throne behold all the dwellers of the earth, and reignest with power supreme and uncontrolled over all kingdoms, empires, and governments, look down in mercy, we beseach Thee on these American States, who have fled to Thee from the rod of the oppressor, and thrown themselves on Thy gracious protection, desiring to be henceforth dependent only on Thee. To Thee they have appeared for the righteousness of their cause; to Thee do they now look up for that countenance and support which Thou alone canst give. Take them, therefore, Heavenly Father, under Thy nurturing care. Give them wisdom in council and valor in the field. Defeat the malicious designs of our adversaries; convince them of the righteousness of their cause; and, if they still persist in sanguinary purposes, oh, let the voice of Thine own unerring justice sounding in their hearts, constrain them to drop the weapons of war from their unnerved hands in the day of battle.

"Be Thou present, O God of Wisdom, and direct the councils of this honorable assemblage; enable them to settle things on the best and surest foundation, that the scenes of blood may be speedily closed, and order, harmony, and peace may be effectually restored, and truth and justice, religion and piety prevail and flourish amongst Thy people; preserve the health of their bodies and the vigor of their minds; shower down upon them and the millions they here represent, such temporal blessings as Thou seest expedient for them in this world and crown them with everlasting glory in the world to come. All this we ask, in the name and through the merits of Jesus Christ, Thy Son, our Saviour.

"Amen."

End the Otepka Case Coverup

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, for nearly 2 years Otto Otepka's career has been in a state of limbo, his name under an official executive shadow, accused of "conduct unbecoming an officer of the Department of State."

He is charged with providing unauthorized persons, specifically the chief counsel of the Senate Committee on Internal Security, with information regarding the State Department's security division. He has said:

My loyalty to my country I put above my loyalty to the Department.

The following lead editorial from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of April 12 calls for the action which the Otepka situation has clearly demanded from the start. It underscores also the charges I have repeated again and again on the floor of the House and in my committee, that administration officials are covering up facts and denying information to the Congress which we rightfully must have if we are to legislate in the best interests of this Nation.

I commend the Plain Dealer's editorial to the attention of the executive branch:

END THE OTEPKA CASE COVERUP

The State Department should bring the Otto Otepka case out into the open. Too long the Department has been striving mightily to keep the facts from the public.

In September of 1963, the Department fired its chief security risk evaluator on charges of giving confidential information to Senate investigators and of suggesting questions to be asked in an inquiry into the Department's Cuban policies.

The evaluator, Otto Otepka, appealed and is still attached to the Department's payroll as a "surveyor of congressional attitudes on security."

No one, including Otepka, knows what his duties are and it is unlikely that the job will have to be immediately filled if it should become vacant by reason of Otepka's departure, if ever.

Several hearings have been scheduled and postponed at the last moment. Another is slated for May 10 but no one is offering odds that it will be held.

For reasons known only to the State Department, the Otepka case is being kept under the rug where it was swept nearly 2 years ago.

The Department had to change its regulations whereby Otepka could remain on the payroll while his appeal was pending and its phone directory still had him listed as the chief security aid a year after he had been notified he was relieved of that duty.

Also, since the notification, two other Department employees were dismissed after reversing their testimony that they had not wiretapped the chief security evaluator's phone.

All efficiency reports on Otepka have rated him as "highly knowledgeable on communism and subversive efforts in the United States" and have cited his "balance, perception, and good judgment."

If the departmental hearing upholds Otekpa's dismissal, he can then appeal to the Civil Service Commission and then to the courts.

The May 10 hearing should be held to allay the public's suspicions about all the secrecy that has surrounded this case.

The public has a right to know what justification there could be, if any, for firing a public official for giving the Nation's lawmakers the information they might need to cast intelligent votes.

The Community Development Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, in December of 1964, President Johnson described our responsibility to the underprivileged people of the world in an address to the United Nations. He said:

Now on a world scale, the time has come as it came to America 30 years ago for a new era of hope * * * hope and progress for that one-third of mankind still beset by hunger, poverty and disease * * *. Any man and any nation * * * that is willing to fight the good fight against hunger and diseases * * * will find the United States of America by their side, willing to walk with them every step of the way.

Last August, my esteemed colleague, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK told you about an American voluntary organization, the Community Development Foundation, which is making it possible for American citizens to "walk every step of the way" with hundreds of thousands of people living in the underdeveloped areas of the world, who are struggling to find a way out of poverty. I would like to report to you today on the dramatic and ongoing improvements in the lives of impoverished people that are being accomplished through the foundation's methods of encouraging self-help, at an extraordinarily low cost to the American citizens who support its work.

Founded in 1959, the foundation has sponsored to date over 3,300 self-help projects in Europe, the Middle East, the Far East, Africa, Latin America, and in the depressed areas of our own country.

In progress reports issued from the many countries where the foundation sponsors self-help programs and maintains field offices, I have read about thousands of miles of road built through rugged mountains by village men with picks and shovels, of schools, medical dispensaries and community centers constructed—simple projects done by village people that break the chain reaction of poverty breeding poverty. The foundation counselors, many of whom are former U.S. Peace Corps people, are the key to the success of the program. They encourage and guide the people who give their labor to the projects which the people believe will bring the greatest benefits to their families and communities. The foundation supplies small cash grants and interest-free loans for materials, tools, and seed. In highly successful programs now in progress in Latin America, the foundation, working with the Agency for International Development and host governments, distributes U.S. food as incentive for the men who contribute their labor to the self-help programs.

But the constantly growing and vastly important village improvements made by the people under the aegis of the foundation program, tell only half the story. What is of special concern to us here in Congress is the way the foundation counselors practice self-help. These dedicated young men—men of vision, understanding, vitality, and confidence—are liberating the dammed-up energies and ideas of people. They travel to remote villages, live with the people, listen to them and find out what it is they want most to do to better the lives of their children. This is not a matter of American largess being handed out to the less fortunate. This is not the United States telling people what they should do to improve their living conditions. These young counselors introduce hope, stimulate self-respect, encourage people to

think about their needs in terms of practical solutions. Projects are firmly rooted in the community's own human resources rather than in extensive financial aid. The major investment in each project is made by the people themselves—it is their manpower, their time, their determination. When a counselor moves on, he leaves much more behind than a dam or a road or a bridge. He has instilled in the people a profound belief in their ability to help themselves. When he goes on to another village, another community, another country, he leaves behind experience in cooperation, in democratic decisionmaking, in local organization and administration, and confidence in the achievement of a better tomorrow. He leaves behind a group of people who have a true picture of what Americans are really like—people who respect us because we respect them.

In a letter, to Glen Leet, executive director of the foundation, dated August 25, 1964, Sargent Shriver, Director of the U.S. Peace Corps, wrote:

I am most interested to learn that your programs are proving successful, * * * and that you will be widening your scope of operations in Latin America * * * you realize, I'm sure, how gratifying it is to me to see former Peace Corps Volunteers successfully making use of their experience by working in community development with your organization.

Foundation methods move people to action—continuing action—whether they are practiced in the rice paddies of Korea, on an African prairie, in a village in Mexico, or a hamlet in Appalachia.

Today the men in the Mexican village of Matehuala and surrounding villages, where there has been practically no rain for 6 years are presently giving all their unemployed time, to digging a reservoir and irrigation ditch and laying pipe to bring precious water down from the mountains to irrigate their lands and furnish clean water for their homes. In a program only 18 months old, Mexican villagers have given over 1,500,000 mandays of labor to 1,676 self-help projects. Two hundred and fifty rural schools have been built, hundreds of miles of roads now connect remote villages to market towns. Community centers and small hospitals have been constructed, orchards planted and improved animal breeding projects undertaken.

It is a partnership program involving the people of the United States, the people of Mexico, AID in Washington, the Mexican Ministry of Health and Welfare and the foundation. The Mexican Ministry of Health and Welfare supplies technical assistance, personnel, and funds for needed materials to the program. Foundation counselors distribute U.S. food made available through AID as daily family rations to honor the village people who are participating in their own development. The villagers are the major partners with their contribution estimated at 78 percent of the total cost of the program to all concerned.

On January 25, 1965, Dr. Jose Alvarez Amezquita, who was Secretary of Health and Welfare for the Government of Mexico, wrote to Glen Leet:

I should very much like to express my great satisfaction for the community development foundation program that the Mexican Government and the foundation initiated. The results could not have been more impressive. Among the terminated activities that stand out vividly are the construction of a bridge in the State of Guerrero, a breakwater in Yucatan, and hundreds of classrooms, health centers and recreation areas all of which are chosen by the people * * * I have no doubt that the food for development program aids a great deal in resolving the communities' basic problems by promoting their improvement sufficiently enough so that afterwards they independently continue activities of incalculable benefit due to the fact that they have been taught the way to do it.

On February 24, 1965, American Ambassador to Mexico, Fulton Freeman, wrote to the foundation director for Latin America, telling him of the enthusiasm of Embassy officials who had just visited foundation-sponsored projects in the State of Guerrero:

The Mexican Department of Health officials commented on the extensive and important work that is being accomplished with an absolute minimum of money input. The Directors of the National Institute of Mexican Youth said they intended to use the CDF approach as a model for similar projects undertaken by their extensive organization. Congratulations on the good work being done by CDF in Guerrero and throughout Mexico.

Foundation counselors are encouraging people in many parts of the world, to use their unemployed time ideas and abilities to help themselves. Half way around the world from Mexico in a foundation-sponsored program in the mountain village of Foustesa in Greece, the need for a school triggered a chain reaction of self-help. When the Foundation counselor came to Koustesa 5 years ago the people said they wanted to rebuild the dilapidated and crowded one-room schoolhouse. They talked with the counselor. The first thing they decided to do was to bring water into the schoolyard and schoolhouse. The Foundation granted funds and the men donated the labor to installing 250 meters of pipe. In addition the villagers built a small reservoir. Encouraged by their success in helping themselves, they went on to repair the school and begin a school library and museum. Using their idle time again, the men planted a school orchard and tree nursery that now provides fruit and walnuts for additional income. Encouraged and guided by the foundation counselor, the people of Koustesa continue to plan improvements. Ideas translate into action. A beekeeping project to provide honey for the children has been started. The men are planning to build a road leading to the schoolhouse. Next on their agenda: a school kitchen addition that will allow the village children to qualify for the government school lunch program. There are 150 people living in Koustesa, 40 of them men, but they are men who have learned to believe in themselves and their ability to gradually solve their problems of poverty.

The process is repeated wherever foundation-sponsored self-help programs are in progress. In Lebanon, the people of two small villages, Hissanich and Kfar Hatta, joined forces to build a 300 meter road leading to barren land they owned jointly. Working together, the villagers have reclaimed 70 acres of land and will plant fruit trees and tobacco this spring.

Now people living in the Korean village of Sa Am Ri can water their crops from the new reservoir built with foundation support to conserve the torrential spring rains for the months of drought. The people of La Touche Pirot, in the heart of ancient Brittany in France, people whose customs and ways belong to the past, will draw water for their cattle, water to drink, to wash in, to cook with—from the new faucets they have installed in the village with foundation aid. In all such self-help programs the small grant or loan from the foundation is multiplied 10 times by the contribution of labor given by the people themselves.

This holds equally true in the foundation's self-help program in the southern Appalachian Mountains in the United States. Foundation counselors, working closely with students, families, community leaders, schoolteachers, and social-workers are currently administering 369 school, community and family self-help activities in Appalachia. In battered one-room schoolhouses which still offer the only educational opportunities for many of the children, parents work together to repair school buildings, renovate interiors, install kitchens for hot lunch programs, plant vegetable gardens and bring in electricity and running water. In community centers, abandoned buildings which the people themselves have renovated with foundation support, the traditional southern mountain skills of rugweaving and furniture-making are being revived to increase the family incomes for people who have lived too long in poverty amidst American affluence.

Mr. Leet said:

Whether in the United States or abroad, the key to the success of the foundation's self-help programs lies in the ability and training of the counselors who work with the people. Several young graduates of the U.S. Peace Corps are now working in the field in Latin American countries. These men will work in the expanding programs overseas and in our own depressed areas here in the United States. Foundation counselors are chosen for their respect and understanding of the cultural traditions, abilities, and needs of the people living in the areas where they work. A special foundation training course includes intensive in-the-field training, study assignments, and problems to be solved in foundation methods and techniques for stimulating self-help.

As the Community Development Foundation expands its work here and abroad, new refinements are introduced. In Mexico, Colombia, and the Dominican Republic, the foundation uses a computer-aided reporting system. The monthly reports sum up each month's work efforts and accomplishments in terms of commodities distributed, types of projects, number of men working, and number of men, women, and children benefited by the projects in each area.

Mr. Leet said:

Governments of developing countries, faced with the tremendous demands for progress of their people, are turning to the foundation, eager to utilize the methods of encouraging self-help we have pioneered. During 1964 a score of countries have asked the

foundation to present plans for joint self-help programs.

Many parts of the world are the proving ground for the thesis supported by the foundation that men and women, no matter how deeply enmeshed in poverty they may be, can progress together when their talents and ideas are used with proper regard for their dignity and the inherent need to give of themselves. Every day the foundation is helping people to understand that they can raise their standards of living, working side by side and at peace with each other, assisted by their own governments, and fortified by the knowledge that people in the United States care so much about their welfare, that they are willing to send funds and trained counselors to guide them in their struggle to insure that the future will be better.

The foundation maintains national headquarters in Norwalk, Conn., and at 345 East 46th Street, New York, N.Y. Detailed reports on the work being accomplished by the people in each country where the foundation is active are available upon request.

Text of an Address by Representative Gerald R. Ford, of Michigan, at a Testimonial Dinner, April 11, 1965, in Chicago, for Cook County Sheriff Richard Ogilvie, of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD RUMSFELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, on April 11, 1965, the minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD FORD], was the speaker at a State of Israel bond dinner in Chicago, Ill., in honor of the sheriff of Cook County, Richard Ogilvie. Because Mr. FORD's remarks were so well received by the more than one thousand people in attendance and because I believe his speech is of interest to other Members, I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

TEXT OF AN ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE GERALD R. FORD, OF MICHIGAN, AT A TESTIMONIAL DINNER, APRIL 11, 1965, IN CHICAGO, FOR COOK COUNTY SHERIFF RICHARD OGILVIE, OF ILLINOIS

We are here for several reasons this evening. One of them is to salute Sheriff Richard Ogilvie. I join you in applauding him for building a professional police force from scratch, handling the Dixmoor riots with courage, calmness and finesse, and providing an entrenched political machine with strong and healthy opposition.

His dedication is akin to the fine work of DON RUMSFELD, who represents the 13th District in the House of Representatives as a staunch and articulate spokesman for the people back home in Illinois.

I am delighted to be with you for other reasons—first, because of the most worthwhile cause this dinner supports.

Very shortly the State of Israel will celebrate its 17th anniversary. In that brief period of history, a courageous and dedicated people have almost miraculously transformed a largely arid and undeveloped land into a modern industrial nation. As you well know, this tremendous progress has been accomplished under the most adverse circumstances. I commend those who in the face of such adversity have accomplished so much in so little time.

Since the Israel Bond Organization was formed in 1951, Israel's agricultural production has increased nearly six times, industrial production has gone up five times, and exports have risen nine times. More than 1½ million subscribers to Israel bonds should be justly proud of their contribution to this significant growth.

With your aid, Israel has overcome serious economic, social and political problems. It has taken in many thousands of homeless refugees and given them meaningful and productive lives. It has even extended the hand of friendship, in the form of technical assistance, to nations which are less fortunate. On the African continent and in some parts of Latin America, Israeli teachers, irrigation experts, medical specialists and engineers are helping others to cross the barrier from "have nots" to "haves."

But the problems of Israel are not all in the past. While half of the nation is now fully developed, there is still another half that is in a primitive state, relatively speaking. These desert and waste areas must be irrigated, populated and made economically viable. There is still the need to absorb an expected 500,000 additional settlers by 1970. There is still the absolute necessity to go forward vigorously with Israel's present 5-year plan for industrialization.

However, with support such as yours, I have no doubt that the free and democratic State of Israel is well on its way to complete self-reliance and stability.

Another reason for being pleased to be with you is more complicated and subtle. It is because your participation in this cause represents an outstanding example of one of the strengths of the American system.

You have made a considerable commitment of time, effort, resources and emotion to help others with whom you feel spiritual ties.

Too often, I believe, we stress the sameness, the homogeneity of American life, while ignoring the healthy differences and variations that give such richness to the American fabric.

The texture of our Nation, which has contributed to its unparalleled greatness, comes from many ethnic, religious and nationality strains. America, as we know it and love it, is like a good soup. Its full flavor comes from the blending of many ingredients.

Yet from many quarters we hear a great deal of talk about assimilation—especially from the younger generation. And, of course, it is necessary that we should be alike in some ways—in our standard of justice, our concept of democratic government, our common ideal of liberty and freedom.

But, we must also recognize that we can pay too high a price for sameness. We can make our soup blend. There are differences that we cannot afford to lose.

I do not like to believe, and do not concede, that in this country we have Italian-Americans, Irish-Americans, Afro-Americans or Jewish-Americans because the hyphen implies that different groups should be given different treatment. This is wrong.

On the other hand, it is necessary to understand that different groups have added immeasurably to American life because they are different. Out of their differences have grown ideas, a fuller cultural life, and a more interesting and stimulating America. Our national outlook is broader; our character stiffer.

Rather than question in any way those who feel deep emotional ties to other countries—whether it be Israel or Ireland or Italy or Africa—we should salute this as a manifestation of the genius of our Nation. This is part of what we call Americanism. It is one of the things that makes both Israel and America unique in the world. The beauty of Joseph's coat was that it was of many colors.

And so I salute you tonight—salute you for your support of a worthwhile cause—and salute you, my fellow Americans, because you have unselfishly helped pave the road to economic self-reliance for the people of Israel. With pride you can say you have played a major role in Israel's progress. With your head high, you know you have personally shared in an enterprise of historic significance for the survival of the Jewish people and of the spirit of human freedom and dignity to which it is dedicated.

The Removal of the Remains of Roger Casement to Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT E. SWEENEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, February 23, 1965, the remains of Sir Roger Casement, the Irish patriot, were returned to Ireland after having been buried for nearly 50 years in Pentonville Prison in London. The release of the remains follows repeated representations to British governments by successive Irish governments and by all who have exposed the cause of Roger Casement.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to include in my remarks comments concerning the life and work of Casement on this the occasion of his journey home.

Now his remains are to rest in Ireland. So ends a short but bitter chapter in recent history. And so the right honor is done to a man who well deserved it; a man loved and revered, ignored and reviled, by patriots and others alike. At all events, the government of the Irish Republic has now brought him home to rest and an English government has made it possible. His contemporaries are long since passed and unable to rejoice or to sorrow.

His life demonstrates that, in the last analysis, it is people, and not governments, who make heroes and martyrs; and the verdict on Roger Casement was made by popular acclaim when no other government wanted nor desired to befriend his memory and when his private life was in fierce dispute.

The aforementioned comments follow:

If you persist in treating me as an Englishman, you bind yourself thereby to hang me as a traitor before the eyes of the world. Now as a simple matter of fact, I am neither an Englishman nor a traitor: I am an Irishman, captured in a fair attempt to achieve the independence of my country; and you can no more deprive me of the honors of that position, or destroy the effects of my effort, than the abominable cruelties inflicted 600 years ago on William Wallace in this city when he met a precisely similar indictment with a precisely similar reply, have prevented that brave and honorable Scot from becoming the national hero of his coun-

try. I am not trying to shirk the British scaffold: it is the altar on which the Irish saints have been canonised for centuries.

GEORGE BERNARD SHAW.

LIFE AND WORK OF ROGER CASEMENT

Casement was born at Sandycove, County Dublin, on September 1, 1864. He grew up at Magherintemple, County Antrim, in a period which the effects of the great famine of 1845–47 were still in evidence throughout the country. At the age of 21, he joined an expedition, led by the American General Stanford, into the independent State of the Congo, lately established by Leopold II, King of the Belgians. Casement joined the British Colonial Service in 1891 and between then and 1900 served in Nigeria and Portuguese West and East Africa. In August 1900, he took up appointment as British Consul in the Congo Free State. From May until September 1903, on official instructions, he carried out an investigation of conditions in the Upper Congo where there were large rubber estates. His report revealed the extreme hardships suffered by the native peoples and on its publication in 1904 was acclaimed throughout the world as a great humanitarian achievement.

After the publication of his report, Casement spent a long vacation in Ireland to recover his health, which had been greatly taxed by his exertions in the Congo. During his vacation he came into close contact with the literary, social, and political movements, led by men like Hyde, Yeats, Griffith, McNeill, and Pearse, which had begun to redefine the national identity and to inject new vigor into Irish life. By the end of his vacation, he appears to have been inclining to the conclusion that the only solution to "the Irish Question" was the elimination of the British presence and that political separatism as enunciated by Tone, Mitchel, and the Fenian leaders was the sole, wholly satisfactory objective for the Irish Nationalist.

Casement's next tour of consular duty was in South America. In 1908 he was appointed Consul General at Rio de Janeiro. In 1910, he investigated, with a Commission of Enquiry, the conditions to which the Indian peoples were subjected in the rubber-producing areas worked by the Peruvian Amazon Company in the Putamayo along the upper reaches of the Amazon basin. Here, as in the Congo, his report brought to light a regime of barbarous cruelty and eventually resulted in the winding up of the company.

Years of service in Africa and the Putamayo had taken their toll of Casement's stamina, and in 1913, broken in health, he retired from the consular service and returned to Ireland, where, in November 1913, he became a founder member of the Irish volunteers. In the following July, he went to the United States to raise funds for the training and equipping of the volunteers. While he was there, war broke out in Europe and Casement went to Germany to probe the attitude of the German authorities to Irish independence and to explore the possibilities of military aid for achieving it. An attempt by Casement to form an Irish Brigade recruited from Irishmen in the British Forces held as prisoners of war proved a failure, as did an effort to obtain German agreement to equip the Irish volunteers on a scale adequate to insure the success of a military uprising in Ireland.

Early in 1916, he learned that the uprising was planned to take place the following Easter. In an endeavor to dissuade the leaders from an action which he regarded as doomed to failure, Casement went to Ireland by submarine. On Good Friday, April 21, 1916, he landed on the Kerry coast and a few hours later was arrested by the British authorities. He was brought to London, tried for treason, found guilty, and hanged at Pentonville on August 3, 1916.

CASEMENT'S JOURNEY HOME

The exhumation of the remains at Pentonville on Monday, February 22, 1965, was attended by officials of the Department of External Affairs, the Department of Justice, and the Irish Embassy in London, by British officials, and by the prison Catholic chaplain. The remains were placed in a lead-lined mahogany casket which was sealed and escorted to the Catholic chapel in the prison where prayers were said. The casket remained in the chapel overnight. The remains were conveyed to Northolt Aerodrome from which they were flown, draped in the tricolor, by Aer Lingus to Baldonnel Military Airport near Dublin, on the following day.

The announcement concerning the removal of Casement's body was made simultaneously in Dail Eireann and in the British House of Commons. In the Dail, the Taoisearch (Prime Minister), Mr. Sean F. Lemass, T.D., said "I am very glad to be able to announce to the Dail that I have been informed by the British Prime Minister that his Government has recently decided to meet our request for the repatriation of the remains of Roger Casement.

"As Deputies are aware, it was Casement's expressed wish that he should have his final resting place in Ireland, and it has long been the desire of the people of Ireland, shared by successive Irish Governments, that this wish be fulfilled.

"Mr. Wilson has generously responded to my representations in this matter, and I wish to record, therefore, the Government's deep satisfaction at his decision, which will render possible the fulfillment of Roger Casement's wish.

"This decision, coming as it does so soon after the centenary of Roger Casement's birth, will, I am sure, be universally welcomed as yet another step toward the establishment of the closest and most friendly relations between the two countries."

The Taoiseach stated that the Government had decided that the remains should be reinterred in the burial plot in Glasnevin Cemetery, Dublin, which had been selected by Roger Casement's sister, Mrs. Newman, to whom he was particularly close and who had expressed the wish that her brother's body should lie near those great heroes of the past who fought for Irish freedom. The grave is located in the O'Connell Tower Circle just inside the main gate, which is one of the most prominent sections of the cemetery.

Father James McCarroll, the prison chaplain who attended Casement during his last days, returned from the execution and found in Casement's overcoat in the condemned cell a manuscript which Father McCarroll had almost completely copied when the deputy governor of the prison entered the cell and confiscated both the overcoat and the manuscript. These are Casement's last written words and include the poignant sentence: "If I die tomorrow bury me in Ireland." Now after 48½ years his last wish is being fulfilled.

Announcing his Government's decision to return the remains, the Right Honorable Harold Wilson, O.B.E., M.P., Prime Minister, told the British House of Commons that, "The Government has authorized the removal to the Irish Republic of the remains of Sir Roger Casement. Arrangements have been made for the remains to be transferred to Dublin today." Mr. Wilson said that the Government had completed their examination of the matter and in response to a request from the Irish Government had agreed to the removal of the remains. "The Government of the Republic," he said, "has informed Her Majesty's Government of their decision to reinter the remains in Glasnevin Cemetery, Dublin, and of their intention that they should rest there." In reply to a question, Mr. Wilson said: "This matter has been discussed many times. Everybody is aware of the very great difficulties here and I think we have taken the right decision and this will help to improve understanding between the two countries."

The patriot's remains arrived at 5 p.m., on Tuesday, February 23, at Baldonnel Airport outside Dublin, where they were received by the Minister for External Affairs, Mr. Frank Aiken, T.D.; the Minister for Defense, Mr. Gerald Bartley, T.D.; and the British Ambassador to Ireland, Sir Goefroy Tory; together with army officials and a military escort. After ceremonies at the airport church, the procession moved off to the Church of the Sacred Heart at Arbour Hill where the executed leaders of the 1916 rising are buried. The attendance included President de Valera, the Taoiseach, and the members of the Government.

The remains lay in state at Arbour Hill for 4 days and on Sunday, February 28, were taken to the Pro-Cathedral, where, on Monday morning, the archbishop of Dublin, Most Rev. J. C. McQuaid, presided at a solemn requiem Mass.

On receipt of the news of the repatriation of Roger Casement's remains, President de Valera issued the following statement:

"Every Irishman throughout the country and abroad will be happy to hear that the body of Roger Casement is at last in his native land and amongst his own people. For them he died and as long as this nation exists and Irishmen live, his sacrifice will be recalled and his memory revered."

National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, since the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965 is due for House consideration in the near future, I believe the following statement in support of the bill H.R. 6468, presented by a valued constituent, Mr. Bennett W. Cooke, Jr., president of the Coyne Electronics Institute of Chicago, Ill., will be of interest to my colleagues. Mr. Cooke speaks from a background of considerable experience in the field of vocational education and his comments, therefore, are of particular significance.

STATEMENT BEFORE THE SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, BY BENNETT W. COOKE, JR., PRESIDENT, COYNE ELECTRONICS INSTITUTE, CHICAGO, ILL.

I am Bennett W. Cooke, Jr. I reside at 855 Bridlewood Road, Northbrook Ill. I am president of the Coyne Electronics Institute of Chicago. Coyne Electronics Institute, founded in 1899 and chartered as a not for profit institution since 1951, offers practical resident technician training courses in electricity, electronics, television-radio, refrigeration, air conditioning, and industrial electronics, running from 16 to 80 weeks in length—and a 2-year technological degree-granting program in electronics engineering technology. Coyne has graduated over a quarter of a million men during the past 66 years, including thousands of Signal Corps men during World War II, veterans of World

War II, Korean veterans, manpower development training students, men from many States and Federal rehabilitation agencies, Indian agencies, and from the Division of International Education of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I also appear before you as vice president of the National Association of Trade and Technical Schools, vice president of the Central Schools Association and treasurer and trustee of the Specialty Oriented Student Research, Inc., which is a research organization working with Dr. Kenneth Hoyt, of the Department of Education of the University of Iowa, in gathering research information from students in private business, trade and technical school settings throughout the United States and also making followup studies on the same students after they have graduated. This complete and accurate information on private business, trade and technical schools can then be distributed to high school counselors throughout the country, so they will be in a better position to counsel with the high school student and his parents as regards the opportunities that exist in private business, trade and technical schools. I would like to add here that these findings have just been published within the past week and are available from the University of Iowa's Publications Department.

I have also been authorized to speak in behalf of the Indiana Association of Private Vocational Schools, by Mr. Stanley Moore, vice president of that organization.

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

We have studied H.R. 6468 entitled "The National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965," and on behalf of myself and all of the previously mentioned associations and organizations, I can say, without hesitation, that we wholeheartedly support this bill and as one voice and one mind sincerely look forward to this legislation being enacted.

REASONS FOR FAVORING LEGISLATION

The private trade and technical schools, which have been contributing so much to the vocational training of young people throughout our country since before the turn of the century, must operate on income that is virtually 100 percent derived from tuition fees. This has become increasingly difficult because of today's constant need for upgrading of facilities, equipment and instruction and these difficulties are compounded by the fact that many, many qualified, intelligent and vitally interested young people are unable to attend our type of schools, offering specialized training, because they can't financially afford it and, in a great many cases, there is no place they can turn for financial assistance. I have read personally over 30,000 individual prospective student comments in the past 3 years and I can assure you that there are a tremendous number of young people who would be able and qualified to take advantage of this sort of specialized training if these loan funds were available to them. As it stands now, the vast majority of these young people are unable to get assistance and therefore drift either into unemployment or low-paying jobs where they are never able to use their real potential. To carry this picture on to its end result: these young people therefore earn less money and pay less income taxes. The schools in turn have less money to work with and are in a lesser position to continue with the vital needs of upgrading and research.

At Coyne Electronics Institute, as well as at other private trade and technical schools, we have a variety of payment plans that we offer our students without which we would have a very small student body indeed. These payment plans all require a downpayment and the balance of tuition is spread over the length of their course, or twice the length of their course, or a plan whereby the student pays his tuition balance after his graduation. As helpful as these plans are, they all, nevertheless, require a substantial downpayment, carry higher interest charges and in the case of out-of-town students, do not provide for months of living expenses.

I would like to bring out at this point a fact that I am sure will be of interest to you. Over the past two-thirds of a century, my school's collection experience on these graduate tuition accounts has been most gratifying. We have realized over 95 percent collection. We attribute this to the fact that these fellows have acquired here at our school the skills that assure them a higher standard of living for the rest of their lives and have been helped toward that goal by reason of being able to put off a large percentage of their tuition payments until after they had graduated and were working in the field making a good salary. I bring this point out because I am sure that your future experience on these student loans will easily parallel that of Coyne's graduates.

Another point that I want to make regarding student loans to young people enabling them to take up training at a private trade or technical school, is this: Our courses are thorough and concentrated so as to fully prepare students to obtain immediate employment in a skillful occupation in the shortest possible time. It is training without frills and without months, or years, spent on subject matter unrelated to the direct matter of their future job success. Therefore, because their training period is relatively short, extremely interesting, and the demand for their skills is great, these persons are much sooner in a position to reach their goal to begin earning money and also to begin paying back their loan (which incidentally is smaller than 4 years of college tuition). Also, it must be noted here that for the previously mentioned reasons there are greatly fewer dropouts than there are in general 4-year college programs. Many of these facts that I have mentioned, and a great many more facts, have been borne out by the University of Iowa specialty student research program that I mentioned earlier.

CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman and committee members, some of the benefits of the approval of H.R. 6468—the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965—are as follows:

1. The program of guaranteed loans will enable a great many young men and women to get technical training in fields that they are best suited for, which they were previously unable to do because of a lack of financial assistance.

2. The outlay of money by the Federal Government on this program will only be a small percent of the financial benefits it will soon realize in income taxes from the greater earnings of those who receive this type of training.

3. The lowering of national unemployment and the filling of the Nation's need for more technically trained people.

4. Helping to reduce enrollment pressures on the 2- and 4-year colleges. Many of the young people who are today applying for admission to a college, actually would prefer and are better suited for a trade or technical program, but up to now they have been unable to get financial assistance in these areas.

5. The trade and technical institutions themselves will benefit by having a larger student body on which they will not be required to handle as much long-term financing and therefore will be in a much better position to fulfill the tremendous requirements in technical education's upgrading, research, and maintenance of high standards. This legislation will, therefore, help to insure the continuation of the finest in training programs by these schools for future generations.

In behalf of all of the private trade and technical schools of America, we wish to express our appreciation for the opportunity of appearing before this committee and to state that we feel this is an excellent bill and we greatly hope that this legislation will be enacted.

Regional Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I call my colleagues attention to another chapter in the fascinating story, "Pittsburgh Research: Key to Tomorrow," published by the Regional Industrial Development Corp. of southwestern Pennsylvania:

REGIONAL ACTION

Several years ago, it became apparent that there was need for a regional organization that could concern itself—on a continuing basis—with strengthening the economic base of the nine-county Pittsburgh area.

The area had undergone drastic changes since World War II. Most of the modifications were for the better—a rebuilt and rejuvenated downtown section, more and better housing, smoke abatement, expanded educational opportunities, flood control, new cultural activities, and the beginning of industrial diversification.

But there was need for greater industrial expansion and diversification, particularly in such rapidly expanding areas as nuclear energy, electronics, aerospace, and scientific instrumentation. It became increasingly evident that the Pittsburgh region could no longer depend solely upon the steel, coal, glass, and other materials industries to achieve its growth potential.

In 1962, the Regional Industrial Development Corp. of Southwestern Pennsylvania (RIDC) was reshaped to help the Pittsburgh area seek out new opportunities and to adapt to the forces of change that were bringing about new materials, new processes and techniques, new products, and new markets.

RIDC sought to preserve and to expand employment opportunities; to upgrade the labor force; to broaden the region's industrial base; to provide financial assistance beyond that available through conventional sources to companies; to assist firms in need of new facilities; to accelerate scientific and technological spin-offs; to get the region's total resources working together as a unified economic entity; and to help provide a regional environment conducive to more rapid economic growths.

During its brief history, the Regional Industrial Development Corp. has: created two new vehicles—the RIDC Industrial Development Fund and the RIDC Real Estate Co. Inc.—to assist growth situations through financial assistance and attractive sites, including an industrial park; sought to attract new industries to the region; formed a scientific group to serve as a catalyst in stimulating area companies and developments; and undertaken retraining programs in new technological fields.

The Scientific & Research Advisory Group—composed of 12 academic scientists and engineers and a coordinator—assists RIDC in the identification, evaluation, and advancement of new ideas, products, and companies.

Since its creation, the advisory group has been instrumental in laying the foundation for a rapid transit industry in the Pittsburgh area; staging a regional precision machine work seminar; organizing the MPC Corp. for handling cooperative research projects by Mellon Institute, University of Pittsburgh, and Carnegie Institute of Technology; creating a new company concerned with advanced technologies; and stimulating interaction between educators and the professional societies leading to new courses (such as instrument maintenance), the establishment of precision machine institutes, and plans for a regional high school of science and technology.

It Sounds Ridiculous and It Is

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES D. MARTIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the following column by James J. Kilpatrick is meant to be amusing and I am sure many will enjoy the satire. Mr. Kilpatrick's analogy sounds ridiculous and it is when applied to baseball. You just could not run baseball under those rules.

It is just as ridiculous when we try to apply these same rules to our society and to our economy. In the end, the results will be the same as in Mr. Kilpatrick's mythical baseball game.

The column, as printed in the Washington Evening Star of April 12, 1965, follows:

UMPIRE JOHNSON'S BRAND OF BALL

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

It was the opening day of the season, Mets against the Dodgers at Shea Stadium, and the plate umpire, Johnson his name was, had called a little pregame conference down along the foul line.

Most of the new rules had been explained in spring training, not once but a hundred times, and you would have thought the principles of equal strikes and more abundant runs would have been clear by this time. Dr. Stengel couldn't get it straight.

"It is assumed," said the umpire, with great patience, "that any team that wins fewer than 50 percent of its games is the victim of invidious discrimination which is a blatant affront to the conscience of this generation of Americans."

"Quite so," said Casey. "Last season we won 53 and lost 109, which is 40 games out."

"The new rules," said the umpire, "will not permit this. The acid of the Cards shall not be allowed to corrode the soul of the Mets. Neither can a prosperous nation tolerate islands of poverty in a sea of plenty. You therefore begin with 15 games in the win column, and each of your hitters will get one extra strike."

Walt Alston had come with a complaint signed by 20 Dodgers, alleging discrimination. Duke Snider started to argue that with an 80–82 record last season, the Dodgers weren't all that prosperous and were entitled to the same 50 percent presumption, but the umpire cut him off.

So they took the field, with Al Jackson on the mound for the Mets, and Jesse Gonder behind the plate. In the first inning the Dodgers loaded the bases and Willie Davis clobbered one into the stands. He came trotting around third, while a low moan arose from the Mets.

The umpire stopped him 15 feet from the plate. "The challenge facing us is clear and immediate," said the umpire. "You are flouting the Constitution. You are frustrating the intent of the Mets. The hymns of the oppressed have summoned us to justice. Yer out."

Well, sir, the Dodgers came foaming onto the field. Willie was like a wild man. Alston threw himself down on the ground, and Duke Snider howled till they heard him in Brooklyn. The Dodgers had four attorneys suited up. They all charged out yelling that Willie was not guilty of willful denial or abridgment; it was nothing but apathy, indifference, and a fat one down the middle. But the umpire just squinted his eyes and talked them down.

"You are contributing to the creation of conditions," he said, "which are both inimical to our domestic order and tranquility and incompatible with the standards of equal justice and individual dignity on which our society stands. And Duke can go to take a shower."

By the end of the fifth, it was Mets three and Dodgers eight, which wasn't as one-sided as it might appear, considering that in the interests of social justice the umpire had cut the Dodgers down to seven men.

Willie was playing the outfield all by himself, but even with four strikes to the hitter the Mets were looking like last year. The umpire summoned Dr. Stengel to discuss appropriate legislation.

"Unless we act anew," said the umpire, "with dispatch and resolution, we shall sanction a sad and sorrowful course for the future."

"What we need," said Dr. Stengel, "is a few runs."

"The most crucial new instrument in our effort to improve the American pastime is the run supplement," said the umpire. "It now proposes to add to the rules through direct payment of a portion of the score of needy individuals and ball clubs."

So the umpire took two runs away from the Dodgers and gave them to the Mets, which made it 6 to 5 Dodgers. In the bottom of the eighth the Mets tied it up on Jesse Gonder's homer into short centerfield. It would have been a single in any other game, but the umpire ruled that Jesse had an income under .270 and was entitled to special benefits under the poverty program.

The Dodgers' lawyers charged this was a mere test or device not permitted under the 50 per centum rule. By this time Casey and the umpire were singing "We Shall Overcome" and half the crowd had gone home.

The game finally ended 6 hours after it began, with the score Mets 44 and Dodgers 41, but it wouldn't have ended then if the umpire hadn't decided that all managers over 65 were entitled to a bonus.

This was the program of Metcare, and Casey couldn't have been more pleased. Anyhow, this was how the season began, and it stayed that way all summer. They called it baseball, but what it was, was chaos.

Nationwide Support for H.R. 1096

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following release issued by the National Federation of Independent Business which contains the results of a poll conducted by the federation among its more than 200,000 independent business proprietor members.

This poll demonstrates overwhelming support among small businessmen for my bill, H.R. 1096, which would provide for the separation of Federal employees who deliberately refuse to pay final judgments entered against them.

H.R. 1096 is currently pending before the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and I hope that the committee will be able to schedule the bill for early hearing during the current session.

The release follows:

Government employment should not be a sanctuary for deadbeats. That is apparently the attitude of the Nation's independent business proprietors who have just completed a nationwide vote on H.R. 1096 introduced into Congress by Representative ABRAHAM MULTER, of New York.

This bill, which would provide dismissal for Government employees who refuse to pay their debts despite judgments against them, was given approval by a majority of 77 percent, with 20 percent opposed, and 3 percent undecided.

The nationwide voting was conducted by the National Federation of Independent Business, which has received many complaints from businessmen on the problem of collecting from a small minority of Government employees who take advantage of a law which holds their salaries immune from the ordinary processes of attachment, or garnishment to satisfy a judgment.

Commenting on the vote, C. Wilson Harder, federation president said, "While obviously the vast majority of Government employees do honor their obligations, all are given a bad name by the relatively few who refuse to pay, knowing that unlike people in private employment, ordinary processes of collection cannot be used against them."

Granite State Trucker Averts Collision, Wins Praise for Highway Courtesy, Skill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the latest edition of New Hampshire Motor Transport carries an editorial and correspondence relating how a skilled truckdriver, Mr. James Tsetseranos, averted a potentially disastrous accident last February and then came to the aid of the riders in the second car. It is a privilege to pay tribute in the House to Mr. Tsetseranos, his employer, the Auclair Trucking Co., of Manchester, and to the sometimes maligned group he represents. Our country owes a great deal to these "gentlemen of the road." In addition to the vital economic role they play in seeing that goods and commodities are transported safely, they set high standards of courtesy and skill for us all. I congratulate Jim Tsetseranos and commend to my colleagues the following editorial and letters:

THE SPOTLIGHT

Elsewhere in this issue is a short but eloquent letter expressing the feelings of passengers in a car that narrowly escaped a collision.

It is evident that the quick action of Jim Tsetseranos saved a number of people from serious harm. Additionally, Jim took the trouble to stop and change a tire for the frightened but safe ladies.

Our faith in the gentlemen of the highway has never wavered nor are there sound reasons that it should.

Regrettably there are a small group of cowboys who never would be missed, who cast a shadow over the professional driver.

There are many like Jim Tsetseranos of whom we never hear, because to them, to be thoughtful and considerate of other drivers is a part of the day's work.

And so Jim—the industry thanks you and through you all the other swell guys.

AUCLAIR TRUCKING CO.,
Manchester, N.H.

DEAR SIR: Mrs. Hopkins, Mrs. Hazel Cary, Mrs. Virginia Hodgerman, and Mrs. William Broeg were returning from the theater in Boston on February 18, blew a tire, and turned around a couple of times.

Your truckdriver, Jim Tsetseranos, did a wonderful job not to hit them. Then, very graciously, he changed the tire for them.

They wished me to convey to you how much they appreciated same—as I do also.

These are the things that make one realize what fine people we have in this fine State.

Again, please extend to him, their thanks.

Yours truly,

SUMNER P. HOPKINS.

Mr. SUMNER P. HOPKINS,
Greenfield, N.H.

DEAR MR. HOPKINS: I wish to personally thank you for your letter directing our attention to a "good turn" by our driver, James Tsetseranos, on the evening of last February 18.

I have complimented Jim on your behalf and have directed that your letter be placed in his personal file.

It is indeed a pleasure to receive a complimentary letter concerning a driver's action because, too frequently, their gentlemanly actions are taken for granted by the motoring public and go unnoticed and unrecognized by management.

We are proud of Jim and the helpful attitude he displayed in helping your wife and friends.

Truly yours,

AUCLAIR TRANSPORTATION, INC.,
HENRY J. PARISEAU, *President.*

Extremism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. GRIDER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago a fine group of citizens who live in suburban communities along the Tennessee-Mississippi State line just south of Memphis unanimously adopted a resolution condemning extremism of all sorts.

I would like to join with this group—the Whitehaven-Oakhaven Democratic Club—in urging the Committee on Un-American Activities to include within the scope of its inquiry into the Ku Klux Klan the activities of the Black Muslims, the Minutemen, and other groups which seek to undermine our basic constitutional guarantees through hate-peddling and racism.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED MARCH 29, 1965, WHITEHAVEN-OAKHAVEN DEMOCRATIC CLUB

Whereas democratic values are threatened by Communist tyranny abroad and infiltration on the domestic front; and

Whereas there are organizations in the United States who by acts of violence, terrorism, threats of murder, organizations who ride in the night and use costumes to hide their identity and advocate activities similar to these are a threat to the internal security of our Nation; and

Whereas there are organizations and political parties which have used or have allowed their facilities to be used to spread suspicion for persons in authority in our Government at all levels, and breed hate among our peoples and for our country's leaders; and

Whereas such activities on the part of any organization, be it foreign or domestic, who use, promote, or condone acts of violence, acts of terror, threats of murder, bombings, who spread suspicions and breed hate among people of our community and Nation are detrimental to the security, peace, and welfare of our people and this Nation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Whitehaven-Oakhaven Democratic Club, its officers and members reaffirm our dedication to the Bill of Rights. That freedom and civil liberties are compatible with the security and vital to the national strength of our Nation. That the right to vote is the first principle of self-government; and be it further

Resolved, That the Whitehaven-Oakhaven Democratic Club shall go on record to use its offices and facilities to promote programs in schools and homes to teach respect for our flag, the Constitution of the United States, the Bill of Rights and respect for persons in authority; and be it further

Resolved, That the Whitehaven-Oakhaven Democratic Club deplores and condemns any organization which advocates directly or indirectly acts of violence, acts of terror, threats of murder, bombings, and who ride in the night in costumes to hide their identity or engage in activities similar to these; and be it further

Resolved, That this club make known to the press and to the Congressmen and Senators of Tennessee that we urge a prompt crackdown and an immediate and exhaustive investigation by the House Un-American Activities Committee of any and all racist or hate peddeling organizations, such as, but not limited to, the Klu Klux Klan, Black Muslims, the Minutemen, and others for the purpose of drafting legislation to bring them under effective State and Federal laws.

(Adopted March 29, 1965, by unanimous vote.)

TAYLOR L. BLAIR, JR.,
President.

Minority Heritage—New Series of History Books

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, one of the tragic aspects of the bitter unnecessary costs nations around the world pay today as a result of oppressed man's quest for freedom and human dignity comes from the fact that for centuries there has been a calculated blackout in the acknowledgment, publication, and teaching by usual educational sources of the history and contributions of Africans and Afro-Americans to the civilization, culture, and progress of mankind. Outstanding historical works by Negroes over the years have been denied the broad spread publication they merited and have failed to find entry into educational curriculum and libraries of almost all but the segregated Negro school and college.

Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of profound gratification that I submit for the RECORD the following articles from several newspapers showing the breakthrough in this area made possible by the awakened conscience of America and its increasingly desegregated heart.

The five articles follow:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 25, 1964]

NEWS OF THE WEEK IN EDUCATION: FOR MINORITIES, A PLACE IN HISTORY

(By Fred M. Hechinger)

A chronic complaint of minority groups is that schools and textbooks ignore the minorities' own distinctive past and contributions to the majority culture. In theory, the American public schools take pride in their melting pot function. In practice, it is often charged, the stirring of the pot's mixture aims at eliminating the minorities' cultural flavor in order to produce a homogenized blend.

Inevitably, too, the minorities are sensitive about any aspect of literature that presents them in an unfavorable light. Thus, some Jewish spokesmen have fought against the reading of "The Merchant of Venice." Roman Catholics, in the early days of public education, objected strongly to the anti-Catholic bias of history texts, and Negroes have attacked "Huckleberry Finn."

Last week, Doubleday, the book publisher, announced that it will launch a new series of books to give minorities a fair deal in the study of American and world history and literature. Zenith books, as the new series is to be known, will respond first to the demands of the Negro for civil rights by aiming at a fuller understanding of African history and the history of the Negro in the United States. Two volumes are scheduled for January. They are "A Glorious Age in Africa" by Daniel Chu and Elliott Skinner and "Worth Fighting For" by Agnes McCarthy and Lawrence Reddick.

These books are to be followed by others on the Puerto Rican, the Mexican-American, the American Indian, the Chinese-American and other minority groups.

Aimed at the junior high school, the books will be written in cooperation between noted scholars and professional writers. The intent is to offer books with a mature level of content, but written for sixth-grade comprehension.

NEED SURVEYED

Charles Harris, editor of the series and himself a Negro, said that after several years of research and discussion with educators, historians and textbook experts, he surveyed the need and the potential response in leading school districts across the country.

Mr. Harris met with curriculum supervisors, department heads of English and social studies, teachers and principals in New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Washington, Richmond, Atlanta, St. Louis, Detroit, Chicago, San Francisco, Oakland, and Los Angeles. Out of these meetings came plans

for special teachers' manuals to accompany the books. The books are to be linked as closely as possible with the junior and senior high school curriculum.

The new venture may come to grips with two problems which have worried both educators and civil rights leaders:

1. Traditionally, many textbooks have been edited with a view to the total market, including the Southern States. Books which have avoided even the term Civil War, substituting for it the War Between the States, could hardly be expected to provide much complimentary detail about the Negro in American life.

2. The self-image of Negro youngsters, already distorted if they attend de facto segregated schools in slums, suffers even more if their own ethnic group is overlooked in a study of the country's and mankind's past. While sporadic efforts have been made to put an end to the all-white pictorial presentation in elementary school primers, the problem obviously is not solved by adding a few Negro faces to illustrations.

NEW SECURITY

There is little doubt that sympathetic treatment of the Roman past or of great Irish leaders or of the heroism of Israeli patriots has given children of Italian, Irish, and Jewish heritage a new sense of security and self-reliance.

Obviously, an excessive swing of the pendulum holds dangers. Unless the new study of minorities becomes part of all students' reading, the various groups could easily emerge with an excess of separatist zeal, without the necessary understanding of others' heritage. The burden remains on the schools truly to integrate the study of history and literature.

Finally, it will of course be vital to the success of the Doubleday series not to confuse full recognition of the minorities' history with sentimental or even propagandistic treatment. Apparently the editors are aware of this: They have instructed their staff that "the approach which is used in writing the books is to take factual historical information and develop readable, vivid, and dramatic stories, while scrupulously preserving historical accuracy and perspective."

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Chronicle, Feb. 14, 1965]

MINORITY HERITAGE: NEW SERIES OF HISTORY BOOKS

(By James Benet)

A new series of history books—that sounds very much like fiction—was described here last week by its editor.

Take the story of how Ali the Great conquered Jenne, a city of legendary beauty set in the marshes at the headwaters of the Bani River.

The city held out for 7 years, 7 months and 7 days. But at last it fell to Ali's troops, which had sacked another famous city and slaughtered many of its people.

But at Jenne the conquerors, troops of the Songhay empire, treated the defenders with courtesy because of their bravery. Ali sat the young king down beside him, and to seal their new alliance he married the young king's mother.

AFRICA

Pretty good story, but—history? Who ever heard of any of those people or places before?

The reason that the account sounds like a lively invention of some author of adventure novels is simple, editor Charles Harris explained, that this is part of the history of West Africa. And Americans are almost totally unfamiliar with it, although about 10 percent of them are of African origin. Similarly, they are ignorant of the histories of other American minority groups.

The Zenith Books series, which Harris is editing for Doubleday, is aimed at ending that ignorance.

CIVIL WAR

The first two books in the series are "A Glorious Age in Africa," and "Worth Fighting For," a history of Negroes in the U.S. Civil War and Reconstruction.

But other books, Harris said, will deal with Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans, Chinese-Americans, and many other U.S. minority groups.

The books are aimed at secondary school students primarily, and written in approximately a sixth-grade vocabulary since so many minority students are below grade level in reading.

But, Harris said, the first pair of books, published officially January 22, have already had a striking sale to adults in regular bookstores, since so little is available in the field they cover.

SCHOOLS

School districts in big cities are expressing eager interest, he said, and he also expects substantial interest in the South "everywhere but in Mississippi."

School systems that are making progress toward intergration can obtain Federal funds for suitable supplies, he explained, both under the new Civil Rights Act and under other programs such as the National Defense Education Act's support for English teaching.

Doubleday's president John T. Sargent, in announcing the new series last month said candidly that it was aimed at meeting an avalance of criticism of publishers for neglecting minorities in schoolbooks.

"I believe this will signal the beginning of a new trend," Sargent said.

TALENT

Generally the books combine the talents of eminent scholars and practical school people. The general editors are the noted Negro historian, Prof. John Hope Franklin of the University of Chicago, and Shelley Umans, a specialist in reading instruction in the New York City school system.

The authors of "A Glorious Age in Africa" are Elliott Skinner, a Columbia University professor of anthropology and specialist in African cultures, and Daniel Chu, a staff editor for a group of magazines aimed at schoolchildren.

A nine-man advisory board includes the San Francisco school system's specialist in compensatory education, Isadore Pivnick.

BIOGRAPHIES

So undoubtedly the books really are history, all properly certified and carefully written.

But—one of them is to contain the biographies of Peter Salem, Phillis Wheatley, Jean Baptiste Pointe de Sable, Benjamin Banneker, Paul Cuffe, and John Chavin.

Ever hear of them? They were all Negroes who helped to build the Nation.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, December 1964]

BOOKS ON MINORITIES PLANNED FOR STUDENTS

A major publishing company is planning an extensive series of history books about American minority groups.

Many city school systems, including Washington's, are considering the books as supplementary texts for social studies classes.

The company, Doubleday, will publish the first two volumes in the series, which bears the name of Zenith books, in January. One will describe Negro history during the Civil War and Reconstruction and the other with the African background of American Negroes.

Subsequent books in the series, which may be expanded to 50 volumes, will deal with Puerto Ricans, Mexican-Americans Chinese-Americans, American Indians, and members of other minority groups.

The series aims to help pupils who are members of minority groups take pride in their culture and accomplishments as well as to encourage them to value their contributions to this Nation.

The idea for the series originated with Charles Harris, a Doubleday editor. Harris, who grew up in Portsmouth, Va., found in his own schooldays that standard books distorted or obscured the role of Negroes in American history.

Written in a dramatic manner at a fifth to sixth grade reading level the books are expected to appeal to poor readers and to potential dropouts.

"There's hardly anything in regular textbooks that shows Negroes as anything other than a problem," Harris pointed out.

"Our history of Africa destroys the myth that the Negroes who came to this country had no language or culture of their own, and were just savages running around with bones in their noses waiting to be benefited by the 'civilizing' institution of slavery."

Each book has co-authors—a historian and a professional textbook writer. Published in both paperback and hardcover, the books also are expected to interest some adult readers.

Harris visited District school officials last week to describe the series. Joseph E. Penn, supervising director of the District's school history department, is on the advisory board for the series.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Afro-American, Feb. 23, 1965]

EXCELLENT NEW HISTORY SERIES LAUNCHED: BOOK REVIEW

(By Saunders Redding)

"A Glorious Age in Africa," by Daniel Chu and Elliott Skinner. Zenith Books, New York, 120 pages.

"Worth Fighting For," by Agnes McCarthy and Lawrence Reddick. Zenith Books, 118 pages.

Doubleday & Co., perhaps the largest book publishing firm in the country, has established a new division called Zenith Books, which has just issued its first offerings.

The purpose of the new division is to "present the history of minority groups in the United States" and to emphasize the part these groups have played in the growth and development of this country.

Like those that will follow, books so far published are for young—10 or 12 to 16 readers.

Neither the establishment of a new division, nor giving it more or less autonomous control of its policy is a unique departure from publishing practice.

At least a dozen firms have subsidiaries and in general each subsidiary has its own publishing policy.

HARRIS' IDEA

What is unique about the Doubleday venture is that Zenith Books is supervised by a bright, energetic young colored man named Charles Harris.

Indeed, the idea of Zenith Books originated with Harris, and I came to know him 2 or 3 years ago, when the idea was developing. The publication of the first two titles brings the idea to reality.

It was not easily accomplished, and the details of how it was done are unknown to me; but this much is certain—it took more than financial inducements to lure John Hope Franklin, Rayford Logan, Rupert Picott, and Hugh H. Smythe as consultants to Zenith Books.

SOMETHING BIGGER

It took more than the promise of pecuniary reward to induce Elliott Skinner and

Lawrence Reddick to study and apply the special craft of writing for children.

This is not to say that Professors Skinner and Reddick worked alone. It is simply to say that without their work, the two current books would not have been as good as they are, and it is quite conceivable that they might not have been at all.

THREE NATIONS

"A Glorious Age in Africa" is the story of three ancient and great African empires:

Ghana, "the land of gold," which was already fabled during the 10th and 11th centuries, while Europe was still in the Dark Ages;

Mali, whose great King, Musa (which means Moses) developed the city of Timbuktu, where was established one of the finest seats of learning known to the early Middle Ages;

And Songhay, the empire which took up where Mali's development left off, and which played an important part in establishing Islam as the principal religion south of the Sahara.

COURAGEOUS BLACKS

"Worth Fighting For," tells the scarcely more familiar story of the Civil War and Reconstruction, what part the slaves, black freemen and ex-slaves played, and how what they gained through toil and bloodshed was worth fighting for.

The old, honored names—Nat Turner, Tubman, Vesey, Douglass—crop up in this book, and the good stories of courageous black men and noble black women are recounted.

If one can judge on the basis of "A Glorious Age in Africa" and "Worth Fighting For," Zenith Books should have a long and successful future.

[From the Amsterdam (N.Y.) News, Jan. 30, 1965]

LAUNCH BOOKS ON NEGRO HISTORY

(By George Todd)

If Johnny shows scant interest in reading, don't be too harsh with him. He just might be smarter than you think.

According to a specialist in reading instructions some of the material in his textbooks can be so dull, drab and meaningless to him, he naturally rejects them.

Actually, what Johnny needs is some motivation for reading, said the specialist. He needs something more in the texts—something which he can identify with himself, thus giving him a feeling of importance.

And therein lies the story about the Negro child who goes through American schools learning very little, if anything, regarding the history of his ancestors.

LONG NEGLECTED

For too long the deeds of the Negroes have been neglected and there has been a clamor recently for more diversity in the type of reading material used in our schools.

"The impression on the children in our schools," said Dr. John Hope Franklin at Doubleday's press conference announcing publication of a series of books on American minority groups, "is that only one group made America what it is, and those who can identify with the dominant group get the erroneous feeling of importance. Those not identified with that group become inevitably depressed by their apparent lack of importance."

The first volumes of Doubleday Zenith Books published with the hope of correcting this appalling lack, are "A Glorious Age in Africa," and "Worth Fighting For."

WRITER-HISTORIAN TEAM

Daniel Chu, a professional writer, and Elliott Skinner, professor of anthropology at Columbia University, collaborated on the volume which reveals the magnificent history and heritage of Africa.

Agnes McCarthy, an editor in the Department of School Services and Publications at Wesleyan University and Lawrence Reddick, history and politics professor at Coppin State Teachers College, Baltimore, Md., prepared the other book portraying the Negro achievements before and after the Civil War.

Both volumes come in hard cover and paperback. Each carries vivid illustrations, printed in large type and under 120 pages.

TWO-YEAR SURVEY

Charles Harris, editor of Zenith Books, said the books were written at a sixth grade reading level, but feels that the subject matter can also meet existing secondary school requirements.

As far as acceptance of the first two titles and others to follow in the series are concerned, Harris said a survey be made in the last 2 years indicated there would be great response. Several cities were visited both in the North and the South to get the reaction of board of education officials or directors of curriculum research.

"Many of them said they like the books and will take them, but it might be a question now of setting up the machinery," Harris explained.

URBAN LEAGUE HELP

The National Urban League will help publicize the books through releases to teachers across the Nation, and will use material to further promote the new publications in Negro History Week exhibits next month.

Letter To Correct Mistaken Impression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the House to a letter I have received from Dr. Richard L. Rubenstein, the distinguished director of the B'nai B'rith Hillel Foundation at the University of Pittsburgh.

The letter follows:

B'NAI B'RITH HILLEL FOUNDATION,
Pittsburgh, Pa., April 9, 1965.

Hon. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MOORHEAD: On March 30, 1965, Mr. DICKINSON, of Alabama, stated in a speech before the House of Representatives that I left the Alabama freedom march from Selma to Montgomery because of my disgust at the immoral conduct of some of the marchers. Mr. DICKINSON's sources of information are not correct. I did not participate in the march from Selma to Montgomery and, therefore, have absolutely no knowledge of what took place on that march. I did accompany a group of 130 students from the colleges and universities in the Pittsburgh area to Montgomery, Ala., on Monday and Tuesday, March 15 and 16. I can testify that the moral conduct of our students was beyond reproach. They represent the finest traditions of young men and young women at our colleges and universities in the Pittsburgh area.

I would very much appreciate it were you to correct the mistaken impression which has now become a matter of national comment by including these facts in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I am also writing to Mr. DICKINSON.

With many thanks, I am,
Sincerely yours,

RICHARD L. RUBENSTEIN.

Poverty in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on March 14, 1965, the suffragan bishop of the Episcopal diocese of Washington, the Right Reverend Paul Moore, Jr., preached a sermon to the Washington Cathedral on poverty in Washington.

Bishop Moore graphically described the terrible situation of those in the District of Columbia who live on the margins of society.

I commend his sermon to the attention of our colleagues:

POVERTY IN WASHINGTON

(Sermon preached by the Right Reverend Paul Moore, Jr., suffragan bishop, Episcopal diocese of Washington, at special service of evensong at Washington Cathedral, 4 p.m., Mar. 14, 1965)

The enormity of our poverty is not being dealt with by the citizens of Washington. Though many of us are Christians, though most are enlightened, thoughtful people, though there is more political and social skill gathered here than anywhere else on earth, the human suffering, discrimination, and degradation in our city cries to the heavens.

Perhaps our very sophistication in these matters makes us turn our eyes away from the ghetto, lest we have to admit the failure and to realize that since we cannot blame our lack of know-how, we must blame our lack of will.

I am a newcomer to Washington; yet I have been here long enough to be rehearsed in the Washington reason—or is it excuse—for inaction. "It is Congress, the District Committees which are to blame." "It is the fact that people are transient and have roots at home, elsewhere, which is to blame." "It is the Potomac River and the District line which is to blame."

I acknowledge these are factors which shape the special problem of our city. But let us not be naive; these are not the real problems. Even within these conditions, radical changes can be made. No; these are not so much blocks to action; these are excuses for inaction.

Let us look briefly at the situation. These facts are not news, but if they are repeated often enough, they will be branded into the mind of the citizen until we are aroused to action:

1. In greater Washington there are 50,000 poverty families, 30,000 in the District, 20,000 in the suburbs.

2. There are 337 substandard schoolrooms, and even some new schools are already overcrowded.

3. Employment: No minimum wage law exists in District of Columbia From their attitude toward legislation, it appears the hotel industry and board of trade opposed it. Some men are paid as little as $0.85 an hour—38,000, out of 87,000 in low wage industries, receive less than $1.25 an hour. The blocking of upward mobility on the job in the Negro community causes unemployment on the bottom rung of ability.

4. The welfare regulations are barbaric; They force a family apart at their moment of greatest crisis, the unemployment of the father. Of all the immediate actions possible, revision of the welfare regulations is the most urgent.

5. Unrealistic payments for foster care limit the available families and fill Junior Village to overflowing.

6. Housing: Rent control is needed to prohibit gouging by landlords. The poor pay a disproportionate amount for their shoddy housing. Very little low cost housing is available, so that they are at the mercy of the landlord.

7. Crime: Crime in the District was up 25 percent last year. We rank fourth in crime rate among 16 cities of comparable size. We were highest in robbery by violence.

No one knows all the reasons behind crime, but it is agreed that unstable families, bad education, unemployment, and the psychology of being discriminated against are the most common factors found in criminal profiles. The District is deliberately breeding criminals by neglecting these needs. Let this not be misunderstood. I am for tight police methods and quick convictions and sentencing the guilty. No conditions, however base, allow the condoning of crime.

However, our people must realize that the deliberate neglect of negative social conditions like those in this city is the reason we cannot safely walk the street. If we do nothing about them, we deserve the violence. You cannot have it both ways. If you kept a dog and beat him and teased him and starved him, would you be surprised if he bit your child? Is it any wonder that the human spirit, more sensitive than any beast, will break under the degradation of slum living and become ugly?

Such are facts. But poverty is persons. As Virgil Lowder, of the Council of Churches, recently put it:

"Poverty is a tiny girl in an overcrowded institution for dependent children, starving for love, looking up at a woman volunteer, asking, 'Are you my mommy?' grasping at the trousers of a passing man, crying, 'Are you my daddy?'

"Poverty is a teenage boy, unskilled, ready to go to work, but unable to find a job. He stands hard faced before the judge, his life hanging in the balance because of the crime he committed to express his sense of rejection.

"Poverty is a truck driver, hard working, but unable to earn enough at his part-time job to support his family of 11 children. Advised to leave home in order that his wife might receive aid-to-dependent-children funds, he left his home and the family he loved. He told a friend, 'They have taken my family from me.' A few days later they found his body floating in the river.

"Poverty is a mother with fear-darkened eyes, in a small, cold room, with five crying children huddled about her, not knowing where the next meal is coming from. 'We have rats big like cats in our apartment,' she told me. She ought to know. One of them had bitten her baby."

Poverty can be eliminated. All it takes is the will. Some individuals, surely, have the will, but the community does not.

1. We do not have the financial will. Millions, billions are needed to catch up on the deferred human maintenance of this city. The embassy balls, the glitter of the social life of the very people who make the decisions which hurt our city are made possible by the sweat of the poor. The shining marble, the long vistas, the crown of the Capitol itself, are built by the poor. They deserve a share in this—a share, at least to the extent of three meals a day, a decent room, and education, and a chance for a job. We are not willing to spend the millions necessary to accomplish this.

2. We do not have the political will. Home rule is just around the corner, but with a few notable exceptions, no one has screamed for a vote. No one has marched on the Capitol. No one has laid himself down in front of the Senate subway. Yet in Alabama men die for a vote. Do we need Martin Luther King to come up and give us suffrage?

3. We do not have the religious will. The churches are only beginning, only beginning, to speak of poverty and freedom.

4. Perhaps we do not have the journalistic will. Who is behind our civic disaster? Who calls the shots? Who killed Adams-Morgan? Are those who are against home rule, for instance, willing to come out and say what their real reason may be? Can the newspapers find out who blocks social justice and expose them? In most cities the power structure cannot hide; here it seems to masquerade behind the congressional district committees.

Now Washington is not by any means the worst city in America. But it is the Capital City, and its problems are manageable, compared to Philadelphia, Chicago, or New York. May I make some concrete suggestions:

1. That the community, especially the religious community, become personally involved with the people of the poverty families in whatever way possible, so that they can learn first-hand of rats, and smells, and fear, and pain, and cold. The Urban Institute of the Council of Churches can provide all necessary information for programing on the local level. Their report on poverty contains the most complete available record.

2. That a trained corps of "minutemen" be formed to ready to leap into action on call, to be present at hearings, to demonstrate concern, to vocalize, and pressure those who dare to shake off apathy and act.

3. That the poor organize themselves, as unions did of old, and demand their rights as members of the so-called Great Society. Until they do, they will continue to get only scraps from the table.

4. That the President be called upon to take an even more vigorous interest in his city.

We are conscious today of the crisis in the civil rights movement. The Nation is sick and tired of halfway measures. Civil rights and the fight against poverty are part of the same battle to free God's children from prison.

May each of us today join in this fight.

Judge Lincoln of Amherst; His Final Report, a Classic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, as my remarks from time to time here in the U.S. House of Representatives indicate, I have always deplored the continuing movement of authority toward the center of power in Washington. For the record, I should admit that even in the great State of New Hampshire, the Granite State, the second district of which I represent, the trend toward centralization is occasionally manifest.

Not long ago, the court system in our State was reorganized and many small country courts were consolidated. A perceptive and whimsical commentary in this connection by Judge Charles J. Lincoln, of Amherst, N.H., was recently offered for the Town Report of Amherst, N.H. This same report was picked up by Time magazine.

I submit Judge Lincoln's final report as it appeared in the Milford Cabinet and the article from Time and commend them to my colleagues:

[From the Milford Cabinet, Mar. 11, 1965]

AMHERST COURT—END OF ERA: FINAL REPORT OF THE JUSTICES OF AMHERST MUNICIPAL COURT

(Taken from Amherst Town Report)

After some 14 years during which the great wheels of justice ground relentlessly onward, implemented to some degree by the Amherst municipal court, the Governor in his great and inscrutable wisdom, aided and abetted by the great and General Court of New Hampshire, has seen fit to render any municipal court system of this State passé. On July 1, 1964, the Amherst municipal court ceased to exist, its functions having been assumed by the district court. It is therefore fitting and proper that the justices, relieved of the necessity of maintaining the judicial demeanor, render their final report in such form as they jolly well choose, with the full knowledge that since they can't have their names carved in granite on the courthouse cornerstone, because there is no more court, this report will be their final hour.

Over the years there have been the usual run of transient breaches of the peace, such as motorists who made the mistake of being found in charge of motor vehicles while three sheets to the wind, a large number of people who took route 101 to be a drag strip, those who understood stop signs were for other people, and to those who took the position that their cars just couldn't go that fast. These cases contain nothing novel or interesting.

However, there have been a few moments of heightened interest, moments that can now be revealed without suffering the penalties of slander, lack of judicial demeanor and the like. Therefore, this report will concern itself with those matters, the likes of which may never be repeated, and unless set down for posterity herein, may very well pass into oblivion unheralded.

There was the woman who for several months running complained violently to all law enforcement agencies about the unreasonable and dangerous speeders on the Mont Vernon Road. These complaints became so bothersome that the State police set out a roadblock just to keep this lady off their backs. The net result of the roadblock was that the lady who made all the fuss was herself picked up for unreasonable speed driving to the post office, and to crown the lily, was picked up 15 minutes later for the same offense on her return trip. She has since moved from town.

Then there were several so-called domestic matters, in which the wife, bloody and shaken, brought charges against her husband because she just couldn't take any more. Without exception, these matters were dismissed because upon hearing, the sole witness testifying in favor of the erring husband, was the complainant wife.

Then there was the case involving complicated issues of conflict of laws. In this case, a chickenhouse, on the Amherst-Milford town line, was the scene of cockerel carnage such as has never been seen since. It seems some animal frightened the chickens on the first floor of the chickenhouse. They ran from the Milford end to the Amherst end of the house and proceeded to expire there in great numbers. The fracas caused by this activity, frightened the chickens on the second floor of the chickenhouse and they ran to the Milford end of the chickenhouse where they in turn undertook to die in equally vast numbers. The problem arose over which town should pay for the dog damage thus arising. The town of Milford took the position that the first floor hens died in Amherst, the damage was therefore done there, so Amherst should pay. Amherst took the position that the fuss started in the

Milford end, and anyway, the second floor chickens, though they started their flight in Amherst, nevertheless died in the Milford end, and therefore Milford should pay. Though this created an impasse, someone inquired whether the damage was originally caused by an errant dog, or whether it was caused by some extraneous element, like a skunk or a fox (a taxpayer in neither town) rather than a dog, and as far as your justices know, the matter is still "under advisement."

Nor was the courtroom itself devoid of drama. At various times the court has witnessed the collapse of a chair under the weight of a State trooper, the justice got the zipper on his gown caught in his tie and sat out an entire session thus involved, with the tie hanging out like the tongue of a Saint Bernard and during a conference "in chambers" (the kitchen of the town hall) counsel for the respondent was so taken with the leftovers of the school lunch program that serious question was raised about his eating habits.

Aside from the foregoing, and occasional conflicts with the ways and means committee over who had priority in the courtroom—the court or the committee—the time the grange whist night refreshment committee raised a hue and cry over a man the State police had handcuffed to a column in the dining room for safekeeping, things proceeded with reasonable aplomb over the years.

However, vestiges of the Amherst municipal court remain; nobody knows what to do with the pile of old complaints and warrants accumulated over 14 years, and nobody has the courage to throw them away. Perhaps in the distant future, some archeologist, digging in the remains of Amherst, will unearth these artifacts and in learned conference with his colleagues, come to the conclusion that ours was a strange era—nobody threw anything away.

CHARLES J. LINCOLN,
Justice.

[From Time, Mar. 26, 1965]

LEST THE WORLD FORGET

Judicial reform in New Hampshire has done away with the State's many little municipal courts. But Amherst Justice Charles L. Lincoln was worried lest the world forget the drama that took place in his courtroom. Thus, the highlights of 14 years are immortalized in his final report to the town (population 2,501).

"At various times," the judge recalls, "the court has witnesed the collapse of a chair under the weight of a State trooper," while "the justice got the zipper on his gown caught in his tie and sat out an entire session thus involved, with the tie hanging out like the tongue of a Saint Bernard." The court, of course, had some serious cases, not the least of which involved a woman who complained violently about speeding on Mount Vernon Road. When State troopers finally set up a roadblock, "the lady who made all the fuss was herself picked up for unreasonable speed driving to the post office, and to crown the lily, was picked up 15 minutes later on her return trip. She has since left town."

Amherst's judicial landmark was a famous conflict-of-laws case involving a chickenhouse that happened to straddle the Amherst-Milford town line. When some prowling animal frightened the chickens on the first floor, "they ran from the Milford end to the Amherst end of the house and proceeded to expire there in great numbers. The fracas caused by this activity frightened the chickens on the second floor of the chickenhouse, and they ran to the Milford end of the chickenhouse where they in turn undertook to die in equally vast numbers."

Who was liable for damages? "The town of Milford took the position that the first floor hens died in Amherst, the damage was therefore done there, so Amherst should pay. Amherst took the position that the fuss started in the Milford end and, anyway, the second floor chickens though they started their flight in Amherst, nevertheless died in the Milford end, and therefore Milford should pay."

In the end, no one paid. Blame was laid to "some extraneous element like a skunk or a fox (a taxpayer in neither town) rather than a dog, and as far as your justices know, the matter is still 'under advisement.'" So is just about everything else. "Nobody knows what to do with the pile of old complaints and warrants accumulated over 14 years, and nobody has the courage to throw them away." They will doubtless endure for the delight of "some archeologist digging in the remains of Amherst. As for himself, says Justice Lincoln, it feels great to be "relieved of the necessity of maintaining the judicial demeanor."

Soil Conservation Service, Conservation Application in Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR CALLAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, conservation is a big word. It covers a lot of ground. When we talk of soil and water conservation we are referring to many things—for conservation is not merely protecting land and water from misuse, or holding it for future use. These are part of land and water conservation, but by no means all.

Conservation is, essentially, using the land and water resources to their best advantage on a long-term basis. Conservation planning looks far into the future, anticipates needs and attempts to foresee problems that sound conservation practices—established now and faithfully carried forward—can prevent. Conservation relies on a thorough understanding of the land and water resources—their potential if respected, and the extent of the loss if they are neglected or ill-used.

Conservation is a complex business, involving many sciences and many practices. Nebraska is involved in most of them.

Soil conservation district cooperators in Nebraska, during fiscal year 1964, built 1,455 farm ponds for a total of some 18,000, seeded 38,945 acres of cropland to pasture, developed 783 acres for wildlife habitat, preserved 1,072 acres for wildlife wetland, and planted 3,835 acres to trees. Conservation cropping systems were applied on 49,176 acres in fiscal 1964, bringing the State's total on the land under conservation rotations to 8,501,547 acres.

Contour farming has been completed on 3 million acres in Nebraska, and 127,000 miles of terracing have been installed throughout the State.

Nearly 46,000 cooperators in Nebraska's 87 soil conservation districts have developed basic conservation plans on 18,800,000 acres of land. Farm and ranch conservation plans are fully applied on 12,250,000 acres. Construction of floodwater retarding structures has grown to an estimated two and a quarter million dollars for fiscal year 1965.

As a result of outstanding local leadership, local tax money amounting to $133,000 is provided in 69 counties to assist local districts in fiscal 1965. At the State level, the Nebraska Legislature appropriated $394,000 for soil and water conservation work in the current fiscal year.

The efforts to build a sound program of soil and water conservation in Nebraska, and the support these efforts have received, attest to the recognized importance of this endeavor at the local, State, and national levels of our society. In Nebraska, as elsewhere, the programs must continue to build if it is to adequately serve the needs of the State and the Nation.

The Future of the FBI

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER S. BARING
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Cincinnati Enquirer on April 7, 1965, concerning legislation I introduced in this Congress, H.R. 3414, providing that future directors of the FBI be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate and that they be drawn from those who have served for at least 10 years as members of the FBI:

THE FUTURE OF THE FBI

J. Edgar Hoover, longtime Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, is getting no younger. And despite the high esteem in which he continues to be held, despite the demonstrated confidence of seven Presidents, it is obvious that he cannot direct the work of the FBI forever. Ultimately he will retire.

The task of finding a successor of comparable stature and talent will not be an easy one. But the crucial nature of the FBI demands that its directorship not become a political plum to reward one of the faithful of either party.

Toward that end, Representative WALTER S. BARING, Democrat, of Nevada, has sponsored a measure (H.R. 3414) to provide that future directors of the FBI be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate and that they be drawn from those who have served for at least 10 years as members of the FBI.

The Baring bill would preclude a frankly political appointment to the FBI directorship. It would also preclude the selection of an outsider unacquainted with the traditions and responsibilities of the Nation's most highly honored and respected Federal agency.

In the course of its history, the FBI has accumulated more information about more Americans than any other institution—public or private—in the Nation. In responsible hands—like those of Mr. Hoover and his colleagues—this information is properly used. In less responsible hands, the FBI's archives could become a weapon capable of unlimited mischief.

The House Judiciary Committee, to which the Baring bill has been referred for several sessions of Congress, has shown no disposition thus far to act on it or to give the full House of Representatives an opportunity to act. The bill's purpose, we think, is too significant to make further procrastination wise or desirable.

"Take a Billion or I'll Brain You"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the aftermath of President Johnson's major foreign policy speech on Vietnam, a proper interpretation of the new position is in order.

The Chicago Tribune, in a most practical editorial of Friday, April 9, questions the wisdom and practicality of the President's proposal, both in its philosophy as well as the potential costs.

I personally feel that the President's address was an international farce and since the Tribune's editorial so effectively analyzes the speech, I place it in the RECORD at this point:

"TAKE A BILLION OR I'LL BRAIN YOU"

Mr. Johnson's speech was a curious concoction. He started out talking about the war in Vietnam. He wound up talking about the "war on poverty," which in this particular context began to assume global dimensions, with an offer of $1 billion to put TVA's and REA's in southeast Asia.

The first part of Mr. Johnson's address was a commendable expression of American resolution. He said the United States would not flag in the fight to keep South Vietnam out of the hands of the Communists and that there would be no defeat, retreat, or withdrawal. He had some harsh remarks about Red China's activity in goading on Communist North Vietnam's aggression.

The President did not try to sugar-coat the fact that the American response had toughened recently, with heavy air attacks into Communist territory above the 17th parallel. We have power, he said, and "we will use it."

This is the kind of language Communists can understand—probably the only kind they can understand. Mr. Johnson seemed to offer assurance that he had not been sucked in by the propaganda of the commentators and clergymen and professors and certain of his own party followers that appeasement was the only course and that we should cut and run once more.

But then the President shifted gears and offered "unconditional discussions" toward a negotiated settlement. There were no preconditions. He did not ask the Communists first to call off their war or disavow their purpose, which is conquest.

Then came the usual salvationist content we may expect in any Johnson speech. He saw the lions and the lambs lying down together in southeast Asia. As an enticement to peaceful reconciliation, the billion dollars in prospective aid was dangled in front of the good people and the villains alike, while Mr. Johnson dwelt fondly on the wonder-working gimmicks of the New Deal and the Great Society, which could be transported to lands halfway around the world.

A Tennessee Valley Authority along the Mekong River would rise with the help of Mr. Johnson's billion, and an Asian Rural Electrification Administration would light the darkness.

Some Republican skeptics, and even a Democrat or two, said baldly that this was an overture to buy peace and that it would not work. In fact, if war is to be the preliminary to massive infusions of American foreign aid, the proposal might prove to be less of an incentive to peace than an encouragement to further wars in other regions just as backward and poverty stricken as southeast Asia. If war earns a ticket on the gravy train, why not a little shooting to attract bighearted Lyndon's interest?

We are not aware that history offers a single instance to demonstrate that the Johnson formula of a purchased peace has ever bought off an invader. When the Ottoman Turks turned up at the gates of Vienna, they were not turned back by a promise from the defenders, "Go home and we will reward you with a shipload of shish kebab." Nor did Charles Martel deal with the Moors by taking the field at Tours with an offer of a few fat bucks if they'd just retire across the Pyrenees.

Mr. Johnson will discover that the way to deal with Communist imperialism is by showing a good left hook and a strong right cross, not by riffling bills like a bank teller in his cage.

A Builder Goes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few minutes today to pay tribute to the late A. D. Brochman, from my hometown of Kingsport, Tenn., who was a good friend and neighbor of mine. The memory of Mr. Brockman, one of the pioneer builders of Kingsport, will linger on and on in the hearts of the people of this great city. Love and devotion for its progress was always uppermost in his thoughts, and he truly aided in Kingsport's growth.

Mr. Brockman was a great American, a man who was greatly admired and highly respected by all who knew him. It is with respect that I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the Friday, April 9, Kingsport Times editorial which points out many fine things about his career:

[From the Kingsport Times, Apr. 9, 1965]

A BUILDER GOES

Albert Davis Brockman, who has just passed from the scene in Kingsport leaves behind him a shrinking number of people who remember his great services to his city. Illness had forced him into semiretirement for some years during which he watched others carry on the work.

His service was many-sided but his biggest contribution was to the educational system here. The men who planned and built Kingsport were clearly aware of the fact that one of the cornerstones of any progressive city must be its school systems. They did not fail to see how much the future depended on a strong modern system. And much depended on the school board which would take this work in charge.

Albert—or "A. D." as he was called—became the chairman of that board in the early years and for many years thereafter his life was divided into three parts. There was his work with the schools; his work as a banker; and his private life. And it was said of him that the first became the most important to him. He had time for other things, such as serving his church and serving as president of the Kiwanis Club, and other activities; but his heart was in the schools.

We need not say how well he and his colleagues did the work. It was an ever-expanding job as the city grew and more and more children needed more and more schools. There were problems, especially during the days of the depression. But it is no accident that time after time surveys and checks by national educational groups not only gave Kingsport schools a clean bill of health but high rating.

If we are proud of our schools today—and we may well be proud—it is because they were built on sound foundations through the dedicated services of a group of men, one of the principal ones being A. D. Brockman.

Oddly enough, like so many others of the early builders "Brock" was no tooter of his own horn. If he ever made a public speech we never heard of it. He did his work without fanfare and with no thought of reward or credit. He was that sort of man.

But it is time to give credit. Some time ago in this column we suggested that the next time the city of Kingsport had a school to name, it should carry the name of Albert Davis Brockman. We repeat that suggestion now. It is the lease we can do to recognize the long years of service this man gave the city and its schools.

President Has Given Reds a Clear and Vital Choice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD FULTON
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, among those who have joined in commendation of President Johnson's foreign policy speech at Baltimore is the Nashville Tennessean.

In an editorial, "President Has Given Reds a Clear and Vital Choice," published April 8, 1965, the Nashville Tennesean stated that what President Johnson is seeking is "to make clear to the Communists in Hanoi there is a choice and to advance a cautious and ticklish effort to broaden the approach on South Vietnam and thereby to improve the U.S. position with respect to its allies and the uncommitted world."

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include this editorial in the RECORD and commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

[From the Nashville (Tenn.) Tennessean, Apr. 8, 1965]

PRESIDENT HAS GIVEN REDS A CLEAR AND VITAL CHOICE

In his major foreign policy address to the Nation last night, President Johnson told the world there will be no retreat in Vietnam, but he said that in the interests of peace the United States stand ready to talk without imposing any preconditions.

With one sentence, the Chief Executive has disarmed critics at home and abroad who have argued that the United States has been dogmatic on its terms for discussion of the war; and imprecise on what preconditions might be asked. Heretofore, the Johnson administration has insisted that Hanoi must leave its neighbors alone before there could be any talks.

Some among the 17 nonaligned nations which have urged both sides to talk over the problem have complained that the positions of both have been too rigid. No one can now accuse the United States of rigidity, or of closing doors to mediation efforts.

President Johnson has taken his concern for peace a step further by calling for a "massive effort to improve the life of man" in southeast Asia. He urged U.N. Secretary General U Thant to "use the prestige of his office—and his deep knowledge of Asia—to initiate with the countries of the area, a plan for cooperation in increased development." And he said he would ask Congress for $1 billion as an American investment in the effort, once it is underway.

Although conciliatory in tone, President Johnson made it clear the United States is not suing for peace; that its will and determination is strong as ever. In ringing tones, the Chief Executive said:

"We will not be defeated. We will not grow tired. We will not withdraw, either openly or under the cloak of meaningless agreement." Commenting that the United States has no desire to see thousands of Asians or Americans die in battle, and no desire to devastate North Vietnam, the President went on to say that "We will use our power with restraint and with all the wisdom we can command, but we will use it."

Although the President has proffered the opportunity for talks without conditions imposed, there was no great comfort to Hanoi in any "peace at any price" implication. For the kind of peace the President has in mind was clearly stated: "an independent South Vietnam—securely guaranteed and able to shape its own relationships to all others—free from outside interference—tied to no alliance—and a military base for no other country."

What the President obviously sought to do in his address was to make clear to the Communists in Hanoi there is a choice and to advance a cautious and ticklish effort to broaden the approach on South Vietnam and thereby to improve the U.S. position with respect to its allies and the uncommitted world.

President Johnson's speech marks a subtle shift, not in U.S. objectives or policy in Vietnam but in the realm of diplomacy. The President is, in effect, trying to escalate diplomacy into a wider and more clearly understood effort for peace and order, and to bring into concert a kind of world diplomacy for peace.

So far, Hanoi and Communist China have shown not the slightest indication of wanting to talk peace. In fact, in the past day or two there has been a noticeable hardening of the Hanoi line. But if the Communists want to risk the peril of widening the war more, it is essential this country be on record as seeking peace and the betterment of man and making sure its motives are not misunderstood by the world.

The United States has made it implicitly clear to Hanoi—as well as Peiping and Moscow—that southeast Asia has the choice of bombs and bullets or the prospect of the better life. The Communists must now choose. Whatever their choice may be, neither they nor the world can now say that the United States has left no alternative to bloody conflict.

Political Science Seminars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable KEN HECHLER, of West Virginia, on Monday evening, April 5, led a discussion on "Congress and the Presidency" as part of a series of seminars for primary and secondary teachers of social studies in Arlington County, Va., schools.

Cosponsored by the county school system's division of instruction and the American Political Science Association, this unique program is bringing outstanding leaders from the legislative and executive branches of Government, political scientists, and other experts in the field of public affairs to Stratford Junior High School for a series of eight discussion meetings with about 45 teachers of civics, geography, and history. According to the distinguished APSA executive director, Dr. Evron M. Kirkpatrick, the program is a part of a continuing association effort to improve the quality of teaching about government and public affairs at the grade and high school levels.

Himself a former university teacher, Representative HECHLER made a significant contribution to this important program, and I am advised the association hopes to organize comparable programs elsewhere in the Nation. I am pleased that a school system in my district is participating in this innovative educational experience.

Under unanimous consent, I include the entire program, "Political Science and the Social Studies," in the RECORD so that my colleagues in the House may bring it to the attention of school officials in their districts:

THE ELECTORAL PROCESS

Monday, March 29, 1965: An analysis of the process and the relationship between political, economic, geographic and social factors of the electorate.

Richard M. Scammon: Director of the elections research center of the Governmental Affairs Institute. Mr. Scammon is a former Director of the Bureau of the Census, and the editor of America Votes.

Bibliography

David, Paul T., Goldman, Ralph M., Bain, Richard C., "The Politics of National Party Conventions," Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C., 1960 (paperback).

Polsby, Nelson W., and Wildavsky, Aaron, "Presidential Elections," Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1964 (paperback).

Campbell, Angus, Converse, Phillip, Miller, Warren, Stokes, Donald, "The American Voter," Wiley, New York, 1964 (abridged paperback edition).

Key, V. O., "Public Opinion and American Democracy," Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1961.

White, Theodore, "The Making of the President, 1960," Pocket Books, Inc., 1961 (paperback).

Heard, Alexander, "The Cost of Democracy," University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill, 1960 (paperback).

THE CONGRESS AND THE PRESIDENCY

Monday, April 5, 1965: A discussion of the role of the Presidency and the Congress in the system of checks and balances.

Representative KEN HECHLER: A former professor of political science at Marshall University who has also served as associate director of the American Political Science Association and aid to President Truman, Dr. HECHLER is now serving his fourth term as the Congressman from the Fourth District of West Virginia.

Bibliography

Binkly, Wilfred E., "President and Congress," Vintage Books, New York, 1962 (paperback).

Polsby, Nelson W., "Congress and the Presidency," Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, 1964 (paperback).

MILLER, CLEM, Member of the House, "Letters of a Congressman," Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1962 (paperback).

Peabody, Robert, Polsby, Nelson (editors), "New Perspective in the House of Representatives," Rand McNally, Chicago, 1963 (paperback).

Neustadt, Richard, "Presidential Power," John Wiley, New York, 1960 (paperback).

Rossiter, Clinton, "The American Presidency," Harcourt, Brace & World Harvest Books, New York, 1960 (paperback).

Bailey, Stephen K., "Congress Makes a Law," Columbia University Press, New York, 1950 (paperback).

Burns, James M., "The Deadlock of Democracy," Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, 1963 (paperback).

POLITICAL PARTIES

Monday, April 12, 1965: An examination of the two-party system in action.

William B. Prendergast: Presently the research director of the Republican conference of the House of Representatives, and minority Sergeant at Arms of the House. Dr. Prendergast is a former research director of the Republican National Committee. He is coauthor of "The States and Subversion."

Bibliography

Key, V. O., "Parties, Politics, and Pressure Groups," fourth edition, Thomas Crowell, New York, 1958.

Greenstein, Fred I., "The American Party System and the American People," Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, 1963 (paperback).

Herring, Pendleton, "The Politics of Democracy," Rinehart, New York, 1940.

Munger, Frank, and Price, Hugh Douglas, editors, "Readings in Political Parties and Pressure Groups," Crowell, New York, 1964 (paperback).

Lipsit, Seymour Martin, "Political Man," Anchor Books, New York, 1960 (paperback).

THE JUDICIAL PROCESS

Monday, April 26, 1965: An analysis of judicial decision-making.

Max Kampelman: Mr. Kampelman, Washington attorney and the treasurer of the American Political Science Association, is a holder of a law degree from New York University, and a doctorate in political science from the University of Minnesota. Mr. Kampelman is the author of "The Communist Party in the CIO: A Study in Power Politics," and was legislative consultant to the then Senator HUMPHREY from 1948 to 1955.

Bibliography

Cushman, Robert, "Leading Constitutional Decisions," 12th edition, Appleton, Century, Crofts, New York (paperback).

Swisher, Carl B., "The Growth of Constitutional Power in the United States," Uni-

versity of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1963 (paperback).

Hyneman, Charles S., "The Supreme Court on Trial," Prentice Hall, New York, 1963.

Murphy, Walter, "Congress and the Court," University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1962.

Lewis, Anthony, "Gideon's Trumpet," Random House, New York, 1964.

Taper, Bernard, "Gomillion versus Lightfoot: The Tuskegee Gerrymander Case," McGraw-Hill, New York, 1962 (paperback).

Westin, Alan F., "The Supreme Court: Views from the Inside," W. W. Norton & Co., New York, 1961 (paperback).

Mason, Alpheus T., Brandeis: A Free Man's Life," the Viking Press, New York, 1946.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Monday, May 3, 1965: An examination of urban problems and proposals for dealing with them.

Norman Beckman: The assistant director of Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. Dr. Beckman is an expert in metropolitan affairs. Among recent topics he has written on are: "Our Federal System and Urban Development: Adaptation of Forum to Function," and "The Planner as a Bureaucrat."

Bibliography

Graves, W. Brooke, "American Intergovernmental Relations," Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1964.

Adrian, Charles R., "Governing Urban America," McGraw-Hill, New York, 1961.

Jacobs, Jane, "The Death and Life of Great American Cities," Random House, New York, 1961 (paperback).

Greer, Scott, "Governing the Metropolis," John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1962 (paperback).

Sayre, Wallace S., and Kaufman, Herbert, "Governing New York," Russell Sage Foundation, New York, 1960.

Dahl, Robert A., "Who Governs?—Democracy and Power in an American City," Yale University Press, New Haven, 1961 (paperback).

FOREIGN POLICY AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Monday, May 10, 1965: A discussion of the present situation and future trends in the conduct of international affairs.

H. Field Haviland: The director of foreign policy studies for the Brookings Institution. Dr. Haviland is a former professor at Haverford College and the author of a number of significant works in the area of international relations, including "The Political Role of the General Assembly and Organizing for Peace."

Bibliography

Morgenthau, Hans J., "Politics Among Nations," third edition, Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1962.

Kissinger, Henry, "The Necessity for Choice," Anchor Books, New York, 1962 (paperback); "Nuclear Weapons and Foreign Policy," Anchor Books, New York (paperback).

Claude, Inis L., Jr., "Power and International Relations," Random House, New York, 1962; "Swords Into Plowshares," third edition, Random House, New York, 1964.

Cohen, Bernard C., "The Political Process and Foreign Policy," Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1953.

Westerfield, H. Bradford, "Foreign Policy and Party Politics," Yale University Press, New Haven, 1955.

ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT

Monday, May 17, 1965: An examination of the problems of organization and management in the Federal Establishment.

Harold Seidman: The present Director of the Office of Management and Organization of the Bureau of the Budget, Dr. Seidman is the author of "The Government Corporation."

Bibliography

Pfiffner, John M., and Presthas, R. Vance, "Public Administration," Ronald Press, New York, 1953.

Simon, Herbert A., Smithburg, Donald, Thompson, Victor, "Public Administration," New York, 1950.

Millett, John D., "Government and Public Administration," McGraw-Hill Book Co., New York, 1959.

Fenno, Richard, "The President's Cabinet," Vintage Books, New York, 1959 (paperback).

Wildavsky, Aaron, "Dixon Yates: A Study in Power Politics," Yale University Press, New Haven, 1962.

Wallace, Robert, "Congressional Control of Federal Spending," Wayne State University Press, Detroit, 1960.

Snow, C. P., "Science and Government," Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1961 (paperback).

POLITICAL SCIENCE AND THE SOCIAL STUDIES

Monday, May 24, 1965: An analysis of the teaching of social studies at the elementary and secondary school levels, and the potential contribution of the discipline of political science.

Evron M. Kirkpatrick: Dr. Kirkpatrick is the executive director of the American Political Science Association. A former member of the University of Minnesota faculty, he is the coauthor of a number of works including: "Elections—U.S.A. and High School Social Studies Perspectives."

Bibliography

Ranney, Austin, editor, "Essays on the Behavioral Study of Politics," University of Illinois Press, Urbana, 1962.

Kirkpatrick, Evron M., and Kirkpatrick, Jeane J., "Political Science," in "High School Social Studies Perspectives," Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston, 1962 (paperback).

Van Dyke, Vernon, "Political Science: A Philosophical Analysis," Stanford University Press, Stanford, 1950.

Hyneman, Charles S., "The Study of Politics: The Present State of American Political Science," University of Illinois, Urbana, 1959.

Young, Roland, "Approaches to the Study of Politics," Northwestern University Press, Evanston, Ill., 1958 (paperback).

Agricultural Research Stations, Supporting Continuation of Programs (S. Rept. No. 156)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MASTON O'NEAL
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it was with considerable reassurance and revival of optimism that I read the report last week of the Committee on Appropriations emanating from the other body.

The report is thorough and bears evidence of meticulous study. It also reveals an unmistakable sign of good judgment in opposing the elimination of many long-term agricultural research stations.

While I commend Senator SPESSARD HOLLAND and his colleagues for the entire report, I am especially interested in four items that vitally affect the farmers of my district, and I would like to bring those to the attention of my colleagues by giving them emphasis here as follows:

5. Elimination of research on tung (Cairo, Ga., Bougalusa, La., and Beltsville, Md.), $221,300: The committee recommends that the production research on tung be continued indefinitely at an annual expenditure of $221,300. The production of tung is regional in nature and the hearing record shows that on the average only 50 percent of our domestic requirements of tung is met by U.S. production. In order to step up domestic production of tung, the research program should be continued to cope with various problems of cold resistance, cultural, nutritional, harvesting, and related problems of production.

7. Elimination of research on sugar sorghum (Cairo and Experiment, Ga., Beltsville, Md., and Meridian, Miss.), $75,200: The committee recommends the indefinite continuance of research on sugar sorghum at an annual rate of $75,200. Sorghum is produced in 29 States as silage, sirup, or as a molasses crop. The farm value of the crop is estimated at $80 million. Due to the wide area of production and the need for continuing research, there appears to be little basis for proposing to discontinue this line of research which is effectively conducted at a low rate of expenditure in relation to the value of the crops produced.

8. Elimination of research on rye (Tifton, Ga., Beltsville, Md., and Stillwater, Okla.), $39,800: The committee recommends that the insect research on rye be continued. The annual expenditure is $39,800 and the results apply throughout the rye-producing area. Production of rye has increased over the past 16 years both for forage and grain purposes. Rye is now produced in 31 States with an estimated farm value in excess of $35 million annually.

15. Florida: Quincy—Tobacco insects, $24,400: The committee recommends that the research on tobacco insects located at Quincy, Fla., at an annual expenditure of $24,400, be continued indefinitely.

The demand for wrapper leaf type of tobacco currently exceeds the available supply. The total producer return from this type of tobacco averages $48 million annually and this type of tobacco does not receive any Government price support. This expenditure of $24,400 annually is the only Government program assistance on the shade-grown type of tobacco.

It is obvious that the decision to propose discontinuance of this research project was arrived at hastily, and the alternate proposal to continue the research activity on these particular insect problems at a location several hundred miles distant under so-called controlled conditions does not meet with the concurrence of the committee.

If it is the current and general view of scientific leadership in the Department that research investigations at field locations should be abandoned in favor of controlled environmental research chambers for the conduct of farm research, the committee will need a good deal more justification from the Department before it concurs in such a basic and major change in the conduct of farm research investigations.

Smithsonian Institution Exhibition Series as Outlined by Dr. S. Dillon Ripley, Secretary, Before the Interior Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, 200 years ago in our Nation's history, there were

occurring significant events that would culminate in the American Revolution.

It is interesting to note that the year 1965 is also the 200th anniversary of the birth of James Smithson, distinguished Englishman and great benefactor of the Smithsonian Institution which bears his name. The spring of 1965 also marks the bicentennial of the Virginia resolves, drafted by Patrick Henry, which played such an important part in bringing about the Stamp Act Congress which would be held in the colony of New York in the fall of 1765.

I think it is most appropriate that the Smithsonian Institution plans a series of exhibits at the National Museum, and I would like to insert in the RECORD a tentative schedule of these exhibits as outlined by Dr. S. Dillon Ripley, the Secretary, in recent hearings before the Interior Subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, with explanatory preliminary comment excerpted from the hearings, as follows:

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTE EXHIBITION SERIES AS OUTLINED BY DR. S. DILLON RIPLEY, SECRETARY, BEFORE THE INTERIOR SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MARSH. Now, in light of Smithson's interest in American history and the efforts of the museum to depict the history of the American people, which I think is one of your fundamental objectives, what efforts are you directing toward commemoration of what many historians consider to be the bicentennial of American ideas, the formative 12 years that would precede the signing of the Declaration of Independence, or Concord Bridge, frequently referred to as the golden years of the American Revolution?

What efforts are you making to observe these bicentennial events at the present time?

For example, the Stamp Act Congress, which met in September 1765, the same month as the birth of Smithson?

Dr. RIPLEY. We have a committee working on the commemoration and celebrations, and I will have to ask them what they are planning to do about this aspect.

Mr. MARSH. Don't you think it would be quite appropriate to begin to focus attention now on the issues, events, and the history of the preconflict era?

Dr. RIPLEY. I do, indeed. I know we have members of our staff who are part of these committees. There have been one or two committees formed to commemorate these particular events, I believe.

Mr. MARSH. Can you make some sort of display in the museum? For example, this spring marks the 200th anniversary of the Virginia Resolves, which precipitated the Stamp Act Congress.

Dr. RIPLEY. It may be we are managing that. We have an active Department of Political History. I will have to ask them.

Mr. MARSH. There is no question in my mind but what we are going to reenact the battles of the American Revolution, including Concord Bridge, and there will be the pageantry and drama, and people will leave the reenactment and some child will ask why did they fire the shot at Concord Bridge, and I think we will realize the bicentenntial of ideas has passed us by.

It seems to me our agency is in a particular position to influence American historical thought and a scholarly examination of these causes and issues that occurred during this period, which actually, as Toynbee said, reflect into the 20th century.

Dr. RIPLEY. Right.

Mr. MARSH. Can you devote some attention to that?

Dr. RIPLEY. I would be happy to put something in the RECORD on what we are doing in this regard.

THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION'S BICENTENNIAL CELEBRATIONS OF EVENTS OF NATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE, 1765–1775, INCLUSIVE

TENTATIVE SCHEDULE

The next 10 years will recall many significant episodes in our country's history preceding the Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1776. It is appropriate that the most outstanding of these that are of national importance be noted in bicentennial commemorations, which will be observed at the Smithsonian Institution by temporary exhibits. For all of these we can display material already in the national collections, supplemented occasionally by loans from public and private donors.

The tentative schedule of historic events, to be celebrated between May 29, 1965, and October 13, 1975, is as follows:

1. Virginia resolutions, May 29, 1765.—Introduced into the Virginia House of Burgesses by Patrick Henry, they represented the first articulate outcry of opposition to the Stamp Act. The resolutions maintained that the General Assembly of Virginia had the sole and exclusive right to levy taxes on the inhabitants of Virginia. During arguments over the Virginia resolutions, Henry delivered his famous "Treason" speech. Henry's Virginia resolutions set the spark which led to the Stamp Act Congress on October 7, 1765.

The exhibit will include the well-known contemporary engraving of Henry's speech in the Virginia House of Burgesses, an actual British revenue stamp of 1765, Patrick Henry commemorative postage stamp, and cultural items referring to Virginia in this period.

2. Stamp Act Congress, October 7, 1765.—The Stamp Act Congress, which began on October 7, 1765, in New York, was represented by members from nine of the colonies, including Pennsylvania, Connecticut, South Carolina, Rhode Island, Maryland, Massachusetts, Delaware, New York, and New Jersey. Reaffirming the earlier arguments of Patrick Henry and others, the Congress maintained that the colonies had the sole right to tax themselves. Petitions demanding repeal of the Stamp Act were prepared for submission to the King, the House of Commons, and the House of Lords.

The exhibit will include material comparable to the preceding, plus a William Pitt halfpenny, a rare William Pitt medallion, and cultural items referring to the nine colonies represented at the Congress.

3. Repeal of the Stamp Act, March 18, 1766.—After nearly a year of intense opposition to the Stamp Act by the American colonies, aided within the British Parliament by the Whigs, the Stamp Act was finally repealed, effective May 1, 1766. The Stamp Act was eloquently opposed before Parliament by Benjamin Franklin, acting as agent for Pennsylvania.

The exhibit will include items associated with Benjamin Franklin, contemporary prints, material referring to Parliament in 1766, and Franklin philatelic specimens.

4. Daniel Boone and opening of the West, 1769.—Daniel Boone explored Kentucky and opened the way for westward expansion in 1769. Four years later, in 1773, Colonel Boone and his family, with five other families, begin the settlement of Kentucky.

The exhibit will include original Boone material, cultural items associated with Kentucky, maps and prints referring to areas involved, and related military specimens.

5. Boston Massacre, March 5, 1770.—Protesting the posting of British troops in Boston, a fray took place in Boston between a private soldier of the 29th regiment and an inhabitant on March 2. On the 5th, the soldiers were pressed upon and in resentment fired upon the crowd. Three of the Bostonians were killed and five seriously wounded.

The exhibit will include the rare Paul Revere engraving of the massacre, Revere silver and other items, military paraphernalia, artifacts related to Boston of this period, both tory and rebel.

6. Boston Tea Party, December 16, 1773.—The Bostonians objected to the British insistence upon taxes by opposing the unloading of a cargo of tea, subject to duty, from an East India Co. ship. The vessel was boarded by a group of patriots who emptied several thousand pounds of tea into the harbor.

The exhibit will include a few leaves of the actual tea that escaped immersion, appropriate contemporary prints, tea-drinking paraphernalia, material pertaining to naval architecture of the period.

7. First Continental Congress, September 5, 1774.—On September 5, 1774, the First Continental Congress assembled in Carpenter's Hall in Philadelphia, to "consult upon the present unhappy state of the Colonies." The Continental Congress was represented by delegations from every colony except Georgia. The purpose of the Congress was to attempt to resolve the differences between the American Colonies and the British Parliament.

The exhibit will include material relating to Carpenter's Hall, the city of Philadelphia in the 1707's, commemorative philatelic items, and personal memorabilia of several of the delegates (John Adams, Thomas Hancock, Charles Thompson, etc.)

8. Second Revolutionary Convention, March 23, 1775.—In a speech at St. John's Episcopal Church, Richmond, Va., Patrick Henry, urging strong colonial defense, used the famous phrase "Give me liberty or give me death."

The exhibit will include Patrick Henry items, prints, material associated with early Richmond, and related political items.

9. Paul Revere's Ride, April 18–19, 1775.—Official courier of the Massachusetts Provincial Assembly and Committee of Correspondence, his famous ride was from Charlestown to Lexington on April 18, 1775, to announce the approach of the British troops. This was the basis for Longfellow's poem, "The Midnight Ride of Paul Revere."

Battle of Lexington and Concord, April 19, 1775.—General Gagè, the King's Governor of Massachusetts, detached a body of 800 men to march to Concord and destroy the military stores collected by the Americans at that place. The first battle of the Revolution ensued, which began the contest which dismembered the British Empire and ended in the establishment of independence in our own country.

The exhibit will include appropriate military items, cultural historical items concerned with the Boston, Concord, and Lexington areas, maps, photographs, Longfellow material, and Paul Revere items.

10. Battle of Ticonderoga, May 10, 1775.—Col. Ethan Allen seized the important fortress of Ticonderoga with 230 gallant Green Mountain Bays of Vermont. With the aid of Benedict Arnold he led a surprise attack against the British.

The exhibit will include appropriate military and cultural material, Vermont items, and Benedict Arnold and Allen memorabilia.

11. Battle of Bunker Hill, June 17, 1775.—The Battle of Bunker Hill, fought outside Boston, was one of the most famous battles of the Revolutionary War, and fired the colonists to further acts of heroism in their battle for independence from Britain. Badly outnumbered, and short of ammunition, Massachusetts militiamen fought off successive waves of battle-trained British soldiers. Though Bunker Hill was lost to the British, it cost them dearly, and they soon retreated from Boston, giving the American troops one of the greatest moral victories of the war.

The exhibit will include, in addition to appropriate military and cultural material, items related to the Bunker Hill monument and its dedication, and Boston topography.

12. Mecklemburg Declaration of Independence, May 20, 1775.—Adopted by a convention in Mecklemburg County, N.C., and sent to the North Carolina delegation at Philadelphia, this declaration declared all laws and commissions deriving their authority from the Crown to be annulled.

The exhibit will include cultural material from North Carolina.

13. The U.S. Navy.—On September 2, 1775, Washington authorized Col. John Glover to convert fishing vessels into armed ships. In Congress a committee was appointed on October 5 to prepare attacks against British vessels. "Rules for the Regulation of the Navy of the United Colonies" were adopted November 28 and a marine committee appointed December 14.

The exhibit will be a major display from the Smithsonian Institution's collection of naval material, together with important objects borrowed from public and private collections.

14. The Post Office Department.—On July 26, 1775, the Post Office Department was established with Benjamin Franklin as Postmaster General.

The exhibit will be a major display from the Smithsonian Institution's important collection of philately, together with items from other Government bureaus and private sources.

15. June 14 and 19, 1775.—On the former date the Continental Army was established and on the latter Washington was appointed its Commander in Chief.

The exhibit will be a major one, in conjunction with the bicentennial of the founding of the Navy, the same year.

Strong but Wrong Dosage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. GOODELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of April 12, 1965, which should have the attention of the Members. It should be pointed out to the membership of the House and the Washington Daily News that the problems mentioned in the editorial would be resolved with the adoption of the Ford-McCulloch voting rights bill.

STRONG BUT WRONG DOSAGE

When House Judiciary Committee Chairman EMANUEL CELLER described the voting rights bill written in his committee as "strong dosage," he was not overstating it.

This is a drastic measure indeed. It goes far toward making the Federal Government complete master of all election procedures and reducing the affected States to mere puppets in this regard.

The House group has put into the bill a number of tough features not included in the Johnson administration's original proposal. They would outlaw all remaining poll taxes, provide Federal poll watchers at regular elections, give protection to persons urging Negroes to register or vote, and even bar discrimination at party conventions. Criminal penalties are provided against private citizens as well as officials for interference with voting rights.

The bill reported by the Senate Judiciary Committee is almost as harsh, except that it includes an "escape hatch" for States—such as Georgia, Louisiana, and South Carolina—in which more than 60 percent of those eligible are registered.

Both versions contain the most questionable segment of the administration plan—the "automatic trigger" which would convict States of discrimination on a mere showing that they use a literacy test or similar device and that fewer than 50 percent of adults register or vote.

This is a bad approach to the problem. It discriminates among States, permitting some to use literacy tests but forbidding them to others. It seeks to prove the fact of discrimination by a statistical formula which may not be pertinent.

Yet the best legal minds in Congress and the administration, in weeks of study, have been unable to come up with an approach which would do the job on simpler and fairer terms.

It may be that some of the new tools fashioned by the House and Senate committees are necessary to insure Negroes in some southern areas absolutely fair treatment both in registering and voting. Certainly little would be gained by winning a Negro the right to register and then permitting him to be frightened away from voting.

But why abolish poll taxes in local elections without even an attempt to show they are being used discriminately? And why so drastic a step as to force a complete remodeling of State party conventions?

In any case, as long as these additional weapons are tied to the basic 50-percent formula, they cannot be applied equally to voting practices everywhere—as they should be.

Congress should redouble its efforts to find a substitute for the administration plan. If it is going to rule that literacy tests are unfair in Alabama, it has the obligation at least to consider whether they are not also unfair in New York and Massachusetts. If it is going to convict States of discrimination without a trial, it should seek a means of outlawing the practice on a more substantial basis than a mere numbers game.

Lease Vehicles for Rural Delivery?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARNOLD OLSEN
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, for the attention of the House I recommend the following poetic comment on the Post Office Department recommendation to lease vehicles for rural delivery of mail:

[From the National Rural Letter Carrier]

JUST 50 MILES AWAY

I started out upon my route, the wind was blowing hard.
The drifting snow was piling high, on every road and yard.
My Government leased auto, was serviced well to go.
It was made for competition, but not with mud or snow.
My little booklet told me, if it fails in any way.
We have one waiting for you, just 50 miles away.
Then I hit the snow drifts, for miles there was no end.
I could hear the motor waver, and feel the fenders bend.
When I could go no farther, then I began to fear.
To back I'd block the muffler, forward I'd strip a gear.
I called my substitute, to help me in the fight.
He said "You have the leased car, to help I have no right."
Then I called the lease man, in that far off town.
The message got through faintly, for the lines were falling down.
Then I heard him talking, and this he had to say.
I would like to help you buddy, but I'm 50 miles away.

Then I wired the Government, I wanted their advice.
For to think up a deal like this, they must be very wise.
It may look good on paper, though profits may be small.
It may work in nice weather, in summer and in fall.
But way out in the country, where you're fighting mud and snow,
And the snow just keeps on drifting, when it's zero or below.
Oh, it kind of makes you shiver, as you move upon your way.
Just to know that there's help for you, but it's 50 miles away.

So I wrote the man in Washington, to see what he would say,
If I was stuck and all my help, was 50 miles away.
And in his heated office, the lights were shining bright.
He opened up my letter, to see what was my plight.
He had a consultation, with others there a few.
They must decide among themselves, the thing for me to do.
At last the message came to me, the answer it read thus.
If you can't move, vacate the rig, and come in on the bus.
Then the Army told me how, to quell a snowy bank.
You make a mighty forward thrust, then attack it on the flank.
If all these efforts fail you, then put reserves in play.
For on our map, you have reserves, just 50 miles away.

So if you are a mail man, stuck in the mud or snow.
Do not get discouraged, if your leased car fails to go.
It may make you happy, to know the contracts say,
That you have help a plenty, just 50 miles away.

—ARTHUR CYR, Clyde, Kansas.

Bribery Our New Foreign Policy?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I wish to include the following editorial by Mr. C. L. Dancey appearing in the April 9, 1965, issue of the Peoria Journal Star:

President Johnson's fight-but-talk speech Wednesday reminds me of a statue on a mountaintop in the Caucasus Mountains between the Black Sea and the Caspian Sea representing one of the most ancient of peoples still on this earth.

The people are the Khatli, or the "Georgians," and they have miraculously survived in their rugged mountains since the oldest of known times as a unique nation with their own unusual language and most unusual system of writing.

They were the people of Colchis in the ancient Greek legend of the Argonauts. Near the cockpit of the world's greatest and most persistent movements of ancient peoples they have had to fight and survive endless waves of human tides sweeping from Asia into Europe and Africa and the Middle East.

They have had to fight Romans and Greeks, Mongols and Turks, Arabs and Persians, Russians and Tartars, and hosts of ancient barbaric tribes, in order to survive.

The statue is a huge heroic work overlooking their capital city of Tbilisi from its mountaintop. It is the majestic figure of a woman, and her back is to the city as she faces the far horizons.

In her right hand she carries a huge sword. In her left, she holds a wine goblet.

The figure represents Georgia meeting strangers, and prepared equally to properly greet them whether they be friend or foe.

The only difference is, we seem to be a little confused about which "welcome" is appropriate to whom, when it comes to Vietnam.

We offer the choice of the wine or the sword to our sworn enemies, instead of reserving one for friends and the other for foes.

We are operating more like the famous "runner" of bootleg booze from the Canadian border who, whenever he happened to be stopped by an innocent traffic policeman on one of the country roads he used as a route, would surprise the officer at the window by the driver's seat. He would stick a .45-caliber pistol in the policeman's face with his right hand, and hold out a hundred-dollar bill in the other, and say, "Which one do you want?"

When it is that intimate, this is pretty primitive and direct psychology.

It could also remind us of some of the approaches taken by Majority Leader Lyndon Johnson to persuade certain of his colleagues to vote right.

Now, he is trying it out as the tactic with which to defeat the Communist drive for mastery of the peoples of the world.

Of course, the "unconditional" offer for talks is not as weak as it sounds. It is really the Communists who have sought a basic condition—that the U.S. bombers quit flying.

So, what he is really saying is, "We'll talk, but we won't stop fighting, or accept any such limitations as the basis for talking."

It may be a shrewd move to take the heat off us without actually changing what we are doing, in fact.

But whatever its real deep-down purpose, and however it fits into any deceptive general strategy, the fact remains that it seems to proclaim to the world, and will be taken by millions of people, as another demonstration of America's desire to buy her way out of trouble.

In countries where corrupt regimes are rotten with bribery, and unless you have the cash to grease official palms you are a second-clas citizen, the United States and U.S. aid is looked upon as just another form of bribing those same corrupt officials.

We now seem to be confirming to the world that bribery is an official foreign policy of the United States.

It may be a sign of wealth, but it isn't a sign of strength, determination, or reliability.

Once again, whether that is actually what we are up to or not, we seem to be putting on a big show of strength for a brief time—and then trying to buy our way out.

Will that discourage or encourage the planners in Peiping and Moscow? We shall see.

C. L. DANCEY.

Capital Punishment—Take That, Supreme Court

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, several days ago Mr. Art Buchwald addressed himself to the principles of federalism in the U.S. Government insofar as they affect relationship between the judicial and legislative branches. He had some interesting things to say about the action taken by the House of Representatives in voting down the pay increase for members of the Supreme Court.

The potentialities of the House in acting as paymaster for the Supreme Court are discussed by Mr. Buchwald in his incisive article of March 25, 1965, which I include in the RECORD in the event it was missed by Members:

CAPITOL PUNISHMENT—TAKE THAT, SUPREME COURT

(By Art Buchwald)

Last week the House of Representatives defeated a bill to give the nine members of the U.S. Supreme Court a raise of $3,000, and all I can say is, it's about time. When you think of some of the decisions the Justices have been making in the last few years, it's surprising the Congressmen didn't vote to close down the Supreme Court altogether.

By refusing to give the Supreme Court Justices a raise, Congress was saying, in effect, "we may not agree with what you say, but we'll defend to the death our right to see you don't get any extra money for saying it."

As everyone is aware, the Supreme Court Justices of the United States are only in their jobs because of the money. If you start hitting them in the pocketbook, they'll think twice about making a decision that will offend Members of Congress.

Up until recently the House of Representatives has had little to say about what goes on in the Supreme Court, but everyone hopes that this will soon be corrected. You can't have a government with three separate branches of government all going in different directions, no matter what the Constitution says.

Our Congressmen have shown great patience with the judiciary, but the Supreme Court has insisted on remaining independent, because it thought it was immune to the desires of the legislative branch of the Government. Little did the nine Justices realize that Congress controlled their bread and butter (and pensions) and the Representatives would have to do something drastic to get the Justices in line.

By serving notice on the Supreme Court that it can't expect any raises from Congress until it toes the line, the House of Representatives has done a great service to the country.

Some editorals have been written to the effect that Congress had refused the pay raises to get revenge on the Court for such unpopular decisions as the reapportionment of congressional districts. But anyone who has talked to our Representatives knows they wouldn't stoop to anything like that. Our Congressmen are not out for blood. If the Supreme Court plays along with them, they'll play along with the Supreme Court. But there is no reason to waste taxpayers' money on nine men who are deciding issues differently from the way Congress sees them.

I think after last week we can expect an entirely different Supreme Court from the one we've had in the past. I have it on good authority that the wives of our Justices were counting on the extra $3,000 raise and have told their husbands to be more cooperative with the Members of Congress in the future.

Some wives have asked their husbands to consult with the various congressional chairmen before handing down any important decisions.

In this way they can appease Congress and hope that the House will reconsider their raises in the next session of Congress.

The decision to veto the Supreme Court Justices' raises will, in the long run, have a very salutary effect on our Government, because it will bring the legislative and judicial branches of the Government so much closer together. The ideal, of course, would be to make the Justices answer to a congressional committee for their actions, but that may have to come later.

Broken Law and Broken Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include extraneous matter I wish to call my colleagues attention to the splendid article in the Washington Sunday Star by Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the U.S. Senate, entitled "Broken Law and Broken Freedom," it is a powerful exposé of the shallow sophistry of those who would defy our traditional and constitutional reliance on the rule of law and substitute for it an individual license to do as one believes best. I hope that many will ponder deeply the inexorable logic of Dr. Brown's message and his eloquent defense of the idea that respect for law and love of freedom are inextricably interwoven in the fabric of American society.

The article follows:

SPIRES OF THE SPIRIT—BROKEN LAW AND BROKEN FREEDOM

(By Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain, U.S. Senate)

In these days of tortured turbulence there is nothing that our social order needs more than to realize that to break the law means to break our freedom which makes laws. There is a frightening description in the April FBI bulletin of a scene last Labor Day weekend in a New England State where 7,000 arrogant, profane, and insulting young people stormed from the beach area, drinking and destroying property as they shouted "Kill the cops, let's have a riot." In addition to this attitude on the part of youth in various

parts of the Nation, the amazing doctrine is now being broadcast in the bitter campaign for civil rights that to reach certain social goals lawbreaking is a virtue. The startling thing in the contemporary agitation for the removal of unjust discrimination is that this lawless conception is espoused by some leaders in the realm of morals and ethics as uncontrolled street demonstrators trampled roughshod over legally enacted regulations. Some riders on crusading white horses covet a martyr's halo rather than obedience to laws of which they do not approve.

In an address at Colby College Adlai Stevenson observed: "Even a jail sentence is no longer a dishonor but a proud achievement. Perhaps we are destined to see in this law-loving land people running for office, not on their stainless records, but on their prison records." To break legal enactments by simply appealing to a higher law is to punch a hole in the legal dike which holds back the flood of anarchy.

Justice William O. Douglas of the Supreme Court has pointedly said, "An individual or marauding group who defies the law to strike a blow for the particular kind of freedom they espouse is indeed destructive of the rule of law."

The present-day gospel of "overcoming" by disregarding laws, even on the way to worthwhile objectives, endangers the very cause, as it thus prostitutes unworthy means as a route to desired ends. At the same time it puts in jeopardy other worthy causes waiting for their day in a lawfully constituted court. The Communists shout out in glee to high heaven at the reported attitudes of representative U.S. citizens that a law to which any person objects is like pie crust—made to be broken.

A prominent leader in the civil rights movement has said: "There are just laws, and there are unjust laws. I submit that an individual who breaks the law that conscience tells him is unjust and willingly accepts penalty, is in reality expressing the highest respect for law." That is transparent sophistry.

Let us state unequivocably that this lawbreaking doctrine is not as some allege a Christian view. A recognized modern theologian has commented on the contemporary attempt to make blatant breaking of law an allowable Christian practice. He declares, "The early Christians under the teaching of the apostles were enjoined to obey the laws of the state—a pagan state mind you—whether they held the laws to be just or unjust, so long as the state did not claim for itself the worship and allegiance owing only to God." Whatever may be said for civil disobedience it is certainly not a Christian doctrine as St. Paul in Romans makes clear. Those who claim Abraham Lincoln as their patron saint ought to listen to him as he solemnly admonishes, "There is no grievance that is a fit object of redress by mob rule."

There is no magic formula which guarantees to bring about in one day, or a thousand, the equality which is at the heart of democracy. Mad insistence on individual wills and whims crowds out sober obedience. Fiats, not fists, are the effective weapons for righting wrongs. A keen young thinker with splendid university training, gazing with anxious eyes at the present omnious scene, has written, "Once it is stated that law need not be obeyed unless it is good law, the beginning of an end to rule by law has been initiated. If each individual, or group of individuals, decides for himself which laws he will follow, and which laws he will disobey, the entire fabric of law is broken down. The fact is that Negro equality can exist only in the same proportion as respect for laws exist. What a tragedy it would be if Negroes succeeded in destroying our system of law and in the very process destroyed the very thing which can make them free."

But alas, in the present orgy of lawlessness in America, there are many well-intentioned citizens who desperately need to be reminded that broken law is the direct path to broken freedom. The way to alter existing law is the legislative path and not the lawbreaking path. Civil disobedience is a long first step in the direction of an invasion of lawlessness in which order and freedom and liberty would be lost.

Over the headquarters of every cause in this day of social ferment there might well be written the inscription which is lifted up in great letters over the courthouse in Worchester, Mass.—"Obedience to law is liberty."

Discrimination by the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES D. MARTIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I would like to include the following column by David Lawrence from the Washington Evening Star of April 12, 1965. How long, Mr. Speaker, are we going to permit the Federal Government to violate the laws against discrimination?

The article follows:

DISCRIMINATION BY THE GOVERNMENT

"Discrimination" is being widely condemned nowadays. Yet the Federal Government itself engages in a certain type of discrimination when it insists on knowing the number of Negroes employed by contractors doing Government work but does not ask for information which might reveal whether any other form of racial or religious discrimination in employment is being practiced.

When a contractor, for example, performs street-improvement work which is subsidized by the Federal Government, it is necessary for the contractor to submit a weekly payroll form which not only itemizes the total number of his employees separated into categories of the skilled, semiskilled and unskilled, but also has a special column to show how many of the total in each group are Negroes.

An Executive order issued on March 6, 1961, and subsequently amended by the Democratic administration, requires the contractor to agree that he "will not discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, creed, color or national origin."

The Federal Government does not, however, require any report on how many Catholics, Protestants, or Jewish persons are employed, nor does it ask the "national origin" of employees—that is, whether they are Italians, Greeks, English, French, Mexicans, Africans, or Asians.

The purpose of the governmental forms is to prevent discrimination, but the Federal Government seems to be concerned only with discrimination involving Negroes. A contractor in a Western State—whose personnel changes from time to time because of the nature of his work—writes to this correspondent:

"You will notice that, in addition to the number of employees, the form requires that the number of Negroes employed must also be reported. This appears to us to be a most flagrantly discriminatory type of inquiry for our Government to make at a time when discriminators are to be punished. Aren't American Indians, Chinese and all other races now being discriminated against by our Government because these people are not included in the reporting requirement? It is difficult to believe that thinking Negroes would want to be singled out in this way as the only people named on a Government questionnaire.

"We are a small organization and we have employed Negro men in past years who have done excellent work and were a credit to our firm. But when several of these payroll forms were submitted last summer we did not happen to have any Negro employees to report. By our answer to this inquiry in the negative, we naturally are concerned about its effect on Government personnel and how it will in turn affect our relationship with the Government in the future."

The Government has not drawn up its report forms to ascertain whether competent employees applied for the jobs and whether a sincere effort was made to hire persons of different races or nationalities. The form simply asks the total number and how many are Negroes. If there is a suspicion that the percentage of Negroes is too small, the Government, of course, can make this a basis for refusing to renew a contract or to do business with the firm in the future.

Naturally, when there are complaints about discrimination on grounds other than race, the Government looks into the matter. But the chief concern of many contractors today is whether, when seeking to do work on any project in which Government funds are used, they will be granted or denied contracts on the basis of how many Negro employees are on their payrolls.

Although the Government now requires lists to be prepared on the basis of white or Negro employees, only last autumn the U.S. Supreme Court struck down as unconstitutional certain laws of the State of Virginia requiring a listing of race on voting, poll tax, and real estate assessment lists. In some areas, race is not shown on the records of those attending public schools or employed in local government offices, as it is felt that any listing which includes race would in itself be a discriminatory practice.

So it is surprising to see the Federal Government requiring contractors to classify their employees by race when they seek Government contracts.

Incidentally, if a contractor decides that, in order to make sure he will get a government contract, he must have more employees of a certain race or group and limits his hiring to that group, or dismisses some of his present employees to make room for them, there is no way to fix legal responsibility on those officials in the Federal Government who have indirectly caused such a discrimination to take place.

Ayres Opposes VA Cutbacks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, on April 7, 1965, Mr. Robert H. Giles, a most astute and informed editorial writer, prepared a most comprehensive story about the closing of 14 veterans hospitals. This story appeared in the Akron Beacon Journal of that date.

As Mr. Giles mentions in his story, I was of the opinion that Veterans' Administration Administrator, W. J. Driver, had conducted a complete investigation

before making his Presidentially endorsed order.

Subsequent hearings before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee left no doubt that the closing order was completely without justification. The preponderance of evidence by 50 witnesses, heard by our committee, pointed directly at the complete error of the hospital closing order.

I believe that immediate action should be taken by the Presidential Commission so that the anxiety of the veterans concerned might be alleviated.

The fine Akron Beacon Journal story by Mr. Robert H. Giles follows:

AYRES OPPOSES VA CUTBACKS

(By Robert H. Giles)

Two months ago, Representative AYRES, of Akron, was willing to sit out the controversy over the closing of 14 Veterans' Administration hospitals.

"You can't preach economy and then oppose something like this just because of the effect on the local communities," he said then. "Besides, with these hospital operations consolidated into more efficient units, the veterans will get better service."

Now, AYRES has changed his mind and is opposing the President's plan to close the VA installations.

AYRES said he told VA Administrator W. J. Driver, "I would support him if he proved his claim that these closings were necessary and would result in better service.

"But, the VA didn't make its case. Based on the evidence that came before the House Veterans Committee, they weren't going to save the amount of money they claimed and give better service at the same time.

"Apparently it was just a matter of having to cut costs somewhere, and this is the only place they decided to cut it," AYRES told Reporter Philip Meyer of the Beacon Journal Washington Bureau.

AYRES is not alone in having some second thoughts about the VA closings, however. Last week President Johnson announced he was naming a blue-ribbon committee to study whether 11 of the VA facilities should be shut down.

The President said he was taking this step because "controversy has developed over our decision to close several veterans hospitals and domiciliaries."

As recently as mid-February, Johnson refused to compromise on his order to close the hospitals.

Among the facilities to be studied by the Presidential committee is the Broadview Heights Hospital at Brecksville.

AYRES, who has been criticized by veterans groups for his earlier stand, said there is no reason for the new investigation "except that it might provide the administration with a scapegoat."

Local veterans have complained that the Broadview Hospital has a capacity of about 250 patients, although only 90 beds are now used by TB patients. At the same time there is a long waiting list at other VA hospitals in the area.

Is the Attorney General Qualified for the Office He Holds?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, from the beginning of his term of office as Attorney General of the United States, it has been apparent that Nicholas Katzenbach is not an impartial legal officer. The height of his impartiality was made clear in his amazing performance on "Meet the Press" last Sunday evening. In this interview the Attorney General conferred on Martin Luther King a high degree of responsibility; found nothing wrong with demonstrations and civil disobedience in Alabama, but deplored it in his own office and in Washington; and could think of nothing illegal in King's demand for a boycott of the State of Alabama.

Such preconceived notions of justice should certainly raise a serious question in the minds of many citizens of the Attorney General's fitness to hold his high office. There are other questions which could be asked—Why was he appointed as Attorney General? What commitment did he make to receive the appointment?

A very interesting column on this subject by Holmes Alexander recently appeared in a number of newspapers.

I include Mr. Alexander's column on the Attorney General as a part of these remarks:

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA DISPATCH

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON.—From the 3d of last September till the 28th of this January, Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, a tall, talkative, second-echelon lawyer in the Justice Department, hung suspended over the abyss of oblivion.

For those 5 months President Johnson hesitated to elevate Katzenbach, who had been ROBERT KENNEDY's Deputy Attorney General, to the top post. KENNEDY had not only recommended him, but had tried to make Katzenbach's appointment a condition under which he, KENNEDY, would go quietly from the Cabinet. But Mr. Johnson would not dicker. He put Katzenbach through a 148-day novitiate or conditioning period.

How did Nick think? How did he work? Could he make the loyalty switch from the Kennedy clan to the Johnson camp? As a sort of ordeal by torment, Katzenbach danced on the thin air of executive whimsy. If he didn't make Attorney General by the President's pleasure, it was back to obscurity, no name in the history books, no oil portrait on the walls of the Justice Department corridor, no brief moment of the recognition which men call fame.

Only Nick Katzenbach knows the agony of mind which accompanied that period of suspense, or knows what kind of capers he had to cut to please the giver of political immortality. But something can be surmised from the performance which the Attorney General has given on the Voting Rights Act of 1965. The President must have wanted—and demanded—and possibly whipped into shape by methods of suspension—just the man we now behold. The profile of Katzenbach, with the initials of L.B.J. in the corner of the canvas, stands revealed in this bill which the Attorney General drafted and presented to Congress.

What manner of man? The Attorney General is a man with a chin line of expediency. The voting rights bill, he has said, is shaped to demolish the "hard core" resistance to Negro suffrage, rather than to mete out equal justice. It is drawn to punish those few States and counties which fail to fit an arbitrary Federal standard. It strikes at discrimination against Negroes, but it practices discrimination against a minority of the States.

The Attorney General shows a profile of heresy. He is a lawyer-politician without faith in the majesty of law. He told the Senate Judiciary Committee that "the judicial process * * * is inadequate to deal with practices so deeply rooted in the social and political structure." Not merely does he distrust southern courts and judges, he distrusts the American judicial system. This system, as every schoolboy knows, puts the burden of proving guilt upon the prosecutor. The Katzenbach bill goes back to an old French system which puts the burden of proving innocence upon the accused. Any State with a literacy test for its voters is presumed to have cheated unless 50 percent of the voting age population turned up at the polls last November. The bill further presumes that southern courts and judges are corrupt, for it requires each culprit State to appeal its case before a special three-member court in the District of Columbia.

The Attorney General shows the profile of a rank sentimentalist, an uncritical idolator of raw democracy. He believes the right to vote is a human right, not a privilege or duty of citizenship. He is known to assess an illiterate elector, or electorate, as being of the same worth to a democracy as a literate one. He is known to have expressed the opinion that person's names, but never political propositions, should appear on the ballots. This would seem to mean that he trusts voters to elect delegates to Constitutional Conventions, but does not trust them to decide on those propositions which have been (and will be) amendments to the Constitution. The profile here shows the inconsistency of sentimentalism, not becoming in an officer of the Nation.

The Attorney General is a striking figure, and a winning personality, but his public profile looks as if it were made to order at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

Mig's in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I wish to include the following editorial by Mr. C. L. Dancey appearing in the April 6, 1965, issue of the Peoria Journal Star:

The appearance of Mig fighters in the actions over North Vietnam have an instinctive reaction in most of us that is not really fitting. Indeed, they point up some very odd facts that run counter to the natural first reaction.

In the first place, there is something about air combat that strikes an emotional chord out of proportion to the real air tactics and strategy in war.

We lost more aircraft in World War II (as well as Korea) to ground fire than in air combat, and so did the Japanese in World War II, for example. Yet, we instinctively regard ground fire as ineffective and air combat as a serious challenge.

Sometimes the opposite is also true. For example, in one small island situation, this editor saw our installations heavily bombed for a period of 3 months—spectacularly. Surely, the returning pilots gave glowing accounts of results. Yet, in fact, we suffered slight damage and few casualties, while shooting down a sizable number of enemy air crews (far more than our own casualties) and destroying far more aircraft in the air than the material they damaged on the ground.

In short, the drama goes one way, but the results can be another matter altogether.

Drama and spectacle, speed and show, can be treacherous guides to actual results.

So, while the appearance of Mig's heightens the drama, it actually makes much less significant change in the situation than it might seem.

Then, we come to the odd facts of detail as to whether their appearance has a political significance that may be bad news.

The Mig's that appeared have been identified as Mig–15 and Mig–17 models. The planes with which we fought, so successfully, against those fighters in Korea are now retired and obsolete. In short, those Red planes are out of date. They are not modern Russian fighters.

If they catch you unaware, laden with bombs, they can do you damage but they are not a match, plane for plane, in direct combat.

That fact, however, is also deceptive, because it is not the role of fighter planes in defense to fight other fighters. It is their job, when possible, to seek out easier victims and pounce on them rather than engage in duels.

We like to think in terms of fighters versus fighters, tanks versus tanks, and such, but it is the business and science of war, in fact, to make tactical use and take tactical advantage with these weapons and that is often the opposite of seeking head-and-head combat.

A final fact put a real twist to the situation.

A much more modern Soviet fighter than those seen over Vietnam is the Mig–21. It doesn't appear to be in Vietnam. There are conflicting reports on whether the Chinese have any of them.

But we know for a positive fact that the India Air Force has them, and even has factories undertaking the manufacture of Mig–21's.

So, it would appear that the most modern Soviet fighters in all of southeast Asia are not in the hands of the Communist aggressors of that region, but in the hands of a free nation that has been trying to defend itself against such aggression.

Which only illustrates that international politics sometimes gets about as scrambled as local politics in Peoria.

C. L. DANCEY.

To Raise the Price of Bread

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, April 7, the Chicago Sun-Times carried a fascinating and concise editorial on the latest farm proposal of the administration.

No doubt, the President will twist enough arms to jam the latest farm proposal through the Congress; but afterward, those who voted for it must in their hearts know it is wrong.

At this point I include the editorial to which I refer as part of my remarks:

TO RAISE THE PRICE OF BREAD

For many years, critics of Government farm subsidy schemes have argued that farmers, consumers, and taxpayers all would benefit if an effort were made to create a freer market for agricultural products.

In one sense, President Johnson's proposals for extending wheat and feed grain controls another 2 years depend more on the open market. Farmers would receive a 50-cent increase in the price of wheat. But the Government would not shell out the added funds. The extra cost would be shifted to the marketplace—it is estimated that this would increase the price of a loaf of bread to consumers about a penny.

A similar arrangement would be made on the rice crop, raising prices 4 cents a pound.

It is estimated that these arrangements will save the Government about $200 million. But they will add about $300 million to consumers' food budgets.

Farmers now receive a support price of $2 a bushel, of which 75 cents comes from processors who pay a form of processing tax through the purchase of marketing certificates. The support price would be raised to $2.50 and the certificate raised to $1.25, the added cost then being passed along to the consumer by the processor.

It has been obvious for years that the great financial burden carried by the Government to subsidize food prices must eventually be eased. The President's program moves toward easing that burden, slightly, but it does not change the fundamentals of the price-fixing system. It does not put more reliance on the marketplace to set realistic prices for food products. It merely shifts part of the subsidy from the general taxpayer to the food purchaser.

Charles B. Shuman, American Farm Bureau president, described the proposal as a "hoax to trap both farmers and consumers." He said:

"There is need for action to help farmers get better prices in the marketplace, but it is quite another thing to ask consumers to pay higher food prices to perpetuate a program designed to keep producers dependent on Government handouts."

The plan maintains a system under which farmers must depend on Government subsidies rather than the working of the open market. As they pay more for subsidized products, consumers may be inspired to question the wisdom of Government manipulation of prices.

Copper Is Golden in Perth Amboy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, one of America's leading copper refining plants, International Smelting & Refining, a division of the Anaconda Co., is located in the district I represent.

Today's Perth Amboy plant covers 40 acres, has its own dock facilities and employs 1,200 persons.

Middlesex County, N.J., is proud of International Smelting & Refining: the firm's leadership in copper refining; its vast facilities, which produce 40 million pounds a month; and its dedicated employees, many of whom have worked there for years.

On March 28, 1965, William J. Madden wrote an excellent article on this distinguished firm and its great product. The article, "Copper Is Golden in Perth Amboy," was published in the Newark Star-Ledger and follows:

COPPER IS GOLDEN IN PERTH AMBOY

(By William J. Madden)

There is hardly a soul in Perth Amboy who remembers when "we didn't have our copper-refining plant."

Today, the plant on the banks of the Raritan River is International Smelting & Refining, a division of the Anaconda Co.

Before it became International Smelting & Refining, at the end of the last century, the plant was called the Raritan Copper Works, a name by which it is still known today.

Almost from its beginning, the firm became a part of its community. As early as 1898, the generating station at the plant supplied the power for the city's lights, as well as power for the streetcars which ran through the heart of Perth Amboy.

The company's generating station supplied the power for street lights and trolleys in the city until about 1906, when other power-generating facilities went into use.

The establishment of a copper refining plant at Perth Amboy came about through natural processes. First, the copper mined in the West and in South America was coming into the eastern market at Perth Amboy, a focal point because of both rail and water transportation facilities.

Then, the major copper-finishing plants were in the New England area, and within easy reach by rail and water of the refining plants in the Perth Amboy area.

In the early nineties, the New England Electrolytic Copper Co. was operating at Central Falls, R.I. It was one of the pioneer refineries of the United States with a yearly capacity of 30 million pounds of copper.

With the development of the copper industry, it was decided, for economic reasons as well as for the ideal transportation setup, to erect a new and larger plant at Perth Amboy. Ground was broken for the construction of the Raritan Copper Works in 1898 and in March of 1899 production of copper was started at the Perth Amboy plant and the old refinery at Central Falls was dismantled.

The refinery capacity of the new plant was 120 million pounds yearly. In that time the total refinery capacity in the country was only 778 million pounds. (Today, the Perth Amboy plant turns out 40 million pounds a month.)

Improvements in the copper refining industry since the early 1900's have been so great that two of today's modern furnaces, such as those in Perth Amboy, could do the work of all of the 13 original furnaces of earlier times.

Of the original plant built in 1899, little remains. The original buildings have all been rebuilt or remodeled. Furnaces and auxiliary equipment are constantly changing as new and more efficient machinery and methods are developed.

While buildings and machinery change through the years, a large number of the 1,200 workers at the plant have long years of service. Many can recall, or probably remember being told in their boyhood, about how the plant ran the trolleys and lighted the streets.

The plant today covers 40 acres, and in 1960 it constructed its own dock to accommodate oceangoing freighters bringing in unrefined copper and to ship its refined copper to foreign fabricating plants.

The products of the plant include all commercial forms of refined copper, such as wire bars, ingot bars, square cakes, slabs, and billets. The byproducts produced are refined silver and gold, platinum, palladium, selenium, and tellurium.

An important adjunct of the refinery is the electro sheet department, where electrolytic sheet copper is made. This material is used for flashing in the building trades and is the basis for printed circuits.

An interesting feature at the plant is that, while capacity has been greatly expanded, the basic process today is almost unchanged from that of 1900, and the finished copper product is still the "N.E.C." brand which was produced at the start.

"N.E.C." is high grade electrolytic copper of high electrical conductivity and meets

requirements where copper of high purity is desired.

What happens before you see those finished copper gutters on a house, or copper wires on a TV set or radio?

Newly mined copper ore looks like any gray granite rock, and a ton of ore may contain no more than 16 pounds of copper. This ore is crushed to a powder and put through a concentration process which removes much of the granite, resulting in a product containing about 30 to 40 percent copper. This is smelted to remove other impurities and cast into pigs, called blister, each weighing from 600 to 700 pounds. This is the crude copper which is further refined at Perth Amboy.

At the Perth Amboy plant, the pigs are put into a furnace and cast into anodes. These anodes, after being refined, are almost 99.8 percent pure.

Further electrolytic processing produces copper cathodes about 39 inches long, 31 inches wide and about 1½ inches thick. The copper cathodes are then cast into marketable shapes and shipped to fabricating plants throughout the world. Approximately 30 percent of the total refined production is exported to foreign markets.

There have been times, through the years, when copper was somewhat in oversupply. It sold below 10 cents a pound at one time. But since then industrial know-how among copper people has opened new fields for its use, and continued healthy growth is indicated.

Government's Role in Design

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, the March-April issue of "Print, America's Graphic Design Magazine," carried an intriguing article about a relatively unpublicized event: The adoption by the State of California of a good design program.

What this means is that an entire State has committed itself to the goal of good design in all its works—ranging from letterheads to bridges. The article quotes the Governor of California, Edmund G. Brown, as saying:

We hope to create a new awareness of the need for excellence of design in State government. Good design is not merely esthetic frosting on the cake, it is functional efficiency, visual beauty and simplicity—a tool that will help our performance on the job.

Late last year, the Governor called on a conference on good design to initiate the program. The conference, which is described in the article, should have widespread application. It should be particularly pertinent to the planning of any additional House office buildings.

The article follows:

GOVERNMENT'S ROLE IN DESIGN: THE CALIFORNIA EXPERIMENT

(On December 8 of last year, an unprecedented event took place in Sacramento, Calif. It was the Governor's conference on good design—the "kickoff" of a determined, coordinated effort to improve and enhance California's designed environment. Perhaps the most remarkable aspect of this event is that it has received so little publicity elsewhere in the country—particularly in the East, and most particularly in New York City. Of particular significance is the fact that the conference was held under the auspices of the State government, and that it had the active backing and support of Gov. Edmund G. Brown. A full report on the conference—how it came about, what was discussed at the sessions, the hoped-for results—appears below.)

(by Terry Roloff)

The best that can be said about most government-sponsored design—whether Federal, State, or city—is that it is dull and inoffensive. The worst that can be said is that government buildings are infuriatingly difficult to work in, government printing is unreadable, and government graphics are very nearly impossible to understand or adapt.

California means to change all that—at least within its own borders. In a pioneering effort, the State government has initiated a campaign from within to provide the kind of State buildings, graphics, signage, publications, etc., that will reflect the vitality and leadership that California is attempting to assume in other areas.

The first big step toward achieving this goal was the conference on good design held in Sacramento last December. It's important to remember that the conference was arranged, not for designers or semiprofessional culture collectors, but for the men in State government who make the day-to-day decisions that affect the quality of state-sponsored design. Agency administrators, budget officials, purchasing agents, department managers spent a day being prodded, scolded, and encouraged by some of the outstanding men from the world of design.

How did it all come about? Did the program spring full blown from a sudden universal urge to make California beautiful? Or did it take form as a result of prodding from some respected cultural organization—or from a legislator's wife who happened to be taking an art course?

By no means. In fact, the impetus for the program came from several directions over an extended period of time.

During the past few years in California, there has been a push toward more inventive, more creative government. Daniel M. Luevano, now Assistant Secretary of the Army in Washington, was until last year chief deputy director of the State's department of finance. In this capacity, he was in charge of the State development plan concerned with the broader picture of preserving California's environment. He was also charged with coping with the problem of technological conversion for a State much too dependent on defense spending to keep its ever-growing population employed.

Plans were already underway for a Governor's conference on the State's role in initiating new economic resources when a copy of California design/eight was brought to Governor Brown's attention. Published by the Pasadena Art Museum, the book was a catalog for an exhibit of furniture, crafts and products designed by California artists. It served to point up the fact that the State's natural beauty had acted as a magnet, drawing increasing numbers of designers to the west coast. Their talents have become more of an economic force with each succeeding year.

If a technique (i.e., conference) can be used to develop the natural resources of the State, why not also use it to develop its design resources—and at the same time do something to raise the quality of government graphics and architecture? A design conference was added to Luevano's agenda. That was late summer, 1963.

Exploratory meetings were held—but then, in the spring of 1964, Luevano and William Lipman, chief planner for the State, left California for Washington. The project was left in the capable hands of John Stanford, deputy director of the newly created department of general services, which includes the State printing plant and the State architectural offices. A highly cultivated man with an appreciation of good design, Stanford had been concerned about the quality of State esthetics for some time.

Nathaniel A. Owings, a partner in the architectural firm of Skidmore, Owings & Merrill, then appeared on the scene. He wrote Governor Brown suggesting a conference on good design at the very time Stanford was approaching the Governor's office with the same proposal.

During the summer of 1964, the idea germinated, and in the fall Stanford received approval to proceed.

Two separate committees were formed: an advisory committee under the chairmanship of Owings, and a planning committee chaired by Stanford. His chief, Robert Harkness, director of the department of general services, was named chairman of the good design conference.

The advisory committee, meeting separately from the planning group, was free to suggest topics and speakers, to chart direction, and criticize the quality of design in the State. The planning committee, comprised of the State architect, printer, training officer, purchasing agent, and chief of the budget division, laid the plans and assembled the audience.

Since a main purpose of the conference was to argue the thesis that physical environment does make a difference, it was considered essential to hold the sessions in appropriate surroundings. The site chosen was the handsome Mansion Inn, designed by Al Dreyfuss, a member of the planning committee.

Designer Charles Eames, a southern Californian, in India at the time, had agreed to participate in the conference. However, difficulties with flight schedules prevented him from doing so. Robert Alexander, an architect and a member of the advisory committee, filled in for him. Industrial Designer Walter Landor, whose headquarters are in San Francisco, came by plane from South Africa to speak on the subject of government graphics. Arthur Drexler, director of the department of architecture and design of the Museum of Modern Art, New York, and Karel Yasko, assistant commissioner of design and construction for the General Services Administration, Washington, were the other participants.

The conference's essential question involved the State's responsibility for good design and the ensuing costs. Nat Owings, in his keynote remarks, pointed out that every State expenditure in some way affects matters of good taste. "Good design costs no more in first costs," he stated, "and bad design costs much more in long-term damages in its effect upon our general environment."

For Bob Alexander, the hero in design is a bureaucrat with taste. "Every administrator," he stated, "should think about the tone and quality and style of living in his office—the little things, like ashtrays and wastebaskets and signs. A conscious program to design the furniture, the landscaping, the numbering systems, and so on, is one of the most important unfilled areas in architecture today."

When asked if we can afford it, Alexander replied, "We can't afford not to get the best design out of every dollar spent."

A film, "Visual Communication Through Government Graphics," emphasized this point with pictures. Created by Landor's film unit, Communication Films, it also carried the message one step further. Landor pointed out the similarity between the needs of business and the needs of government:

"If the direct competitive aspects of the open market are missing in government administration, the need for creating a favorable impression—or image—with the gen-

eral public is no less urgent. All levels of government must be strong without being oppressive, progressive without being reckless, and so on. Design can't make these things true, nor can it fool people into believing they're true if they are not, any more than design can make people believe a poorly made product is good. However, given an honest and sound government, design can reinforce the message and encourage the respect of the people."

About the recurrent problem of costs, Landor said, "Design should express the progressive spirit of government even at the expense of appearing economical. Both citizens and business are interested in government efficiency, and if you can imply as well as practice efficiency, you imply economy at the same time."

Governor Brown's remarks added up to what Arthur Drexler called one of the most impressive and forceful statements he'd ever heard on the role of the government in improving our environment.

"We hope to create from the conference a new awareness of the need for excellence of design in State government," said the Governor. In exploring the role of the State, he expressed his belief that government, especially in California, has a valid part to play in creating an environment of beauty as well as utility. "Good design is not merely esthetic frosting on the case," he asserted. "It is functional efficiency, visual beauty and simplicity—a tool that will help our performance on the job."

Governor Brown was very specific on the subject of signage: "We must make it our business in this State to get rid of unsightly signs that mar and deface our landscape. The effect of signs in some areas is horrifying. No matter how superior the design of buildings in the approach to a city, a clutter of neon signs and billboards can ruin the effect. I would like to see the enactment of ordinances to control these signs in every city and county in the State."

The Governor announced plans to appoint a Governor's advisory committee on good design, to institute a design award program, to call further conferences on good design, and to initiate a series of seminars for State managers. "Our joint goal," he concluded, "is to identify the State with the best in contemporary design and with the use of design to increase human enjoyment and understanding."

Arthur Drexler came to the conference to speak about architecture. More than that, he led a crowded room of fascinated government officials on an intellectual excursion into the nature of environment.

The proper subject of architecture, he suggested, should not be buildings, but the earth itself. To illustrate, he showed pictures of a 400-square-mile conclave terraced by natives in the Philippines whose society revolves about their effort "to carve the mountains into a manageable and fruit-producing environment."

Carving the earth, said Drexler, has been considered an art form even in the 20th century—specifically by Bruno Taut, one of our most original thinkers. During World War I, Taut proposed, quite seriously, that the warring Europeans engage in a more peaceful pursuit—that of carving the Alps. These, he felt, could be faceted, ornamented with trees made of iron and crystal, and carved with terraces.

Drexler reminded the group that earth carving is carried on today, and anyone can see how very clumsily we do it by looking at a hillside subdivision or a freeway. In our culture, he stated "superhighways have the force, sometimes the catastrophic force, of a river in full flood."

"I like highways," Drexler was quick to point out. "I myself want to see more and more of them." But, like many other people who champion good design, he does not think that "it is enough to landscape the sides of the highways. I do not think that it is enough to get good clear signs, although God knows that would help. I think something much, much more drastic is involved."

He called on State government to delegate money "to play with highway design, to see what you could actually make out of a cloverleaf intersection, not to make it less of what it is, but to make it more of what it is."

Karel Yasko recalled a simple incident which took place in January 1961, during John F. Kennedy's inaugural parade. From a casual observation of Arthur Goldberg's on the sad plight of Pennsylvania Avenue, the traditional route of such parades, grew the Ad Hoc Committee on Federal Office Space, which in turn brought about the President's Council on Pennsylvania Avenue and the "Guiding Principles for Federal Architecture."

This document restates the views of Washington and Jefferson that public buildings should set an example for public taste and should provide visual testimony to the dignity, enterprise, vigor, and stability of the American Government. It recommends the selection of distinguished designs that embody the finest contemporary American architectural thought, the avoidance of an official style, the encouragement of professional creativity, and the importance of landscaping.

Yasko addressed himself to the problem of translating policies into action: "The first step is to have men in positions of responsibility who will concern themselves with more than practical utility. They themselves may not be knowledgeable in art and design, but they must have an awareness of the need for the highest quality in whatever the Government produces or sponsors. They must be ready to take advantage of expert advice whenever it is available."

Yasko feels that the quality of the administrator is really the key to the quality of design in government. He told about the General Services Administration's Institute for Continuing Education, which will offer a weeklong seminar this spring for Federal decisionmakers much like the shorter conference held in California.

The conference ended with three clear mandates:

1. A permanent advisory committee on design: Although a new committee has not yet been appointed, the old one has met and compiled a list of suggested members which has been forwarded to the Governor's office.

2. The design awards: The California Arts Commission has agreed to select a jury as well as to administer the awards, which will be presented to State agencies that use or develop outstanding design programs.

3. The seminars: An outline—six or seven morning sessions of 4 hours each—has been submitted to the planning committee and the seminars are due to begin shortly.

A few eager department heads have not waited. The department of general services, feeling somewhat responsible for carrying the new design program forward, has retained Landor to redesign stationery, business cards, and a symbol for the department (the new stationery will be adapted for all other departments in the executive branch). The department of agriculture has also asked for a design proposal, and the transportation agency is ready to adopt four new symbols for its department, to be applied to everything from stationery to shoulder patches.

In fact, requests for new trademarks and symbols for various departments of State government are piling up. These have been held up until an overall approach is agreed upon. Then, like a large corporation with one symbol which can be adapted to all of its affiliates, the State of California will have a new graphic face that can be adapted without creating a profusion of conflicting symbols.

The State legislature has not been unaffected by all this design activity. The assembly and senate order a huge amount of printing and reports from the State printing plant each year. Most of this material is not only unattractive but unreadable. With an excellent plant at his disposal, the State printer is eager to show the quality work the State can produce.

Five reports of the more than 40 being printed for the assembly this spring have been put into new formats by five different designers. It is hoped that this experiment will show that a well-designed report will receive more attention both from busy legislators and the public.

In the next few months, the first Governor's conference on good design should begin to show tangible results. By that time, plans for the second conference on good design will be well along.

Senator Jack Javits for President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, an excellent article on Senator JACK JAVITS, of New York, by Warren Weaver, Jr., has appeared in the Sunday magazine section of the New York Times for April 4, 1965. JACK JAVITS is a rising star whose future looks bright. Why not Senator JACK JAVITS for President in 1966? I believe he would be a fine selection.

The article referred to follows:

PARADOX OF JACOB JAVITS
(By Warren Weaver, Jr.)

JACOB K. JAVITS is a restless politician. One might think that at 60, a national figure in the Republican Party, his recognition in the Senate steadily solidifying, his reelection almost permanently assured, the New York Senator would be comfortably settling into an increasingly important and satisfying niche in the congressional hall of fame.

Well, he isn't. Witness his recent refusal to support Governor Rockefeller for President any longer, an antagonistic public position he need not have taken for at least another 2 years. Witness, again, his flirtation with the idea of running for mayor of New York City, an affair that stubbornly refuses to run its course.

JAVITS' break with Rockefeller's national aspirations had one major purpose: freeing the Senator to maneuver on his own toward a fresh, modern Republican ticket in 1968, conceivably one that might include him as the vice presidential nominee, a choice that would make him the first Jew ever so honored by a major party. He knows the odds are strongly against such an outcome, but he has by no means written off the possibility.

The Senator's interest in the New York mayoralty is another aspect of his current compulsion for political movement. It is entirely possible that a non- or anti-Rockefeller Republican candidate would do better than someone closely identified with the Governor. Perhaps fortuitously, then, JAVITS has not been encouraged by Governor Rockefeller, whose desire to elect a Republican legislature in a special election this fall and reelect himself in 1966 seems to outweigh whatever inclination he has to replace Mayor Wagner with a Republican.

Underlying both these moves by Senator JAVITS is an uneasiness bred of a personal paradox: The liberal Republican has immense influence with the electorate in New York State—and so, potentially, in the Nation—but he has been unable thus far to translate that influence into personal political power.

The figures that excite political restlessness in JAVITS are clear cut. In his political debut in 1946, he carried by 6,000 votes a West Side Manhattan congressional district that had not gone Republican since 1920. Leaving the House in 1954 to seek State office, he was the only Republican to win, beating Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., for attorney general by 180,000.

Two years later he moved from Albany back to Washington as Senator, leaving Mayor Wagner, a pretty fair votegetter in his own right, on the short end of a 458,000 majority. (In all fairness, JAVITS was not unassisted by the fact that the Republican ticket was headed that year by Dwight D. Eisenhower, whose majority in New York State was a record-shattering 1.6 million.)

But the really impressive showing came with his reelection to the Senate in 1962. Then he carried the State by 983,000, a figure exceeded historically only by two presidential candidates, Eisenhower and Lyndon B. Johnson. More significant, he carried New York City; no Republican running on only one ticket had achieved this distinction in a head-to-head contest with a Democrat since Calvin Coolidge in the national campaign of 1924.

What manner of man produced this record? Physically, JAVITS is unimpressive—of medium height, bald, his eyes somewhat protuberant, his ready grin a little toothy. Even at top form, he is not a spellbinding speaker, only a clear, logical, and aggressive one. In personal meetings he is warm and courteous but sometimes a trifle brusque.

And yet he seems to combine in rich measure elements of appeal for almost every voting bloc in the New York electorate. To vote for him gives Republicans a sense of liberalism, Democrats a sense of independence, Jews a sense of identity and pride. Upstate he is accepted, albeit somewhat grudgingly, because he is, after all, a Republican. In New York City he is welcomed as a different kind of Republican. In JAVITS the swelling ranks of independents find a man who is intelligent, broad ranging in his interests, articulate, bluntly honest, hard working and up to date. They all vote for him.

But despite this massive influence with the voters, the Senator's modest personal power is limited to patronage in his own office and a few committee posts—perhaps 30 jobs in all and hardly a basis for a political organization. (As a Republican Senator facing a Democratic administration, he has veto power—and only that—over those few Federal appointments that go to New York: judges, postmasters, and the like.)

Governor Rockefeller has never found it necessary—or, perhaps, prudent—to welcome Senator JAVITS into the inner circles of Republican influence in New York State. The last two times a new Republican State chairman was chosen, JAVITS was not consulted; once he was given the name of his new leader after a reporter had told him about it.

Despite his relative political impotence, JAVITS does have a sort of shadow organization of his own. In every upstate community of any size, he has an agent or two; these are not irregulars but organization Republicans in good local standing. Each of them keeps the Senator informed on political events in his area and helps with arrangements for campaign and speaking tours.

There is a similar group in New York City and the suburban counties. Together there are perhaps 50 key men, who all meet informally once or twice a year with the Senator. But most important of all to the Javits organization is an elite corps of leaders in the New York business community, men with money and power who provide the Senator's strong link with private enterprise philosophy.

Compared with the number of prominent New York Democratic leaders apparently lined up behind Senator ROBERT F. KENNEDY—and on very short notice at that—the Javits organization appears thin. There is a simple explanation: the Democrats were badly split, and the "out" faction, eager for a leader, found one with fame, fortune, and popular appeal suddenly cast upon its shores.

Lately the Rockefeller Republican organization has shown signs of serious division at the precinct level, but not in the upper echelons as yet. If this division should widen and deepen, Senator JAVITS might fall heir to the same sort of instant power that Senator KENNEDY appears to enjoy.

Until their recent dispute over the New York City mayoralty, the Senator and the Governor have enjoyed cordial but discrete relations. Rockefeller has never hesitated to call on JAVITS for campaign duty, but he has relied only collaterally on the Senator's advice. When both men were up for reelection in 1962, they ran essentially separate campaigns, only sharing duplicating machines and messenger boys.

There are those who believe that the Rockefeller-Javits relationship never really recovered from that 1962 election night. Then, as the two men sat side by side in a Manhattan hotel suite, the Senator's majority mounted steadily to a brilliant, near-million mark, while the Governor, whose presidential hopes seemed to hinge on a new birth of popularity, did only about half as well, getting less than his 1958 majority.

As a lawmaker, JAVITS has been no Moses, but this is hardly surprising. In only 4 of his 17 years in Congress have the Republicans enjoyed the majority control that enables their members to sponsor bills that became laws. During 2 of those years, he was a freshman in the House, the lowest form of congressional life. During the other 2 years (1953–54) his name was attached to legislation establishing the United Nations in New York City and some major health proposals.

In the Senate since 1957, however, he has had a role in the legislative process that has been productive, if largely invisible to the general public. At his bluntest in committee, JAVITS has prodded through many amendments in closed session that might have failed on the floor. They do not bear his name, but many of the bills that went through his committees bear his mark.

Finally, in his ninth year of seniority, JAVITS has worked his way up to the senior Republican position on the Senate Labor Committee, a key position on a key group. (Ironically, he got there when Barry Goldwater decided not to seek reelection.) This vantage point has substantially increased his influence over some of the most important bills before Congress—Federal aid to education, antipoverty, automation, and right-to-work laws—but he remains a Republican needling a heavily Democratic Senate.

If the contrast between his electoral and political influence has been frustrating to JAVITS in recent years, it has not seemed to curb his dedication to the role of the complete Senator. To the wonder and occasional irritation of his less bustling colleagues, he has gladly assumed the part of the busiest man on the Hill.

Up early in his Massachusetts Avenue apartment, the Senator can usually be found in the House of Representatives gym soon after it opens at 8 a.m. (The Senate gym doesn't open until 10, and it is hard to muster an opponent from among its older, less athletic patrons.) There he plays paddleball—a cross between handball and squash—and steams and showers before breakfast in the House or Senate dining room.

Senators traditionally spend their mornings office tending and in legislative hearings. JAVITS is likely to do more of the former than the latter. He tends to be impatient at the amount of time spent on routine testimony at hearings and prefers to assign an aid to monitor such proceedings. He likes to drop in at a hearing, be briefed on the high points, listen for a few moments, cross-examine the witness pointedly on a key issue and then depart.

This technique has not always improved his relations with his colleagues. Many Senators drift in and out of their committees' hearings, but few seem to have such a sure knack for getting their questions into the press accounts and thus creating the impression of widespread activity.

At noon, when the buzzers sound, signifying that the Senate is in session, JAVITS begins to move toward the floor as though guided by an automatic homing device. As any Washington tourist discovers, few Senators spend much time on the floor. Usually they go there only to deliver prepared speeches, debate a bill of particular interest to their constituents, or vote. Only a major debate will ordinarily draw more than a handful to the Chamber. But not New York's senior Senator.

"JAVITS can't seem to stand it if he isn't on the floor," one of his friends says. "Any time they're in session, he seems to feel someone is going to make a speech he should be answering. He just isn't happy anywhere else."

As a result, he frequently gets into colloquies on the floor with Senators whose only desire was to read a speech into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD uninterrupted. As another result, his staff is kept busy every afternoon, riding the subway between the Old Senate Office Building and the Capitol, running stacks of fresh correspondence over to his desk on the floor. (When one of the rare Senate photographs was taken at the time of the vote on the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, most of the Chamber was drawn up in well-laundered formality, but JAVITS' desk had a morning paper on the floor behind it and an overflowing briefcase alongside.)

This is all part of a role JAVITS has envisioned for himself as "the conscience of the Senate." He regards it as his responsibility to see that no charge goes unanswered when it involves Negroes, minority groups generally, civil rights, New York City, the North, injustice or liberalism, particularly of the Republican variety.

It is this compusion to engage in abrasive combat that has almost certainly denied JAVITS membership in "The Club," the unofficial inner power circle of the Senate, rather than any lack of respect for his attainments or prejudice against him as a Jew. JAVITS simply will not be silenced, even by his closest liberal colleagues, when he feels an important point should be made. A few days ago, for example, he insisted on questioning Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach late into the afternoon in committee hearings, despite a gentlemen's agreement among civil rights Senators that the Cabinet officer be given a rest after lengthy southern cross-examination on the voting-rights bill.

JAVITS himself usually remains on the floor until late afternoon, then retires to the Senate baths for a half hour or so. He is back in his office about 6 p.m., refreshed and ready for more work. Sometime after 9 p.m. he will take the surviving members of his staff to dinner—at the Monocle on Capitol Hill or Duke Zeibert's or the Knife and Fork downtown.

Two or three days a week this routine is varied because JAVITS is due back in New York City for a luncheon speech, political conference, or dinner. Then he flies up and

back, staying overnight with his family in their Park Avenue apartment if he has no early Washington engagements the next morning. On a few occasions, he has been known to make two roundtrips a day. Almost all his weekends are spent in the city.

JAVITS' political style, despite 20 years of development and resounding ballot-box success, still has its highs and lows. Consider a day in his reelection campaign. In midafternoon, he drove into Hudson Falls, N.Y., to discover that his appearance there was not in the usual drab hotel room but in an old home that had been converted into a modest but tasteful art museum.

Without the slightest appreciable shift of gears—he had spent the morning in a Schenectady locomotive plant—the Senator delivered a crisp, well-informed and throughful speech on the importance of the arts in American life and the increasing responsibility of government in the field. He found time to mention his own sponsorship of arts legislation in Washington, but he was brief, as well as warm and to the point.

A few hours later at a roadhouse just outside Kinderhook, N.Y., the Dr. Jekyll of the Javits personality reappeared. At a county Republican dinner, he was pompous, didactic, professorial, condescending and, above all, unmercifully long-winded. All the sense of political propriety that had infused his museum speech deserted him. He was overwhelmed by a fancied obligation to tell everyone everything he knows—which he feels, and not without reason, to be a substantial body of knowledge.

The truth is that when Senator JAVITS feels he has the answer to a question, however dimly posed, there is almost nothing that will keep him from delivering it in full. When he knows he understands something, he wants to be sure his audience does, too. The syndrome persists at other levels. For instance, when a writer outlined some questions for a later interview, the Senator, overdue at an important meeting, could not resist answering one or two of them on the spot.

And although he is a most congenial social companion, he cannot see himself as a humorist. He will not preface his speeches with bits of humor, however appropriate. When his staff produces a particularly apposite quip, he is likely to hold up a slip of paper to the audience and announce, deadeningly: "One of my assistants told me I had to read this before the speech." Comedian friends like Joey Adams have offered material; he will not use it.

It is something ingrained in his personality. When his closest friends kid JAVITS a little, he often takes their jokes seriously or else bristles in response. Among the many things that do not amuse him are suggestions that he lacks a sense of humor.

JAVITS, therefore, emerges as a political figure to whom anecdotes simply do not attach themselves. When JAVITS was writing "Order of Battle," his 1964 campaign book, his staff pleaded with him for something light and human; he came up with a stifling story about discovering, on an airplane, that he and General Eisenhower were wearing the same kind of shoes. The book was published virtually without anecdotes.

Chief among his other handicaps is a totally unabashed sense of his own importance. It was completely in character a few weeks ago for JAVITS to tell a meeting of New York Republican leaders that he had achieved a brilliant record in Congress. His judgment, after all, was probably closer to the mark than that of those who took silent exception to it.

Impatient, ebullient, and restless, Senator JAVITS takes a guardedly optimistic view of the future of the Republican Party. He believes the GOP has significant open ground ahead, but only if:

1. It moves forward with new men and new ideas. As an illustration, JAVITS considers Richard Nixon an honorable, estimable man, a good cut above the two 1964 presidential candidates, but not a man who is going to rejuvenate a perilously troubled Republican Party at this juncture.

2. The party calls on the full, not just the financial, resources of what JAVITS calls "the new group of corporate managers"—men like David Rockefeller, Henry Ford 2d, Thomas J. Watson, Jr., George S. Moore, and John Hay Whitney, who the Senator believes, look beyond business to opportunities for public service.

3. The American people are still at heart what liberal Republicans now refer to as moderate Republicans. The critical question to JAVITS is whether the majority of the people still opposed enlarged Federal Government, preferring a growing partnership between Government and the best talent in business.

Implicit in this program is JAVITS basic criticism of the Johnson administration. Although he considers it earnest, practical, and obviously well motivated, he also finds it timid and shallow in its sense of history. He sees the President as a man lacking boldness, a man who tends to walk around rather than grapple with the critical problems of the day.

"This is the crux of why the Nation needs—urgently, burningly—a creative opposition today," he says.

In New York State, Senator JAVITS feels, the Republicans have lost their public identification with the progressive cause, the advantage they gained under Thomas E. Dewey and the early Rockefeller. The Goldwater candidacy, totally unacceptable in New York, was partly to blame. But equally important, in the Senator's opinion, was the failure of Republicans in the legislature to aline themselves with a popular liberal tradition.

New York Republicans will move ahead, according to the Senator, when they become "the big party in New York, broad-gaged, wise, not afraid to move in on big problems." This, too, will have to be a broader party, attracting young people generally, certainly including a large share of the young professionals rising inexorably out of the State's racial minorities.

If the Senator has taken a rather individualistic approach to his political career, his wife, Marion, has steered a strikingly independent course of her own. With the same sort of resolute conviction that characterizes her husband, she has declined to become the pretty political wife, a role for which she is eminently endowed by almost any standard.

Twenty years her husband's junior and once a would-be actress, the crackling, dark-haired Mrs. Javits is dominated by a belief that she must be a person in her own right. She makes only the absolute minimum number of ceremonial political appearances with the Senator and entertains, largely, the peoistration's art bill. She won.

At the same time, she is keenly loyal to her husband and enthusiastic about his political advancement. She personally stormed the White House to badger President Johnson's cultural adviser, Roger L. Stevens, into making Senator JAVITS a cosponsor of the administration's art bill. She won

"At almost every dinner party, Marion sets a new indoor record for the intellectual sitting broad-jump," one of her friends says, "but it's hard to fight her. She simply doesn't think congressional society is as stimulating as the theater, art, and business people in New York City. She's probably right."

However right, Mrs. Javits' sense of independence has created some problems for her husband, not to mention long-distance telephone bills. He has never quite achieved the public image of a politician with a handsome wife and family that his handsome wife and family make him merit. He has lacked an important congressional asset: a Washington hostess. Devoted as he is, he has had to spend more time, briefcase in lap, aboard Washington-New York planes than is good for a 60-year-old man, however fresh from the gym.

Some of his closest friends conclude, however, that the Javits family has made a sound adjustment to a difficult political and personal situation. No matter whether you encounter the Senator at one end of the axis, his striking wife at the other or both of them together, you have a feeling that this is where they belong—at that time, in that company.

And so the Senator gamely shuttles back and forth between Capitol Hill and a city-based family that includes three children: Joy, 16; Joshua, 15, and Carla, 9. One of his favorite weekend avocations, season permitting, is taking them skating at Rockefeller Center. And when he can, he takes a child along on a political trip.

Besides his gym program and skating, JAVITS is a superior amateur tennis player. He may have been the only delegate to the 1964 Republican convention who carried a tennis racket to San Francisco. His typically intense concern for his physical well-being has paid dividends; he packs a trim 170 pounds on his 5-foot-9-inch frame and seems hardly to have changed in appearance in the past 15 years, one of the few recorded advantages of being prematurely bald.

Political advancement did not come as a birthright to JAVITS. His father, an Austrian imigrant, was a tenement janitor on the Lower East Side of Manhattan and a minor Tammany functionary. He died when JAVITS was 14. His mother, from Palestine by way of Russia, could neither read nor write English until she was 55. JAVITS had to peddle lithographic suplies for 4 years between high school and his entry into New York University law school.

The Senator who emerged from his background to become one of New York's most persuasive candidates will not acknowledge that his current political unrest is a natural product of the limitations implicit in being a Senator rather than a a major or Governor—a legislator instead of an executive.

"That whole thing is up to me," he said the other day. "There's no reason why a Senator can't exert a major influence on his party and his country if he has the time and the talent. After all, look at Kennedy and Johnson.

"I don't recognize any limitation inherent in the job. If I need some further prop, such as the mayoralty, to realize my full effectiveness, then that's my fault, not the fault of the Senate. If that's true, I just should have done better."

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

Appendix

To Reform the Immigration, Naturalization, and Refugee Laws of the United States

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, following is a breakdown of H.R. 93, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes, which was omitted from my remarks on page 7711 of the RECORD of April 13, 1965:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF H.R. 93—A BILL TO AMEND THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The first section of the bill provides that the act may be cited by its short title (the "Immigration and Nationality Act Amendments of 1965").

The remainder of the bill is divided into eight titles, as follows:

Title I: General;
Title II: Quota system;
Title III: Changes liberalizing visa requirements for nonimmigrant visitors to the United States;
Title IV: The admission of persecuted peoples;
Title V: Changes in provisions relating to ineligibility to receive visas and exclusion from admission;
Title VI: Provisions relating to entry and exclusion; deportation; adjustment of status;
Title VII: Loss of nationality;
Title VIII: Miscellaneous.

TITLE I. GENERAL

Section 101. Definitions: Section 101(a) of the bill amends section 101(a)(27)(A) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (hereinafter, the act), which grants nonquota status to spouses and children of U.S. citizens, to extend nonquota status to parents of U.S. citizens as well.

Section 101(b) of the bill amends section 101(a)(27)(C) of the act to extend nonquota status to all natives of independent Western Hemisphere countries.

Section 101(c) of the bill amends section 101(a)(3) of the act, by deleting language governing the meaning of the term "residence" as it is used in sections 350 and 352 of the act. This is a conforming amendment to section 701(a) of the bill which repeals sections 350 and 352 of the act.

Section 102. Powers and duties of the Secretary of State: This section of the bill amends section 104(a)(1) of the act, relating to the powers and duties of the Secretary of State in administering the act and all other immigration laws. Under existing law the Secretary's authority extends to the powers, duties and functions of diplomatic and consular officers of the United States, but not to the granting or refusal of visas. This section of the bill would extend the Secretary's authority to cover the powers, duties and functions of consular officers relating to the granting or refusal of visas.

TITLE II. QUOTA SYSTEM

Section 201. Determination and allocation of annual quota: Section 201(a) of the bill revises the language of section 201 of the act, making the following changes in the law.

The annual quotas of quota areas would be equal to one-sixth of 1 percent of the entire 1960 population of the United States, rather than one-sixth of 1 percent of the white population of continental United States in 1920 as under existing law. This would change the size of the aggregate annual quotas, which are currently set at 156,987, to approximately 300,000. The minimum quotas would be raised from 100 to 200.

Each quota area would continue to receive the quota numbers it receives under existing law. The additional quota numbers created by the bill, after deducting those necessary to increase the minimum quotas from 100 to 200, would be distributed among the several quota areas in proportion to the actual immigration of immigrants chargeable to each quota area between July 1, 1920 and July 1, 1960.

The Secretary of Labor would be added to the list of officials (Secretary of State, Secretary of Commerce and Attorney General) who are responsible for determining annual quotas for quota areas. The new quotas would be determined as soon as practicable after enactment of the bill and would take effect on the first day of the fiscal year, or next half fiscal year, following the expiration of 6 months after the date they are proclaimed by the President.

Section 201(e) of the act would be amended to reflect the effect of section 10 of the act of September 11, 1957, which terminated the reductions in annual quotas under the Displaced Persons Act of 1948.

The bill would add a new subsection (f) to section 201 of the act providing for the pooling and redistribution among oversubscribed quota areas of quota numbers unused at the end of a fiscal year. The pool would be on a worldwide basis, no distinction being made on an area or country basis, and would be allocated on a first apply, first considered basis. In other words, immigrants with the earliest registration date on quota waiting lists would be the first to receive immigrant visas from the worldwide quota pool. The preferences would apply to those issued from the pool. Quota numbers from the pool which are not used within a year after they are proclaimed would lapse.

Section 201(b) of the bill amends the heading for section 201 in the table of contents of the act.

Section 202. Determination of quota to which an immigrant is chargeable: This section of the bill abolishes the Asia-Pacific triangle provisions of the act and eliminates the maximum limitation of 100 which applies to subquota areas.

Sections 202(a)(5) and 202(b) of the act contain provisions regarding the quota chargeability of aliens who are attributable by one-half ancestry to peoples indigenous to the Asia-Pacific triangle. These provisions would be abolished by section 202 (a) and (b) of the bill. In addition section 202(a) of the bill amends the language contained in 202(c) of the act relating to the quota chargeability of aliens born in a colony or dependent area and places it in 202(a)(5). As amended the existing provision limiting the number of persons chargeable from colony or dependent area to 100 a year would be eliminated thus making the entire quota of a governing country available to persons chargeable to its subquota areas.

Section 202(c) of the bill contains conforming amendments.

Section 203 eliminates parents of citizens of the United States from the second preference category. This change conforms the act to the amendment made by Section 101 of the bill making parents of such citizens nonquota immigrants.

TITLE III. CHANGES LIBERALIZING VISA REQUIREMENTS FOR NONIMMIGRANT VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES

Section 301. Nonimmigrant visas: Section 301(a) of the bill amends section 212(d)(4) of the act to authorize the Attorney General and Secretary of State, acting jointly and on the basis of reciprocity, to allow nonimmigrants to visit the United States temporarily for business or pleasure without the necessity of having in their possession a nonimmigrant visa or border crossing identification card.

Section 301(b) would authorize medical officers of the Public Health Service and immigration officers to serve at consular posts overseas in order to examine and inspect aliens seeking to visit the United States temporarily for business or pleasure for whom the requirement of a visa or border crossing identification card had been waived.

Section 301(c) repeals a provision in section 214(b) of the act creating a presumption that every alien applying for a visa or for admission is an immigrant until he proves that he is entitled to nonimmigrant status.

TITLE IV—THE ADMISSION OF PERSECUTED PEOPLES

Section 401. Refugee relief: Section 401(a) of the bill amends section 212(d)(5) of the act (which grants the Attorney General authority to parole aliens into the United States) by adding a new subparagraph (B) which defines the term "refugee" as used therein, and authorizes the President, whenever he finds that a situation has arisen creating a class of refugees, to direct the Attorney General by proclamation to parole into the United States such refugees selected by the Secretary of State. The Attorney General is further authorized in the absence of a Presidential proclamation to parole up to 10,000 such refugees into the United States in a fiscal year upon selection by the Secretary of State.

Section 402. Adjustment of status of certain aliens: Section 402(a) of the bill adds a new paragraph (9)(A) to section 212(d) of the act, authorizing the Attorney General, upon application of an alien paroled into the United States under section 212(d)(5), to adjust his status to that of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence. If the Attorney General is satisfied that the alien has remained in the United States for at least 2 years, is a person of good moral character, and that such action is not contrary to the national welfare, safety, or security, he may record the alien's admission for permanent residence as of the date of the alien's last arrival. The Attorney General must submit a complete report to Congress in the case of each alien whose status is adjusted. Either the Senate or the House of Representatives may pass a resolution disapproving the adjustment of status prior to the close of the following session of Congress, in which case the alien will be required to leave the United States in the manner provided by law. If neither House of Congress passes such a resolution within that

time the alien's status will be adjusted as of the date of his last arrival.

Section 402(b) of the bill authorizes the issuance of 20,000 special nonquota immigrant visas to refugees during the 2-year period July 1, 1964 to June 30, 1966. These admissions are to be in addition to the admission of refugees on parole under section 212(d)(5) and under the "Refugee Fair Share Law" provisions of Public Law 86-648.

Section 402(c) of the bill provides especially for the admission of up to 10,000 "hard-core" refugees (as determined by the U.N. High Comissioner for Refugees) as nonquota immigrants including those who are afflicted with tuberculosis. Such refugees must be otherwise admissable and their admission is to be subject to such terms, conditions and controls, excluding the giving of a bond, as the Attorney General may prescribe in consultation with the Surgeon General of the U.S. Public Health Service.

Section 402(d) provides that, except as provided in subsection (c), an alien must meet all eligibility requirements of the act in order to be admitted as a refugee under this section of the bill.

Section 403. Issuance of visas: This section states that any special nonquota immigrant visas issued under the bill, with the exception of those issued under section 402(c), must follow the requirements of section 221 of the act which sets forth the general procedures to be followed in issuing visas.

Section 404. Resettlement of refugees: Section 404(a) authorizes the Secretary of State to make grants to public or private agencies in the United States to assist them in resettling within the United States needy hard-core refugees admitted under section 402(c) of the bill, including the furnishing of care and rehabilitation services. Section 404(b) authorized the appropriation of up to $2,500,000 for this purpose.

Section 405. Immigration and Nationality Act definitions: This section applies the definitions contained in section 101 (a) and (b) of the act to the administration of title IV of the bill.

TITLE V—CHANGES IN PROVISIONS RELATING TO INELIGIBILITY TO RECEIVE VISAS AND EXCLUSION FROM ADMISSION

Section 501. Pardon for crimes: This section of the bill amends paragraphs (9) and (10) of section 212(a) of the act (which declare aliens who have been convicted of or who admit having committed certain crimes ineligible to receive visas and excluded from admission) to provide that an alien shall not be so ineligible or excluded on the basis of a crime for which he has received a pardon.

Section 502. Other excludable aliens: Subsections (a), (b), and (c) of this section eliminate existing language in the act which gives controlling effect to the opinion of a consular officer or the Attorney General in determining the excludability of certain aliens.

Section 502(a) amends section 212(a)(15) of the act (which declares excludable aliens who, in the opinion of the consular officer at the time of application for a visa or the Attorney General at the time of application for admission, are likely to become public charges) by eliminating language referring to the opinion of the consular officer or the Attorney General.

Section 502(b) similarly amends section 212(a)(27) of the act relating to the excludability of aliens who might be seeking entrance to the United States to engage in activities which would be prejudicial to the public interest or endanger the welfare, safety or security of the United States.

Section 502(c) similarly amends section 212(a)(29) of the act relating to the excludability of aliens who might engage in espionage, seek to overthrow our Government by unconstitutional means, or participate in the activities of certain subversive organizations.

TITLE VI. PROVISIONS RELATING TO ENTRY AND EXCLUSION; DEPORTATION; ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS

Section 601. Inspection and deportation: Section 601(a) repeals section 235(c) of the act, which vests in the Attorney General special authority to exclude aliens for security reasons under paragraphs (27), (28), and (29) of section 212(a), on the basis of confidential information and without inquiry by a special inquiry officer.

Section 601(b) contains a conforming amendment to section 235(b) of the act, deleting a reference to section 235(c).

Section 601(c) of the bill amends section 241(a)(8) of the act (which provides for the deportation of aliens who, in the opinion of the Attorney General, have become public charges within 5 years after entry), by striking out the words "in the opinion of the Attorney General."

Section 601(d) repeals section 241(d) of the act, which applies the grounds for deportation contained in section 241 retroactively to aliens who entered the United States prior to the date of enactment of the act and to events that occurred prior to such date.

Section 602. Grounds for deportation; record of admission: Section 602(a) amends section 244(a)(2) of the act (which authorizes the Attorney General to suspend deportation and grant permanent resident status to aliens who are deportable for certain of the more serious grounds specified in section 241 of the act and who have been in the United State continuously for 10 years and prove good moral character during that time), by changing the test supplied by the Attorney General in determining the effect of deportation on the alien or his family from one of "exceptional and extremely unusual hardship" to one of "extreme hardship." This amendment would apply the same test to the aliens affected as is applied to other aliens deportable on less serious grounds.

Section 602(b) repeals section 244(f) of the act which prohibits certain classes of aliens (crewmen, exchange students and professors, and natives of contiguous countries or adjacent islands) from having their deportation suspended and status adjusted under section 244 of the act.

Section 602(c) amends section 249(a) of the act (which authorizes the Attorney General to create a record of admission for permanent residence for certain aliens who entered the United States prior to June 28, 1940) by extending its application to those who entered prior to December 24, 1952 (the effective date of the Immigration and Nationality Act).

TITLE VII. LOSS OF NATIONALITY

Section 701. Loss of citizenship; special proceedings: Section 701(a) of the bill relating to loss of nationality by a citizen of the United States for voting in a foreign election is amended to add the proviso: "if such voting in a political election or such participation in an election or plebiscite is done with the intent to renounce U.S. nationality or to acquire the nationality of a foreign state.

Section 701(b) of the bill repeals sections 350, 352, 353, 354 and 355 of the act, which provide for or relate to the loss of nationality by dual nationals and naturalized U.S. citizents and nationals.

Section 701(c) would make several changes in section 360(a) of the act, which provides for declaratory judgment proceedings for a person claiming U.S. nationality. The existing provision applies only to persons who are within the United States; as amended by the bill it is not so limited. Existing law applies only to persons who are denied a right or privilege as a U.S. national by a department, agency or official of the Government; under the bill the denial is not limited to such a Federal source. The provision presently provides only for the initiation of a declaratory judgment proceeding; as amended by the bill, judicial review under the Administrative Procedure Act would also be made available. The bill would eliminate provisions in the existing section stating that no action may be instituted if the issue of the person's nationality arose out of or is in issue in an exclusion proceding. Finally, the existing 5-year period of limitation within which suit must be brought would be eliminated.

Section 701(d) amends section 360(c) of the act by striking out the second sentence (which provides that a final determination by the Attorney General that a person who has applied for a declaration of nationality is not entitled to admission to the United States may be reviewed judicially only in habeas corpus proceedings and not in any other manner).

TITLE VIII. MISCELLANEOUS

Section 801. Powers of immigration officers: This section amends section 287(a)(1) of the act which empowers authorized officers and employees of the Immigration and Nationality Service, without warrant, to interrogate any alien or person believed to be an alien as to his right to be or remain in the United States. As amended by the bill, the interrogation of a person believed to be an alien would have to be based on probable cause.

Section 802(a) Statute of limitation: This section of the bill would add a new section 293 to the act providing a statute of limitation for deportation proceedings, whereby no alien could be deported by reason of conduct occurring more than 10 years prior to the institution of proceedings.

Section 802(b) contains a conforming amendment to the table of contents to reflect the addition of the new section 293 by subsection (a) of this section.

An Alabama Boycott Would Violate U.S. Constitution, Antitrust Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following article which appeared in the Dothan Eagle, Dothan, Ala., April 11, 1965, as well as many other papers throughout our great country, and written by that outstanding writer David Lawrence:

AN ALABAMA BOYCOTT WOULD VIOLATE U.S. CONSTITUTION, ANTITRUST LAWS

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—Unfamiliarity with the laws of the land is certainly widespread in America today. The mere fact that certain leaders of Negro organizations have proclaimed an intention to call for a boycott by the public of all products manufactured in Alabama tells only part of the story. For what is not generally realized is that there are certain legal consequences which can flow from such an attempt to injure the businesses of private individuals. Not only are damage suits possible to recover any losses, but the Sherman Antitrust Act forbids all combinations or conspiracies "in restraint of trade" that may occur in interstate commerce.

AFFECTED

Unquestionably, in the case of a boycott of products made in Alabama and sold outside the State, interstate commerce is affected, and it is apparent that a combination of per-

sons would be involved. Also, if any companies act in concert not to purchase goods from that State, they could be held liable and suffer penalties under the Sherman Antitrust Act.

The Supreme Court of the United States has ruled that the making of an actual agreement between members of such a combination is not always necessary to bring about a violation of the antitrust law. The agreement may be implied—just so long as the result is a concerted action to boycott particular companies or their products. The Supreme Court in 1910 declared:

"An act harmless when done by one may become a public wrong when done by many, acting in concert, for it then takes on the form of a conspiracy, and may be prohibited or punished, if the result be hurtful to the public, or to the individual against whom the concerted action is directed."

The courts have also held that the word "boycott" itself could imply a threat to certain individuals or companies if they refused to comply with the demands made upon them. The Constitution provides for the protection of individual rights. A person's business is entitled to protection from all unlawful interference, and damages can be imposed by courts if injury to a business can be proved.

Indeed, the framers of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 relied on the interstate commerce clause of the Constitution in outlawing racial discrimination, and yet a burden on commerce could also result from the proposed boycott. The boycott, too, could penalize innocent as well as guilty persons in Alabama, including Negroes.

It has been said that the proposed boycott would be protected by the right of freedom of speech as guaranteed in the first amendment to the Constitution. But the Supreme Court has ruled that there is no such thing as absolute freedom of speech. Thus, for instance, if someone cries "Fire" in a crowded theater and panic results, the damage inflicted by that individual cannot be disregarded just because it was a spoken word. Likewise, obscenity and libel are not protected by the free speech clause of the Constitution.

The device of the boycott has, of course, been used by labor unions, and in certain respects it is lawful. This, however, concerns a dispute between an employer and his own employees. Picketing, moreover, is limited, and, while pickets may carry signs claiming a business is unfair to its employees and urging others not to patronize it, this does not mean that the same pickets can actually prevent sales of goods.

Pickets also may not interfere with the entrance to or exit from a factory or business by any person. Interference of this kind is subject to action by local police and also to injunctive relief in the courts.

There has been in recent years a trend toward the outlawing of secondary boycott. This involves boycotts of the business of third parties—companies, for example, which buy goods from employers who are engaged in disputes with their workers. Interference of this kind with the business of third parties is punishable.

Broadly speaking, the law does not protect general boycotts which can injure innocent persons. The Constitution stipulates that no one shall be deprived of property without due process of law. A nationwide boycott instituted against products manufactured in a particular State and sold outside that State would, therefore, certainly come into conflict with the Federal laws. Innumerable damage suits probably could be filed against organizations and individuals instigating or participating in such boycotts.

Inadequacies of the British National Health Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, an article in the April 13 Wall Street Journal describes some inadequacies of the British National Health Service. The National Health Service is supported by the vast majority of British citizens, but public attention has begun to focus on the system's deficiencies.

Although the Service costs almost 20 percent of the British government budget, it is deficient in glaring respects. A physician recently charged that conditions for operations in Britain are worse than almost anywhere in the world. Two-thirds of British hospitals were built before 1891.

These and other complaints have caused British physicians to demand pay increases and better hospital facilities. In some areas doctors must treat a maximum "list" of 3,500 patients. The pressure of caring for so many causes standards of treatment to deteriorate.

The lessons of the British experience with state-controlled medicine should be ample warning to us in our efforts to ensure that we obtain optimum health care.

The article referred to above follows:

A REBELLION BY DOCTORS ROCKS GREAT BRITAIN'S FREE HEALTH CARE PLAN—MANY THREATEN TO QUIT PROGRAM IN PAY CONTROVERSY—SURGEONS ASSAIL ANTIQUATED HOSPITALS

(By William S. Rukeyser, staff reporter of the Wall Street Journal)

LONDON.—Britain's Government-run National Health Service is facing the worst crisis of its 17 year history.

Three-quarters of Britain's 23,000 family doctors have threatened to quit the NHS if their demands for better pay and other benefits aren't met by July 1. Conditions in several of the nation's aging, understaffed hospitals have so deteriorated that surgeons are refusing to perform operations in them. Angry charges of profiteering against drug manufacturers in Britain, many of which are American controlled, have culminated in a formal inquiry into relations between the NHS and the pharmaceutical industry.

Money is at the root of all these problems. Declares Dr. George Little, a London physician: "The country has got to say to itself, 'Can we afford a health service of the kind we want?'"

Many here are beginning to question whether Britain, or any nation, has the resources to offer free or nearly free medical and dental care to all comers and still maintain high professional standards. John Cronin, a surgeon and a Labor Member of Parliament, believes the NHS is "crumbling to utter ruin."

FREE CARE POPULAR

Despite its woes, the Health Service is unlikely to disintegrate. Free care is extremely popular with ordinary Britons (97 percent have elected to use an NHS family doctor rather than avail themselves of optional private treatment), and no government would want to take the political consequences of presiding over its demise. But the British are having to reexamine the present setup of the NHS as never before.

The problems of the nation's 3,100 hospitals, almost all of which are run by the NHS, are especially dramatic. Although capital spending on hospitals in the fiscal year ending next March 31 will total $190.4 million, up from $57.2 million 4 years ago, only five new hospitals have been completed since before World War II. Two-thirds of the hospitals in England were built before 1891. Waits of over 6 months for nonemergency operations are common.

In the past 6 weeks increasing numbers of surgeons have been airing their complaints publicly. The wave of grumbling apparently was touched off by Surgeon W. P. Greening, who refused in February to continue operating in a 60-year-old room in London's big Charing Cross Hospital. Mr. Greening, who like all British surgeons prefers not to be called "doctor," said dust and debris from nearby renovation work made the operating room unhygienic. Although the hospital's board of governors agreed the room, which lacks air conditioning, is out of date, it remains in use.

Mr. Greening's criticism was followed by similar complaints from hospitals around the country. One London surgeon told of a suburban colleague who has to wheel his own patients into the operating room. At a hospital in Monmouthshire, an exterminator was called in after rats were sighted at the entrance to the operating theater and scampering along an overhead conduit. Fourteen patients at University College Hospital in London were evacuated when the ceiling of a ward collapsed.

EMBARRASSING THE GOVERNMENT

The suddenness with which the complaints began appearing led Kenneth Robinson, Minister of Health, to suggest that surgeons were trying to embarrass the Labor government. A group of doctors at Charing Cross issued a statement expressing "surprise and shock" at Mr. Robinson's charge. Dr. Denis Buxton Hopkin, a consultant at Charing Cross and Lambeth Hospitals, asserted that conditions for operations in Britain are "worse than almost anywhere in the world."

Hospitals are short of funds for staff salaries as well as buildings. Low pay has worsened a national shortage of laboratory technicians and nurses, and many hospitals are almost exclusively staffed by doctors from former British colonies.

The threat of family doctors to resign from the Health Service arose 2 months ago when the Government offered to increase their pay by $15.4 million a year, instead of the more than $50 million they had asked. The Government offer would amount to a boost of about 10 percent; family doctors currently have average net income of $7,742 a year from their NHS work. (By way of comparison, factory wages average about $2,500 a year in Britain.) The British Medical Association condemned the offer and submitted new demands that would cost the Government $84 to $98 million a year. Demands included a 33-percent pay hike, extra payment for night and weekend work, 6 weeks' annual vacation with the NHS footing the bill for substitute doctors, and low-interest Government loans to finance new offices and equipment.

At first the doctors said they would quit the Health Service April 1. The date was delayed 3 months when Mr. Robinson agreed to change the method of distributing the $15.4 million award to meet doctors' wishes and to negotiate on the other points.

It's widely expected that some solution adequate to stave off mass resignations will be found by July, but the BMA says 1,000 or more doctors may quit anyway out of principle. For those who resign, the association has suggested a private insurance plan under which patients would pay doctors 7 to 35 cents a week.

RISING BUDGETS

As in the United States, medical costs have been soaring in Britain, and this has been reflected in the NHS budget. From $1 billion in 1948, the year the service began, its expenditures have climbed to more than $3.5 billion a year—equal to 18.5 percent of the British budget in the 12 months ended April 1. But despite the increased spending, the Government has been unable to provide the quality of care envisaged when the NHS was set up.

In rural and industrial areas where doctors are scarce, many have to cope with the legal maximum "list" of 3,500 NHS patients. Since doctors are paid an annual fee for each patient on their lists, this increases their income, but it can also rule out anything but the most superficial medicine. A general practitioner in Sunderland, near Newcastle, complains that sometimes he has to see as many as 23 patients an hour at his office. Conscientious doctors find that efforts to keep track of new medical developments often extend their working day to 16 hours.

The shortage of doctors that keeps this physician so busy isn't entirely due to the unattractiveness of working for the Health Service. It's true that part of the problem is emigration—a recent study indicates 20 percent of British doctors work abroad for at least part of their careers—but there are other causes.

A STUDY IN CONFUSION

In 1953 the medical journal Lancet wrote: "The profession is probably becoming overcrowded." This view was shared by many medical men, and at their urging a Government inquiry into the training of doctors was set up. In 1957 the inquiry body recommended "A reduction of (medical) students intake by about one-tenth, from as early a date as is practicable." Only in 1960 did medical spokesmen begin wondering aloud whether a shortage of doctors rather than a glut might not be the real problem. By then the medical schools had dutifully reduced their intake of students. Steps have since been taken to increase enrollments.

In view of the Labor government's reluctance to meet their pay demands, doctors are incensed by its decision to discontinue charging NHS patients for prescription drugs. Patients formerly paid a service charge of 28 cents per prescription; removing the charge is expected to cost the Government over $80 million a year. Remarks Dr. Bernard Taylor, who practices in London's industrial East End: "In 10 years of practicing in the East End I have never known a single case of hardship caused by the prescription charge."

A controversy over the prices the Health Service itself pays for drugs has been brewing for 4 years. It will be investigated by a Government commission headed by Lord Sainbury, chairman of a nationwide chain of grocery stores.

U.S. companies are deeply involved; subsidiaries of Chas. Pfizer & Co., American Cyanamid Co., Upjohn Co., Smith, Kline & French Laboratories, Parke, Davis & Co., Eli Lilly & Co., and other U.S. drug producers have captured an estimated 55 to 60 percent of the British prescription-drug market. The Health Service, much the largest buyer in this market, spent $299.3 million on drugs last year, up from $117 million in 1957.

IGNORING PATENT RIGHTS

British patent law permits Government agencies to cut costs by ignoring patent rights, and in 1961 the NHS began buying the antibiotic tetracycline from European sources at $18.20 per thousand tablets. The tetracycline patent holder, Pfizer, and its licensees had been selling the drug for $168 to $252 per thousand.

Pfizer's protests that the Health Service was undermining research efforts by disregarding the patent were overridden. The Government has agreed in principle to pay some royalties to the patentholders in this and similar cases, but negotiations as to amounts still are going on.

The fact that European "pirates" could sell tetracycline for a fraction of the normal price attracted wide attention in Parliament and elsewhere. Leftwing critics of the drug industry led a chorus of charges that there was prima facie evidence of profiteering. The Association of British Pharmaceutical Industries, a trade group, dismisses much of this criticism as the work of doctrinaire Socialists, though it admits there may have been isolated sharp practices by drugmakers.

Green Bay, Wis.: All America City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, some cities can boast of an All America athletic team. Some athletic teams can boast an All America City. In Green Bay, Wis., we have both.

Green Bay has long been famed for its Packers—often the football champions of the world and always All America in the highest tradition of this All America sport. And the city's hometown pride in the Packers has known no bounds.

Today it is the city that moves into the spotlight, and while my hometown has always been All America to me, now Green Bay has achieved that distinction nationally and officially. The National Municipal League and Look magazine, cosponsors of the All America Cities Awards, have awarded the title of "All America City" to Green Bay. The honor was won because of the vigorous action of Green Bay's citizens in bringing about major improvements in the city, and thus setting a good example to all America.

I particularly want to congratulate Mayor Roman P. Denissen of Green Bay and his Committee for a Cleaner Green Bay:

Leslie Andrews, chairman; Mrs. Ralph Curtis Smith, secretary; Mrs. Elaine Griffin, treasurer; Peter Dorschel, chairman of river project; F. J. Euclide, director of public works; Arthur Lundquist, air pollution inspector; Ralph Bergman, city planner.

Robert Adams, James Cordry, Robert Blaney, Paul Buehler, Robert Detry, Sgt. Harold Compton, Dr. Jerome Gandt, K. W. Haubenschild, Mrs. Walter Lambert, Mrs. Alvis Kasberg, Mrs. Larry Medd, Chester Miller, George Murray, Bernard Murray, Walter Singleton, A. E. Swanstrom.

Hugh Sargent, James E. Shepeck, Charles Williams, Walter Zahn, Dewey Decker, Fire Chief David Zuidmulder, Mrs. Robert Brandenburg, John Sainsbury, Cletus Weber, Robert Heaslett, Fred Luisier, Kenneth Larson, Jerome Gille, Frank Vandersteen, and Miss Wilma Bancroft.

The All American Cities Awards go each year to 11 U.S. communities. The winning cities are selected by a jury of prominent citizens and experts on government impaneled by the National Municipal League. The 12-member jury is comprised of:

Dr. George H. Gallup, foreman, chairman of the council, National Municipal League, and director, American Institute of Public Opinion; William E. Dauer, president, American Chamber of Commerce Executives; Miss Lois V. Edinger, president, National Education Association; Mrs. Dorothy M. Ford, president, National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs; George W. Jones, secretary, San Francisco Labor Council, AFL–CIO; Mark Matthews, former president, Junior Chamber of Commerce of the United States; Willard V. Merrihue, chairman, Effective Citizens Organization; Vernon C. Myers, publisher, Look; Mrs. Robert H. Rawson, assistant to the president, Greater Cleveland Associated Foundation; Allen H. Seed, Jr., executive vice president, Keep America Beautiful; Mrs. Robert S. Stuart, president, League of Women Voters of the United States; Dr. Donald H. Webster, director, Bureau of Government Research and Services, University of Washington.

In announcing the members of what they refer to as "this fine new term of All America Cities," the sponsors said about Green Bay:

Green Bay, Wis., has a sweeping campaign going to get next to godliness. The mayor's committee for a cleaner Green Bay is winning its skirmish with litter and air and water pollution. "It all started," says the lady chairman, "when I swept my front porch." Green Bay enjoys the mixed blessing of being an industrial town; for every 2,500 tons of coal burned, 150 tons of ash used to cascade onto the city. Pressured, local manufacturers installed expensive electrostatic dust collectors to catch the ash before it left the smokestack. Sulfite liquor, a byproduct of papermaking, once poured into the Fox and East Rivers, which merge at Green Bay. Now, the local paper companies dry it, bag it, then sell it to mining firms and to packers of animal food pellets. In 1950, 75 tons of dust swirled over every square mile of downtown—every month. Thanks largely to a committee-inspired ordinance requiring hard surfacing of parking lots, the dust count is down to 18.2 tons.

In the summers of 1963 and 1964, volunteers worked to get the waterfront cleaned up; dilapidated buildings came down, and boat hulks were removed. Green Bay's educators cagily employ a new kind of little red schoolhouse: the ordinary suburban home converted into primary classrooms. Such home schools make do while the school board waits to see if housing shifts justify traditional buildings.

To the extent that each city, town, village, and hamlet throughout all 50 States improves itself, to that degree is America improved. Thus I am confident that my colleagues in the Congress—all of us together representing all America—share in the pride I feel over the achievement scored by Green Bay

and its 10 All-America teammates of 1965, and join me in extending congratulations:

Bluefield, W. Va.; Columbia, S.C.; Fort Worth, Tex.; Hazelton, Pa.; Hopkinsville, Ky.; Keene, N.H.; Niles, Ill.; South Portland, Maine; White Bear Lake, Minn.; and Winston-Salem, N.C.

Solving the Mystery of Cancer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE W. GRIDER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. GRIDER. Mr. Speaker, the President has declared war on disease, with an especial emphasis on cancer, heart disease, and stroke. Of these dread diseases, cancer is the word that causes the most fear, for the names of its victims are well known and the reason for the disease itself is unknown.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is a new stir of optimism among scientists and physicians as they delve into this mystery they felt might never be solved. All over the world projects are underway to discover the cause and cure of cancer.

On many fronts in Memphis, Tenn., the research goes on to prolong life, to restore victims of cancer to a useful place in our society.

Foremost among the research centers is St. Jude Research Hospital, a part of the Memphis medical complex, built by Comedian Danny Thomas. Its goal is to find a cure for leukemia and to cure children stricken with this and other malignancies.

Tonight the Ambassador of Lebanon and Mrs. Ibrahim El-Ahdab will inaugurate the 1965 teenagers march for St. Jude Research Hospital with a reception at the Embassy. In the next few weeks teenagers will be marching in Washington and in other major cities throughout the country to raise money for this star-shaped hospital, this "star of hope" for cancer stricken children.

The stories from St. Jude and other medical centers are sometimes technical, but often the good news is as significant and heartwarming as any breakthrough in space.

Mrs. Ida Clemens, in an article on cancer research in Mid-South, the Sunday magazine section of the Commercial Appeal, defined cancer as "a disease of the cells and growth gone haywire." In another article she told of seven children stricken with neuroblastoma, a type of cancer, getting a new lease on life through a new method of drug treatment at St. Jude.

I would like to include these articles at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Commercial Appeal Mid-South magazine, Apr. 11, 1965]

ONE OF THREE VICTIMS IS BEING SAVED, OTHERS COULD BE THROUGH EARLY DETECTION AND MEMPHIS' LEADERSHIP IN CANCER RESEARCH

(By Ida Clemens)

Humphrey Bogart, Dick Powell, Charles Laughton, Gary Cooper, Jack Carson, House Speaker Sam Rayburn—the names of these cancer victims are widely known. Their wealth and fame came to nothing when cancer came to them.

Yet their lives might have been prolonged if the malignancy had been discovered soon enough for treatment.

More than 1,300,000 Americans are alive today and cured of cancer, the American Cancer Society reports.

"With present knowledge and weapons, one out of three cancer patients is being saved. If ignorance and fear did not stop people from reporting their cancer suspicions early, one out of two could be saved," the society emphasizes.

How long until medical science finds a way to prevent and cure all cancers?

"No one can answer this question," said Dr. Donald Pinkel, medical director of St. Jude Research Hospital. "But it seems inevitable that a cure will be found.

"A concentrated effort is being made all over the world toward understanding the disease. Through understanding will come a rational approach to prevention and cure."

There's a new stir of optimism among cancer specialists everywhere. Scientists who 15 years ago felt cancer might never be solved now are talking about where, when, and what the answer might be.

For one thing, it is becoming clearer just what cancer is—a disease of the cells and growth gone haywire.

"Cells are constantly dividing all through the body. We get a new stomach lining every 3 days," said Dr. Edward H. Storer, co-director of the West Tennessee Cancer Clinic at 21 North Dunlap.

"Normally, the body controls and regulates cell division. For example, a cut heals by cell division. This division stops when the job of healing is done. Cells then divide again as needed, always under control of the body.

"Cancer does not obey the laws of the body. The wayward cells just keep growing and dividing, paying no attention to anything and doing little or none of their once normal duty."

Certain agents (carcinogens) such as some chemical compounds, along with radiation and possibly some viruses, seem to have the ability to alter some body cells and spur them into prolific uncontrolled reproduction. These unnatural cells multiply so rapidly that they destroy or crowd out normal cells and tissues.

While scientists can say what cancer is and how it goes about its destruction, they still can't say "why."

This spurs investigators at St. Jude, the University of Tennessee medical units, in medical centers everywhere, to continual search for new information to add to the arsenal against cancer.

A new technique in treatment of advanced cancer of the liver is being tried in UT's department of surgery by Dr. Joe Akin, under direction of Dr. Storer, associate professor of surgery. The pilot study is supported by a grant from the American Cancer Society.

"We are using fluorouracil, a drug used only for certain types of far-advanced cancer. The drug is familiar but we are trying a new route to get the drug faster and in higher concentration to the tumor and avoid some of the toxic (poisonous) effects."

The drug usually is injected into a vein, once a day for several days. There has been some response to this manner of injection but the drug becomes diluted throughout the whole body, causing some harmful effects on normal blood cells. This limits the dosage that can be given, Dr. Storer said.

"In effort to get the drug to cancerous tissues in higher concentration, it has been injected into the artery leading to the diseased part of the body. This takes specialized equipment and involves some risk because of high blood pressure within an artery.

"The liver is the only organ in the body that has a dual blood supply. Both the hepatic artery and the portal vein carry blood to it. The hepatic artery is being used in other medical centers with some success to treat cancer of the liver. We believe our technique is much simpler and safer.

"Blood from the abdominal organs does not go directly back to the heart. It goes to the liver first by way of the portal vein and then to the heart. We are using the obliterated umbilical vein as an easy route to the portal vein.

"When the umbilical cord is cut after birth, no blood circulates through the vein but it is still there. Under local anesthesia, we make an incision under the skin above the navel, find the obliterated vein and open it up by pushing a catheter tube through it to the point where the umbilical vein joins the portal vein.

"We drip the drug solution through the catheter into the portal vein. The catheter cna be left in place a month if necessary. We let the drug drip around the clock.

"We have been able to give twice the usual dose of the drug without a decrease in white blood cell count. White blood cells are the body's defense against infection."

The technique has been used on four patients at John Gaston Hospital. Their liver cancers were either so located or so massive that they were beyond X-ray or surgery.

Two patients are alive, feeling better and gaining weight, Dr. Storer said. The disease was so far advanced that one patient died before the drug had a chance to be effective. In the fourth patient, the tumor did not respond to the drug.

"There is no hope of cure but we believe, in some cases, the tumor will grow smaller and useful life will be prolonged," he said.

Lung cancer is now the leading cause of death from cancer. The American Cancer Society estimates 52,000 will develop lung cancer this year.

Dr. Paul Henry Sherman, assistant professor of thoraic and cardiac surgery at UT, has designed a preliminary plastic model of an artificial lung.

"Its working capacity has yet to be fully established," Dr. Sherman said. "We face similar obstacles, such as blood clotting, that others are encountering in efforts to develop an artificial heart.

"Right now, our main problem is to duplicate the gas exchange of carbon dioxide and oxygen in and out of the blood through some system that will accomplish the same result as in human breathing.

"If the principles involved in the preliminary design prove workable, a more sophisticated model will be made for experimental use in animals."

Dr. Sherman said he will know in 6 months whether the preliminary system is workable. If not, another system will be tried. His work is supported by a grant from the American Cancer Society.

"Someday we will have an artificial lung that people can wear, just as we will have an artificial heart," he predicted.

An artificial lung would be applicable to some cases of lung cancer. It also would be important to people suffering from noncancerous lung destruction as occurs in emphysema.

The artificial lung field has been the most difficult and slowest to be approached by surgery, Dr. Sherman said. Lung airways involve infection which is extremely difficult to control on a permanent basis. Other internal organs can be kept sterile.

"Another problem is that flow of air in and out of lungs is hard to control because the energy for breathing does not come from the lungs but from the chest muscles and diaphragm. In contrast, the heart pumps its own blood. It has its own energy because it's a muscle. Thus, treatment of destroyed lungs is exceedingly complex."

Until an artificial lung comes along, what can be done?

"We can remove all of one lung for disease or parts of both lungs and the patient can still work. Limitations are severe if both lungs are diseased.

"Lung transplants from one person to another have been done without success. Attempts to replace organs by transplantation have been complicated by the natural defense of the body which rejects most living things foreign to it," Dr. Sherman said. "Some plastic materials are not rejected."

Do viruses cause malignant tumors in human beings? In effort to find the answer, considerable research in this area is being done by scientists at St. Jude and across the Nation.

"That certain viruses can cause cancer in laboratory animals is firmly established but no one yet has uncovered a human cancer virus," a local virologist said.

"We have taken a virus from a frog and found it will grow in fish and chicken embryo cells. This offers opportunity to study how viruses affect different cells. A virus may change one type of cell to a malignant cell or destroy another type. We are trying to find new information on the relationship, if any, of viruses to cancer."

St. Jude Research Hospital is dedicated to seeking a cure for children with leukemia (cancer of blood-manufacturing organs), solid tumors and other childhood disorders, through basic and clinical research.

Dr. Douglas H. Sprunt, chief of UT's division of pathology, believes chronic irritation may play a part in lung cancer.

For 5 years he has studied experimental animals which have been repeatedly injected in the windpipe with viruses, bacterial poisons and chemically irritating substances.

"We have produced two lung cancers in rabbits which seldom, if ever, have lung cancer. I think we'll have several more in the near future," Dr. Sprunt said.

Dr. Richard C. Moon, associate professor of physiology, has produced breast cancer in rats, using chemical agents similar to compounds in coal tars. There is no evidence that these compounds produce cancer in humans, he said.

"We are studying the hormonal relationships which are influential in inducing tumors with these chemicals and attempting to prevent tumor development by changing the hormonal balance of the animal.

"By injecting proper doses of certain hormones, only 50 percent of the animals will develop breast cancer."

The attack on cancer is being pressed by many other Memphis researchers.

[From the Commercial Appeal, Memphis, Tenn., Apr. 9, 1965]

DRUG TREATMENT GAINS ON CANCER; SEVEN CHILDREN GET NEW LEASE ON LIFE THROUGH EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAM AT ST. JUDE HOSPITAL

(By Ida Clemens)

Seven of nine children stricken with neuroblastoma, a type of cancer, are living longer through a new method of drug treatment at St. Jude Research Hospital.

The seven youngsters are doing well and have been free of disease more than a year. The first patient treated has had no sign of disease for 23 months.

"Results look encouraging, but these patients have not been followed long enough to be certain the disease will not recur," Dr. David H. James Jr., emphasized.

Dr. James, who directed the research, is a clinical pediatrician at St. Jude and assistant professor of pediatrics at the University of Tennessee College of Medicine.

Neuroblastoma is the third most common cancer in childhood. Leukemia is first and brain tumor is second.

Two drugs have shown some effect against neuroblastoma. They have been used singly in treatment elsewhere. The results at St. Jude have been achieved by using both drugs concurrently.

The drugs are cyclophosphamide and vincristine sulfate. About half the children treated elsewhere with cylophosphamide alone have shown some decrease in size of the tumor. The effect usually lasted only a few months, Dr. James said, although occasionally, it lasted 1 to 2 years.

"There has been less experience with vincristine sulfate alone but, from pubished reports, 40 to 50 percent of children showed some decrease for 2 to 4 months.

"Since the side effects of these drugs are different and therefore not accumulative, we felt that by using both drugs concurrently we might be able to double the effect on the cancer without doubling adverse side effects. We have had only mild side effects in our patients," he said.

A serious side effect of cyclophosphamide is bone marrow depression. Normal blood cells cannot be formed. Use of vincristine sulfate is limited because it damages normal nerve tissue.

The St. Jude patients suffered from nausea and vomiting, some loss of hair and loss of reflexes of ankles and knees. All side effects were temporary.

Neuroblastoma is a malignant tumor that originates from nerve cells, either from the sympathetic ganglion cells that run along the spinal column or from the inside of the adrenal gland above each kidney.

In 60 to 70 percent of cases, the tumor begins in the upper part of the abdomen but can also begin in the chest, neck or pelvis. It occurs most commonly in the first 4 years of life.

"If this tumor localized in one particular area, it could be cured by surgical removal," Dr. James said. "Unfortunately, in most cases it is not localized when first diagnosed. The reason is that the tumor tends to spread before it causes any symptoms."

In five of the St. Jude patients, the tumor completely disappeared. Two others responded to such an extent that the tumor could be surgically removed.

After responding to the two drugs a few months, the other two patients developed progressive disease and died. The nine patients ranged in age from 3 weeks to 11 years.

The research started in May 1963. Dr. James will report results to the American Association for Cancer Research in Philadelphia, Pa., today. Collaborating in the work were Dr. Donald Pinkel, St. Jude medical director, Dr. Omar Hustu and Dr. Earle Wrenn.

Results of Poll in 39th District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, after I became a Member of the House of Representatives, I gave high priority to preparation and distribution of a questionnaire for the men and women I have the honor to represent.

It was carefully constructed to permit expression of a wide range of opinions. It contains 12 multiple-choice type questions on important issues.

The questionnaire was mailed to all residents of the 39th Congressional District of New York in January and February.

During the weeks following the mailing, my staff and I were amazed—and highly pleased—by the responses. Approximately 10 percent of the citizens who received the questionnaire went to the trouble of filling it out, providing their own stamp and envelope, and returning it to my office.

Almost 12,000 citizens took the time to give thoughtful and discerning replies to the questions. Such a demonstration of responsible citizenship makes me want to try that much harder to be their thoughtful and responsible representative.

Many citizens not only checked the answers most closely in accord with their own feelings—but also added personal comments to further clarify their views.

I personally read each completed questionnaire as they flooded my office—and I feel that as a result I am much better acquainted with the people I represent. Their insights will give me guidance as I ponder complex and controversial issues in the months ahead.

Frankly, I am proud of the men and women I represent. They are very well read and well informed. They take seriously their responsibilities as American citizens. Their demonstration in responding to my questionnaire is eloquent testimony to the strength of our democratic form of government—which is indeed built on the premise of responsible citizenship.

To insure complete accuracy, I contracted with a private firm in Washington, D.C., Data Management, Inc., to tabulate the completed questionnaires.

The results are highly gratifying to me. They show that the people I represent desire a progressive, but prudent and cost conscious, Federal Government, as I do.

All costs incurred in connection with the poll—including printing, tabulating, and distribution of results to my constituents—have been borne by my Citizens Committee in Erie County, N.Y. The total of these costs was more than $1,500.

I especially want to call attention to the responses to two of the questions.

One of my questions sought to determine how my constituents feel about the problems of water and air pollution. More than two-thirds of those responding—69.6 percent—indicated that they favor strong Federal programs to attack these problems.

Another question concerned the desirability of polling constituents in this manner. A tremendous majority of respondents—92.8 percent—said they favor questionnaires.

I am planning to poll the citizens of the 39th district again during my present term in Congress.

I feel other Members of the House of Representatives may be interested in examining the responses—and for this reason I have requested permission to place the results, as compiled by Data Management, Inc., in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Results of poll in 39th Congressional District of New York

DOMESTIC ISSUES IN THE 89TH CONG.

1. MEDICARE

The administration will press for enactment of medicare legislation this session. Which would you prefer:

	Percent
(a) The President's program under social security?	34.1
(b) Government subsidized for over 65 citizens (AMA proposal)?	37.4
(c) No Government health insurance program?	20.6
(d) Other response or no answer	7.9

2. EDUCATION

The Johnson administration has asked for an additional $1,500,000,000 for colleges, secondary schools, and research. Do you feel that Federal aid to education should—

(a) Follow President Johnson's proposals?	44.9
(b) Be geared toward research?	11.3
(c) Be curtailed, with the States assuming a larger role?	34.4
(d) Other response or no answer	9.4

3. POVERTY

Congress will be asked to double the present $784,200,000 appropriation in the "war on poverty." Which do you favor:

(a) A total program, designed to wipe out poverty?	20.3
(b) Limited self-help program aimed at unemployment?	64.6
(c) No Federal activity in this area?	10.0
(d) Other response or no answer	5.1

4. LABOR

One of labor's primary objectives in 1965 is repeal of the so-called right-to-work sec. 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, allowing the States to pass such laws. Do you—

(a) Favor such repeal by Congress?	21.5
(b) Oppose repeal; the States should retain this right?	48.0
(c) An amendment requiring a referendum by the States?	15.0
(d) Other response or no answer	15.5

5. POLLUTION

Water and air pollution are gaining increased attention by Congress. As pollution of Lake Erie waters and the air, by our industries, are major problems, do you favor—

(a) A strong Federal program to attack it?	69.6
(b) A State program?	14.6
(c) Local action only?	6.1
(d) Other response or no answer	9.7

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND THE COLD WAR

1. VIETNAM

With regard to the administration's commitments in South Vietnam, do you favor—

(a) Escalation of the war?	26.3
(b) Maintain the status quo, encourage a democratic Vietnam?	28.1
(c) Withdraw American military personnel and make South Vietnam neutral?	29.8
(d) Other response or no answer	15.8

2. UNITED NATIONS

Indonesia's withdrawal and the cost of U.N. peacekeeping missions has brought the world organization to a new crisis point in its 20-year history. Should the United States—

(a) Give unqualified support to all General Assembly decisions?	3.7
(b) Follow a "hard line" regarding paying the U.N.'s bills?	57.8
(c) Expand the U.N. role as an eventual international peace force?	23.1
(d) Other response or no answer	15.4

3. CUBA

The Communist regime in Cuba continues to be a source of unrest and subversion in other Latin American countries. Do you favor an American policy which would—

(a) Encourage an exile invasion of the island?	20.0
(b) Continue to isolate Cuba economically and diplomatically?	52.8
(c) Ease Cuban-United States tensions while remaining vigilant?	14.9
(d) Other response or no answer	12.3

4. AFRICA

The civil war in the Congo and the problems of the new and emerging nations have raised questions about our African policy. Do you favor—

(a) Continued economic and technical support for all countries?	14.4
(b) Curtail aid to those countries critical of our policies?	53.1
(c) Refuse any possible military involvement and reduce current aid?	21.8
(d) Other response or no answer	10.7

5. FOREIGN AID

U.S. military, economic, and technical aid (including the Peace Corps) goes to more than 60 nations throughout the world. Do you feel such assistance should—

(a) Be continued, with more cultural exchanges as well?	39.9
(b) Be eliminated to neutrals and countries like Poland and Yugoslavia?	10.0
(c) Be drastically curtailed, limited to "pro-West" nations?	39.9
(d) Other response or no answer	10.2

IMMIGRATION POLICY

President Johnson has proposed elimination of the quota system in the U.S. immigration policy. The quota system gives larger immigration allotments to some countries than others. (Great Britain, France, and Denmark, for example, have relatively larger allotments than Italy, Poland, and Greece.) Do you favor—

(a) The President's proposal?	22.3
(b) No changes in immigration policy?	29.0
(c) Modification but not complete elimination of the quota system?	40.9
(d) Other response or no answer	7.8

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

The House Committee on Un-American Activities is again the subject of sharp controversy. Would you favor—

(a) Abolition of the committee?	11.9
(b) Transfer of its functions to the Judiciary Committee?	24.9
(c) Retention of the committee in its present form?	45.8
(d) Other response or no answer	17.4

CONGRESSIONAL POLL

Do you favor having your Congressman poll you for your views?

Yes	92.8
No	1.2
Undecided	6.0

Easy Money Leads to Capital Outflow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, for the past few months the administration has been urging the necessity of restricting outflows of private capital in order to lessen the strain on the balance of payments. The Government has created the impression that the private sector alone is responsible for correcting the payments deficit. The facts of the matter are that the Government through its own easy money policies is providing less attractive opportunities for private investment at home than those available abroad. A recent article in the Wall Street Journal summarizes the situation in the following manner:

Outflow of private capital, which enlarges the deficit, last year grew to 6.4 billion from 4.3 billion in 1963 and 3.4 billion in 1962. The stimulus for this growth lies in the presistently greater return available from capital investments elsewhere than in the United States. And one reason for this difference lies in the Government's persistent policy of keeping the money markets of the Nation generously supplied with funds in spite of the very rapid growth in demand for and use of credit in these years of boom.

We thus are faced with the curious situation where the Johnson administration is imposing damaging capital controls to stop an outflow of funds arising in large part from its own shortsighted economic policies.

Under unanimous consent I ask that this article from the Wall Street Journal of April 12, 1965, be included in the RECORD at this point:

THE OUTLOOK—APPRAISAL OF CURRENT TRENDS IN BUSINESS AND FINANCE

Henry H. Fowler, the new Secretary of the Treasury, proclaimed the long-held administration theology when he said the other day that economic growth at home would cure the deficit in the U.S. balance of payments with the rest of the world. He also said the United States needs for the same reason to become even more competitive in world markets. The trouble is that though both aims are desirable they're hardly likely to do the job.

A careful look at the record of recent years demonstrates the point. On the score of economic growth it is difficult to find a better record in this Nation's history than that of the years since 1960 or 1958. The record also looks favorable by comparison with those of other Western industrialized nations, as witness the following table which shows gains in industrial production from 1958 to 1964 in four countries:

United States, 48 percent; West Germany, 57 percent; France, 37 percent; United Kingdom 14 percent.

Among these four, only Germany has grown faster in the years covered. Yet in spite of our rapid growth in those years the deficit in our balance of payments has continued with very little change. Here are the figures, in billions:

Year:	*Deficit*
1958	$3.5
1959	4.2
1960	3.9
1961	3.1
1962	3.6
1963	3.3
1964	3.1

It can be seen that since 1961, though we've enjoyed 3 years of growing economic boom, the deficit hasn't declined at all. The theory has been that rapid growth here would induce foreigners to invest at long term here, but somehow this hasn't worked out.

What the reason may be isn't certain. Perhaps the increases of recent years in prices of securities and of other investments including real estate have discouraged potential buyers from abroad. Immediate returns on investments tend to be smaller here than elsewhere in the world.

The problem of becoming more competitive in world markets faces difficulties too. Actually, we've been getting more competitive, in the sense that our prices have risen more slowly than in most other countries. Here are the price increases that have occurred here since 1958 in comparison with those of the same three countries as in the tabulations above:

[In percent]

	Cost of living	*Export prices*
United States	28	5
Germany (West)	15	6
France	31	20
United Kingdom	18	8

In spite of our advantage of a lower rise in the cost of living, which has been translated into a lower advance in export prices, our exports have risen less than Germany's or France's, though more than Britain's. Since 1958 our exports (excluding military aid) have gone up 57 percent, against 75 percent for Germany, 106 percent for France and 33 percent for Britain.

Furthermore, our imports have risen rapidly too—40 percent. While we strive to become more competitive others are striving, too; and as our economic activity has grown our needs and desires for imports have advanced, as always happens in such cases. Not only do others race us in world markets, with various devices such as tax rebates, but our own purchases of imports tend to race our exports.

Nevertheless, the problem of our payments deficit has existed for enough years to make evident that a general, joint effort is going to be needed to cure it. This becomes especially apparent when the components of the deficit are divided as between the transactions of the Federal Government and those of the private economy. It turns out that in the last few years if adjustments are made for the exports that are financed by foreign aid, both sectors have been operating in the foreign field at a deficit.

For instance, in 1964 about $3.4 billion of of the Nation's total exports of goods and services were financed by Government grants and capital outlays. If this sum is subtracted from private exports of goods and services, the net of all remaining private transactions in the foreign field is a deficit of $1.3 billion out of the Nation's total deficit for the same year of $3.1 billion.

However, this does not fully exonerate the Government of responsibility for any part of the private deficit. Outflow of private capital, which enlarges the deficit, last year grew to $6.4 billion from $4.3 billion in 1963 and from $3.4 billion in 1962. The stimulus for this growth lies in the persistently greater return available from capital investments elsewhere than in the United States. And one reason for this difference lies in the Government's persistent policy of keeping the money markets of the Nation generously supplied with funds in spite of the very rapid growth in demand for and use of credit in these years of boom.

That's why American money has tended to flow abroad, and also why foreign money shows little interest in long-term investments here. That's why it has been necessary for the administration this year to call upon American banks and industries to reduce their investments abroad voluntarily. And it is also why such a voluntary program, though it seems highly successful thus far, cannot be counted on to do the job permanently. American capital needs the help of the American Government in this endeavor.

Naugatuck Valley Communities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to joint with the Ansonia, Conn., Sentinel in its editorial salute to the city of Shelton which, according to estimates issued by the Connecticut Health Department, now leads the communities of the Naugatuck Valley in population.

This is an area which I represent with pride. Cooperation among contiguous communities in the approach to economic development on a regional basis is stressed in the Sentinel editorial, which also lauds the city of Shelton, "for pressing for the organization of a regional development program." The city of Ansonia is also commended for its response to this proposal.

The editor of the Ansonia Sentinel very sagely points out that "The time has come when each community can no longer afford not to look over the next hill, not to cooperate for regional interests." This is a point worthy of consideration by the leadership of all communities, and with that thought in mind I include the text of the editorial, "The Valley Grows," which appeared in the Ansonia, Conn., Sentinel on April 1, 1965:

THE VALLEY GROWS

Congratulations to the city of Shelton which, according to State health department estimates, now leads the valley communities in population.

It is noteworthy that the population of the five towns in the valley region now totals just under 70,000 people.

President Johnson has given clear understanding that the Federal approach to a great many problems, beginning with the economic opportunities program, will be regional. That should be the word to the wise that suffices to encourage the valley communities to get their regional apparatus, lying idle some 5 years, into orderly operation.

If it doesn't, the communities in the historic valley region will find themselves dealt with in a variety of important matters as

peripheral areas to other regions whose own primary needs will naturally come first. If this happens, it will be our own fault. Shelton is to be congratulated for pressing for the organization of the regional development program contemplated 5 years ago. Ansonia is to be credited with its eager response to join. The time has come when each community can no longer afford not to look over the next hill, not to cooperate for regional interests.

The valley did this in obtaining financial authorization of a new State vocational technical school from the 1963 legislature.

It was successful in preventing its being entirely dismembered into several State senatorial districts, although Oxford ought to have remained with the other valley towns also in the common interest.

It has been successful, to date, in getting both Governor Dempsey and the State Republican leadership committed to the valley's most urgent highway need—the linking of our vital Route 8 artery to the Connecticut Turnpike.

These are but a few examples of what can be done for the benefit of each of our communities in areas of regional cooperation without sacrificing any of their individuality.

The formation of the Lower Naugatuck Valley Chamber of Commerce shows the significance the area's industry and commerce attribute to the regional approach. But there are other even more compelling reasons related to the new Federal-State programs which are now developing in many areas which will affect every man.

Location of new industries in any of the valley communities benefits all of them, in jobs and commerce which make all of them prosper. Economic growth of each town benefits us all.

Ansonia's State Representative Joseph B. Buckley has introduced a forward-looking bill which would provide a legal foundation for closer future cooperation among all these independent valley communities in any of the areas they find to their mutual advantage. It deserves support.

Historically, socially, culturally, industrially, businesswise and in many other respects the lower valley is an integral region with interests and needs peculiar to itself.

It is good to see so many elements in these communities awakening to the action that is necessary to guard the valley's common future for the welfare of all its people.

Politics and Beauty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STANLEY L. GREIGG
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. GREIGG. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to commend the President for his genuine, far-reaching action to enhance the natural beauty of our land. As evidence of the news media's broad acceptance of the President's position on beautification, I call my colleagues' attention to the following editorial which appeared in the Sioux City Journal on April 4, 1965:

POLITICS AND BEAUTY

Concern for natural beauty and abhorrence for such ugliness as sprawling junkyards are attitudes one might attribute in greater degree to the esthetic-minded late President Kennedy than to his successor, Lyndon Johnson. Not so. The President's vigorous crusade on behalf of the Nation's physical appearance has germinated a change in conservation philosophy from traditional bigness of parks, forests, and seashores to the little problems of beautifying the corners and niches where people live.

President Kennedy thought in traditional, Teddy Roosevelt terms. The new approach nudged into action by the President takes into account boulevards, tiny islands of public domain, housing programs with built-in natural beauty clauses, highway landscaping and antibillboard measures.

The closer look does not detract from such major problems as water and air pollution, and expanding nature's wonderland as public playgrounds.

Why, one might ask, should a President whose background was the dusty soil of rural Texas be so esthetically concerned about flowers along Pennsylvania Avenue? A large part of the answer can be found in the brilliant and practical political acumen of the man from Texas.

If President Johnson seeks a monument to himself, and his Administration personality leaves little doubt of that desire, there hardly could be a better, or less controversial one, than a beautified America.

Rather than debate the degree of political mileage calculated in the President's urging for exploitation of natural beauty, the response should be one of gratitude. Regardless of the fear of Federal interference in such earthy projects as a flower garden. Americans have been given reason to look about them and to consider the incongruity of maintaining beauty and recreation in isolated preserves while the city and towns in which they live perpetuate drabness and ugly scars.

Common Council of City of Buffalo Urges Passage of Smith Water Pollution Control Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY P. SMITH III
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, on February 23, I introduced legislation which would provide for fast tax writeoffs to industries participating in their own programs of water pollution control.

Specifically, my bill, H.R. 5317, would amend our present Federal tax laws to permit the cost of water pollution control facilities to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income tax purposes.

The pollution of our Nation's lakes, rivers, and streams is a problem that has assumed monumental proportions. Industry throughout the United States must join with local, State, and Federal authorities to combat the critical problems of water pollution control.

I am pleased to report that a number of large industrial concerns in the 40th Congressional District of New York have already undertaken the construction of their own water pollution control facilities.

The passage of this legislation would provide the necessary practical incentive to other industrial oragnizations in the 40th District and throughout the Nation to undertake similar programs.

On April 6, 1965, the Common Council of the City of Buffalo adopted a resolution urging the passage of my water pollution control bill, H.R. 5317.

It is extremely gratifying to me to have the support of the common council in this matter, and I commend them for their outspoken interest in achieving a satisfactory solution to the problems of water pollution control.

The council's resolution follows:

RESOLUTION: ASSISTANCE ON COST OF WATER POLLUTION CONTROL FACILITIES

(By Mr. Ramunno)

To Whom It May Concern:

I hereby certify that at a session of the Common Council of the City of Buffalo, held in the city hall, on the 6th day of April 1965, a resolution was adopted, of which the following is a true copy:

"Whereas each year the incidences of water pollution along the Niagara frontier becomes more and more hazardous to the health, welfare, and well-being of the people of the Niagara frontier; and

"Whereas the Honorable HENRY P. SMITH III, Representative of the 40th District, introduced H.R. 5317, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the prevention of water pollution by allowing the cost of water pollution control facilities to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income tax purposes: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That this common council memorialize and urge the U.S. Congress, on behalf of the people of the city of Buffalo, to pass the bill known as H.R. 5317 and that the city clerk be authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this resolution to both Houses of the Senate and the Congress and to our respective two U.S. Senators from New York State and our Congressman from this area.

"Adopted.

"Attest:

"STANLEY MOLIK,
"City Clerk."

San Francisco's Registered Voters Express Opinions in Congressman Mailliard's Survey on Controversial Legislative Matters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, some 20,000 of my San Francisco constituents have responded to my annual questionnaire mailed in February to every household containing one or more persons who registered for last November's election in California's Sixth Congressional District.

The following tabulation of the replies may interest my colleagues:

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
A. IMMIGRATION			
Under present law, approximately 300,000 people immigrate to the United States each year based on quotas computed according to the number of Americans of the same national origin living here in 1920. Do you favor—			
1. Retaining the present law?	24	54	22
2. New legislation submitted to Congress by the administration which would gradually eliminate immigration quotas based on national origins and substitute priorities based on needed skills and relationship to present U.S. citizens and resident aliens?	73	15	12
B. MEDICARE FOR THE AGED			
The President has submitted to Congress a bill which would initiate a program of hospital insurance and certain other limited medical benefits for the aged. This program would be initially financed by gradually increasing the present social security tax for employers and employees combined to an estimated 10.4 percent of the 1st $5,600 employee income. Do you favor—			
1. The Administration proposal?	38	45	17
2. Our present system of private medical practice backed by Federal and State aid in behalf of the aged who are unable to pay for needed medical services?	35	35	30
3. A Government-sponsored comprehensive program of voluntary medical and hospital care for the aged financed partly by general tax revenues and partly by individual participants on a graduated premium scale based upon their ability to pay?	35	37	28
C. EDUCATION			
The administration has requested $2,600,000,000 from the 89th Cong. to spend on education in fiscal year 1966. This is twice as much as was spent for this purpose in 1964. Do you favor the following essentially new programs—			
1. Spending $150,000,000 for preschool training of the very young in urban and rural slum areas to give them a better chance to learn when they reach school age?	49	36	15
2. A $1,000,000,000 program of general budget support to elementary and secondary schools concentrated in those school districts with the greatest number of low-income families?	60	26	14
3. A $70,000,000 program of Federal scholarship grants to help 140,000 needy 1st-year college students?	55	29	16
D. VIETNAM			
The war in South Vietnam has become increasingly costly to the United States in terms of men and money. In your opinion, should we—			
1. Maintain our policy of military and economic support for the Vietnamese without the direct commitment of entire U.S. combat units?	22	48	30
2. Intensify our prosecution of the war in Vietnam on the theory that the increased risks involved are justified by the chances of an earlier end to the fighting?	43	35	22
3. Conclude the best armistice or peace treaty available to us under present circumstances so as to withdraw our troops and reduce military expenditures?	43	35	22

Boycott

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, recently the New York Times had a very good editorial on Martin Luther King's proposal for a boycott of Alabama. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to this editorial:

BOYCOTT

The Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King's proposal for a boycott of Alabama is wrong in principle and would be unworkable in practice.

An increase in the number of Negro voters and an end to police brutality in Alabama, which are the goals Dr. King has set for such a boycott, are of course admirable. But they can and should be reached by orderly, lawful methods. Once passed, the voting-rights bill now pending in Congress would bring about a substantial increase in the number of Negro citizens registered to vote.

The Justice Department and individual citizens can, through the courts, combat the misuse of State and local police power to intimidate Negroes. If additional legislation is needed, Congress is the proper place to seek a remedy.

A boycott makes no sense because it hurts the powerless more than the powerful, the innocent as well as the guilty. There is no certainty, for example, that Alabama Negroes might not suffer as much or more from such a boycott as the members of the so-called white power structure. It is also unwise because it injects another element of bitterness and violence into a situation that is already impoverished by rancor and hostility.

As a practical matter, a boycott would probably not work anyway. The economy of Alabama, like that of all the States, is too intertwined with the rest of the Nation for consumers and businessmen to be able to make the necessary discriminating choices.

We are equally dubious about the projected investigation of the Ku Klux Klan by the House Un-American Activities Committee. Everyone already knows all that it is necessary to know about the Klan, which is that its racist notions are nonsense and its members are bigoted riffraff. Even if an inquiry were needed, the committee, with its staff bloated by overpaid time-servers, has never demonstrated any investigative competence. It could only serve as a conduit for material developed by the FBI.

If legislation is needed to control the Klan, the Justice Department can prepare it without the bumbling intervention of this discredited committee, which should have been abolished long ago.

Poverty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, Jo Ann Hardee of the Detroit News has reported on the poverty program in a series of articles. The fifth and last article of this series follows:

VIEWS VARY ON BASIC VALUE OF ANTIPOVERTY PROGRAM

(By Jo Ann Hardee)

WASHINGTON, March 18.—Both opponents and advocates of the Economic Opportunity Act agree on two points:

It's too early, after only 6 months of operation, to tell whether it will accomplish its goals or fulfill the worst fears of its opponents.

By itself, it is insufficient to strike at the roots of poverty.

Richard W. Boone, director of the community action phase of the antipoverty programs, said today: "How can we judge success? We haven't really begun to touch people's lives."

House Minority Leader GERALD FORD, Grand Rapids Republican, added:

"It was the most poorly drafted legislation passed by Congress in years. It has the potential for political use and for misuse of funds.

"But we haven't had enough experience to be either critical or enthusiastic. Our job, as a minority party, is to give it a fair break, to be vigilant against abuses, attempt improvement and advance our own positive proposals for a wider and more meaningful antipoverty effort."

NOT IN A VACUUM

Supporters of the act—which passed the House 226 to 185 and the Senate 61 to 34—agree with President Johnson that the antipoverty legislation does not exist in a vacuum.

He has proposed companion legislation:

A $103 million additional appropriation for this year's Manpower Development and Training Act, bringing it to $411 million, with $425 million requested for next year.

Representative MELVIN LAIRD, the Wisconsin Republican who head the House Republican conference, has called the Manpower Development and Training Act and vocational education much more vital than the Economic Opportunity Act.

Stating that "poverty has many roots, but the taproot is ignorance," Mr. Johnson has called for $1.3 billion in Federal school aid—emphasizing assistance to poverty-stricken areas. It is now in the House.

TAX CUTS

Economic stimulants, like last year's tax cut and a proposed $1.75 million excise tax cut, are also considered vital in the economic upgrading of the country.

President Johnson's medicare program, now apparently on its way to the White House in broadened form, is another support to

the antipoverty effort, as is his new housing bill which expands urban renewal and includes $200 million in rent subsidies.

A $1.2 billion program to create 32 regional health centers over a 5-year period.

Extension of the minimum wage to cover 2 million additional workers; and overhaul of the unemployment compensation laws.

Most vital to the antipoverty effort is a continued boom in the national economy.

"SUBJECT TO TREMORS"

One official in the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) put in bluntly: "We are painfully subject to tremors in the economy. If it falters, all bets are off."

In addition, a recently formed Republican task force is to develop "proposals to increase the economic mobility of Americans, whether they are in the poverty class or a higher economic bracket," according to William B. Prendergast, research director for the House Republican conference.

"For example, I live in Maryland," he said. "There are many Negroes there who have risen above the poverty level, but find greater economic acceleration blocked. This results in an exodus of talent. And those who stay are restive and frustrated.

"This is the sort of economic opportunity that our task force hopes to find means of creating."

OPPOSITION BILL

Chairman is New Jersey Representative PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN, JR., who offered an opposition bill to the antipoverty package.

"Our committee will concentrate on a job-finding program," he said today. "We recognize that job retraining is meaningless unless we have a clear idea of what job demands will be in the coming years.

"And we believe that more opportunity should be available to move people along in the economic scheme, thereby creating more jobs for those with limited skills."

LAIRD seconded FRELIGHNUYSEN, saying: "The record of our job needs is in the want ads of every newspaper. What we must do to eliminate poverty is train our younger people to take advantage of jobs that will be plentiful in the 1970's."

FRELINGHUYSEN added that economic opportunities might mean a tax credit for middle income families with children in college, and LAIRD has already introduced a bill permitting the elderly to earn more income without losing social security benefits.

In a minority report on the antipoverty program, Senators WINSTON L. PROUTY, Vermont Republican, and LEN B. JORDAN, Idaho Republican, recommended their own economic opportunity package which included a tax credit to employers for training the unemployed; Federal assistance in transportation for unemployed workers seeking jobs in other States; a national job inventory kept by the U.S. Employment Service; and "human, not political," need as the criterion for distribution of food stamps.

TALENT IN DEPTH

Aside from the legislative changes, one of the demands for a successful antipoverty effort is what one advocate of the Economic Opportunity Act called talent in depth.

R. Sargent Shriver, OEO Director is conceded—even by his opponents—to be remarkably able to gather a top echelon of capable, honest, and dedicated men.

But Shriver, who is also Director of the Peace Corps, is accused of spreading himself too thin.

He also believes in a "lean staff," and as one disgruntled OEO official said, "it takes money and that means additional staff to spend money effectively."

One example of the leanness of his staff is its most vital section, and the one most open to political misuse, the community action program. Its 175 people must monitor the spending of up to 300 communities by July and handle an expected 1,000 applications.

Another concern is that Shriver may leave.

As one critic put it: "No one questions that the poverty glamour boys are doing as good a job as can be done. But they're all Shriver's men, and what happens when he goes to his great reward as Governor of Illinois?"

The antipoverty effort has been praised and condemned, but even its critics, seeing funds go into every State, find it an exciting concept.

An example is Representative JAMES HARVEY, Saginaw Republican, who said today:

"I opposed the bill, but I'll do everything to make it work."

He added there have been several applications for programs from his district.

Shriver commented: "When some of the critics start to see which way the parade is going they run after it shouting, 'Wait for me, I'm your leader.'"

U.S. CHAMBER'S VIEW

After outlining all the faults of the bill, a spokesman for the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, which opposed it, summed up the sentiment here:

"We may be trying to formulate an entirely new social pattern in which the income standard is linked to a minimum level of productivity. If we can achieve it, it will be a great tribute to a free society.

"But we can also go into a great political mishmash of sloganism and the worst of big brotherism.

"We will be watching, and others will be watching, to see which way we go."

Presidential Inability and Vacancies in the Office of the Vice President

SPEECH

OF

HON. RICHARD WHITE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession of the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, in the fall of 1964 160 million Americans were represented at the polls by many millions voting for a new President. For at least 3 hard months millions of dollars were spent carrying their message of the candidates to the American public. And now in the presidential succession constitutional amendment as now drawn, with a few strokes of a pen and within a few hours, even without the public ever knowing of the transition, you are providing for 7 men to change our Presidency.

With this amendment let us project ourselves 50 years from now, to a time with people none of us now know. One of these 7 men would be the Vice President, who countless times probably had dreamed of being President, and on this occasion would sit in judgment of the man he would replace. The other 6 are probably Cabinet officers, none elected by the people. I only assume they are Cabinet officers, because the constitutional amendment does not say who are the principal officers of the executive department, and in that alone is imperfectly drawn.

The House assumes that all men who would occupy the respective positions of responsibility will act infallibly and in the best interests of the United States of America.

When we passed a proposed constitutional amendment to be sculptured immutably into our Constitution we are saying to the American public that we have considered every conceivable contingency and have found this measure safe.

In order to test its safety we are obliged to consider the worst than can happen in some future time, even beyond our own lines.

In this constitutional amendment in the name of good and with good motives we are perpetrating on some future generation a loophole that could allow a usurpation of power by seven men without the sanction of the American people.

Suppose we had a foreign enemy threatening our country. Suppose further the majority of the Cabinet believe the President of that time is too pusillanimous and that his policies endanger the survival of our country. With perfectly patriotic motives these six unelected Cabinet officers convince the Vice President than the removal of the President is imperative.

At a time when the Congress is not in session the determined Vice President and the six unelected officers then transmit to the Speaker and the President pro tempore of the Senate that the President is unable to act as President. There is no requirement that a reason be given other than that the President is "unable" to act, nor is there a definition of "unable," whether it means mental or physical incapacity, or by the judgment of several laymen, nonmedical men, that for some other reason the President is "unable" to act.

At that point the President can transmit his own message to the Speaker and President pro tempore of the Senate and retain the Presidency.

But let us assume the worst, and assume a conspiracy for a genuine takeover. If the President is kidnaped while traveling abroad or in this country before he can transmit a message that he is able to serve, the Vice President remains acting President with all the constitutional powers and duties, powers that include movement of armies, foreign policy, use of nuclear power, and force.

Again, let us assume that the President is not kidnaped, and does transmit his message of ability to serve. Then, a determined Vice President and six Cabinet officers again transmit this message of inability of the President.

The Vice President then is Acting President of the United States for a minimum of 48 hours and possibly several days more during which time he could issue any number of Executive orders, including the irreversible first steps toward a preventive war. Even today

there are a number of misguided people who believe that our survival depends on a preventive war now.

If we must look to past history, I point out that President Lincoln's Cabinet at one point opposed his policies, and if this amendment had been existing then, and the Vice President had been convinced that the country was suffering by reason of the Presidential policies, President Lincoln might have been removed. I point out also that Vice President Aaron Burr was accused of treason and reportedly wanted to carve out an empire for himself.

I do not believe the scepter of power should ever be removed from the President until the Congress itself, after it convenes within 48 hours, should so remove this power. This is consistent with our present Constitution and the proper separation of officers.

Those who would take the mantle of authority from a President, even for 48 hours, argue that it would be dangerous to the country to have a disabled President even for 48 hours. I believe that the risks are far greater to chance a total change of government.

Our careful consideration on this vital issue is our heritage to our posterity. I favor a presidential succession amendment, but we must not, in the name of expediency, open the door to a greater future danger.

Presidential Inability and Vacancies in the Office of the Vice President

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. McCULLOCH
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 13, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession of the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office.

Mr. McCULLOCH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have have not spoken before in order to save the time of the committee. I rise in opposition to the amendment. I should like to comment upon the proposal that an election be held to select a new Vice President. Such an election in the United States, in accordance with a quick computation which I just made, would cost somewhere between $25 million and $35 million. Mr. Chairman, if there were an election for a new Vice President, a member of the opposition party might be elected. We have had some strange and rapid changes in political opinion in America in my time.

I would like to comment on the statement that was made that we might be providing for a presidential dynasty. History does not indicate such danger.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I took the floor not to downgrade my beloved Speaker, the great JOHN MCCORMACK. Back where I come from he would be described as "the like of which there is no whicher."

Mr. Chairman, it was my good fortune to serve as speaker of the House in Ohio longer than any man who ever served, until the time of the present speaker. My friend, Speaker MCCORMACK, I would rather be speaker of the House of Representatives in Ohio that Lieutenant Governor of that State, and I would rather be Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States than Vice President of the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the amendment will be defeated.

The OAS at 75

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, as a Congressman who feels a particular kinship to the Organization of American States, being a native of Argentina, it is a pleasure to call to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial which appeared in today's Washington Post on the 75th birthday of the OAS.

THE OAS AT 75

Ever since the epoch of discovery, residents of the New World have sensed that their hemisphere was somehow tied together by more than geographic accident. In 1826, Simon Bolivar saw the New World as comprising "independent nations, bound together by a common set of laws which would govern their foreign relations and afford them a right to survival through a general and permanent congress."

The Organization of American States, which today marks its 75th birthday, reflects and enhances that historic impulse. The OAS finds its origins in the Commercial Bureau of the American Republics, created in 1890 as the first venture in Pan Americanism. From that seed grew the OAS, which took its present form in 1948, and the Alliance for Progress, which is the economic and social analog of the hemisphere organization.

Much has changed in 75 years. What is truly remarkable is the extent to which that commonsense of destiny has survived those changes. It is undeniably true that countries with an Iberian heritage differ in fundamental attitudes from countries with an Anglo-Saxon background. It is true that the United States has had to learn some hard realities about Latin American national sensibilities—and that the day has gone forever when a Secretary of State could say (as did Olney) that the United States was "practically sovereign" throughout the New World.

Yet it is not empty hyperbole to speak about the sister republics in the hemisphere. The best proof was offered during the Cuban missile crisis in 1962. When the pinch of pressure was hardest, and when the outcome was far from certain, Latin American members of the OAS were unanimous in supporting the United States in the confrontation with the Soviet Union. There is little question that Soviet behavior was influenced by the common resolve displayed on that critical occasion.

No doubt the OAS is imperfect. It is hampered by twin difficulties. The constitutional inhibitions of the United States, which make this country reluctant to enlarge its grant of authority to the OAS, are one problem. Another is the very diversity and frequent clash of interests that characterize the Latin American countries—making them reluctant to vest more responsibility in a regional group.

Still, progress has been enormous and growth impressive. The Pan American Health Organization, founded in 1902, has become a model of its kind. The Inter-American Development Bank, established 5 years ago, has become a principal instrument in the Alliance for Progress. And the Inter-American Committee on the Alliance, known as CIAP, has brought a small patch of order into the complex and confused economic interrelations of sovereign states.

More progress can be achieved this May at a Special Inter-American Conference in Rio. There are some practical organizational proposals suggested by Secretary General Mora, who is showing a somewhat stronger leadership role than in the past. Certainly the OAS should do more to insure respect for human rights and constitutional government. Annual meetings of foreign ministers are an obvious and useful idea.

Some countries—notably Chile—are interested in even more drastic changes in the OAS structure. Surely debate will be welcomed, because the warmth of the discussion suggests that the system is worth arguing about. On its 75th birthday, the OAS not only survives but flourishes. It may yet show the way to a freer, safer, and more prosperous world.

The Mekong River Development Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN G. DOW
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. DOW. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take particular note of the paragraph in the President's recent speech on southeast Asia-Vietnam that relates to the Mekong River. In this great address the President stated:

The vast Mekong River can provide food and water and power on a scale to dwarf even our own TVA.

In order to underline the essentials of this extensive undertaking, which affects the four riparian countries of Laos, Thailand, Cambodia, and Vietnam, let me submit a paper prepared by the United Nations Office of Public Information on this subject. It is titled "The Mekong River Development Project," and was published in March 1964.

I understand that additional progress has been made on the project since that time and that aid has been provided by a great many nations. It is very noteworthy that these activities in this disturbed portion of the world have proceeded notwithstanding the existence of warfare in that area. The article follows:

THE MEKONG RIVER DEVELOPMENT PROJECT

In any listing of major undertakings for economic and social progress, the Mekong development project would be outstanding for boldness of conception, the scale of international cooperation it has commanded, the complexity of technical problems involved,

and the vast benefits that successful realization of its potential will confer on millions of people.

The Mekong is one of the greatest rivers in the world. From its origin in the mountains of the Tibetan Plateau in China, it sweeps along the border of Burma and runs, in its lower basin, through Laos, Thailand, Cambodia, and Vietnam, into the South China Sea. Of the total drainage area of the river, some 77 percent lies within the 4 countries of the lower basin where 17 million people live.

So far, the Mekong has been untamed. Every year it has inundated millions of hectares of land in the delta. Its great hydroelectric potential has never been developed. Less than 3 percent of the area under cultivation is irrigated. Its navigation possibilities are undeveloped. The lower Mekong has thus been a giant asleep—a source of tremendous potential for power production, irrigation, navigation and flood control, but a source virtually untapped.

The United Nations Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East (ECAFE) took a special interest in the Mekong as early as 1951. In that year its Bureau of Flood Control, in cooperation with the four riparian governments, initiated a series of field investigations of the Mekong River. Since conditions were then unsettled in the region, extensive field surveys were not possible, and ECAFE's task was limited to an appraisal of the technical possibilities for the large-scale multipurpose development of the river's lower basin.

This in turn led to the organization by ECAFE in 1956 of a team of high-ranking international experts to conduct a comprehensive reconnaissance and field survey of the river's potential resources.

The experts' report outlined the key problems and possibilities of the Mekong and singled out several projects which might benefit two or more countries, and which were recommended for detailed investigation. Priority was also urged for topographic mapping and the collection of basic data on a standard uniform basis.

The ECAFE report stimulated the four riparian countries—Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, and Vietnam—to a realization of the importance to their own economies of developing the Mekong. In October 1957 the four countries established, under the aegis of the United Nations, a Committee for Coordination of Investigations of the Lower Mekong Basin, composed of representatives of each of the four riparian countries and serviced by the ECAFE secretariat.

The Committee's first action was to request the United Nations to send a group of international experts to undertake further comprehensive studies and make detailed recommendations for joint action. The mission, organized under the United Nations Technical Assistance Administration and headed by Lt. Gen. Raymond A. Wheeler, of the United States, carried out a 3-month survey of the river, both by land and by air, and submitted a report in February 1958 calling for a multipurpose program of studies and data collection which could lead to a full development stage. The Wheeler report also recommended a 5-year program of investigations at an expenditure of about $2 million and proposed that a high-level international technical advisory board of engineers of worldwide reputation be appointed by the Coordination Committee. The Advisory Board was later set up to consist of engineers from France, India, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

An important step in the furtherance of the Mekong program was made in 1959, with the appointment by the United Nations Secretary General, in consultation with the four riparian governments, of Dr. C. Hart Schaaf as Executive Agent of the Coordination Committee, to provide overall day-to-day management, under the Committee, of the ever-increasing technical and administrative complexities of the project.

The Coordination Committee works closely with ECAFE and reports its progress to annual sessions of the Commission. Its meetings are held several times a year, with the chairmanship rotating annually among the four member countries.

By the end of 1958, field operations in connection with the program of investigations had already started, and in 1959 engineers and equipment had begun to move on to key sites in the Mekong Basin. Since then, hydrologic stations have been established; the work of levelling the main river has been completed; and aerial mapping of the main stream and tributaries areas has been carried out.

As the four riparian countries tackled the task of taming the river, financial, and technical assistance rallied to them from many quarters. As early as 1957, France announced that it was placing the equivalent of $100,000 at the disposal of the Committee. Within a year, the Committee's resources exceeded $4 million; by the beginning of 1961 they had come close to the Wheeler Mission target of $9.2 million; and in March 1962 they totalled over $20 million—enough to launch virtually all the data-collection programs suggested by the Wheeler mission; to begin the planning of 10 multi-purpose projects, 3 of them on the mainstream; and to make a start on construction.

Participating in this complex international venture are 14 countries, 11 United Nations agencies, two foundations, two private companies and the four lower Mekong riparian states.

Resources of manpower, equipment, training facilities or materials have been made available or pledged by Australia, Canada, China, France, India, Iran, Israel, Japan, Netherlands, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Philippines, the United Kingdom, and the United States.

The 11 United Nations agencies which are helping are ECAFE, the Technical Assistance Board, the Bureau of Technical Assistance Operations, the United Nations Special Fund, the ILO, FAO, UNESCO, WHO, WMO, IAEA, and the International Bank. In addition, a Ford Foundation team of consultants has assisted the Committee in its examination of economic and related fiscal, social and administrative aspects of the overall Mekong project; the Asia Foundation has provided a number of travel grants; the Pan-Pacific Southeast Asia Women's Association has offered to participate in social studies; the Shell Oil Co. is preparing a documentary motion picture record of present and future phases of the work; and Price Waterhouse Co., Ltd., have offered to contribute auditing services.

The three mainstream projects are:

(a) At Pa Mong, a short distance upstream from Vientiane where the river forms the international boundary between Laos and Thailand, and which project, with one of the largest reservoirs in the world, would make possible irrigation of about 1 million hectares of land in Laos and Thailand and continuous generation of about 1.5 million kilowatts of electricity, and in addition would increase the value of all other downstream projects;

(b) At Sambor, in Cambodia, which would provide irrigation for 100,000 hectares of land and make possible continuous generation of 400,000 kilowatts of electricity even without Pa Mong, and triple this after the construction of the Pa Mong project; and

(c) At Tonle Sap, which, by utilizing the vast Great Lake of Cambodia for storage and regulation, will on the one hand improve the fisheries of the lake now in danger of extermination; and on the other hand make possible the hydraulic management and reclamation of vast areas in the Mekong delta in Cambodia and in Vietnam.

With reference to the tributaries, the Committee has arranged for the preparation of comprehensive multipurpose project reports on the Battambang and the Prek Thnot in Cambodia, the Nam Ngum in Laos, the Nam Pong and Nam Pung in Thailand, and the Upper Se San and the Upper Sre Pok in the Republic of Vietnam. Of these it is believed that actual construction will commence on the Nam Pong in Thailand before the end of 1962, and may possibly commence on the Battambang in Cambodia and the Nam Ngum in Laos in 1963 or 1964.

As regards navigation improvement, the Committee has instituted a hydrographic survey or mapping of the river bottom of an important stretch of the river from Luang Prabang to the sea. On the basis of this hydrographic survey, the channels will be improved and navigation aids and signals installed. The first such navigation aids are now being placed in position in the delta in Vietnam, and will make possible navigation by night in Phnom-Penh and not merely by day as at present.

Commending the excellent progress made by the Mekong Coordination Committee, the eighthteenth session of ECAFE in March 1962 was able to note with satisfaction that the investigation stage of the Mekong project would soon be followed by the construction of the first multiple purpose project on a major tributary. The Commission "welcomed the worldwide interest shown in, and assistance given to, the Mekong project, an outstanding example of regional cooperation in this United Nations decade of development."

An Agricultural Depression Could Trigger a General Depression

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, the chaotic condition of California agriculture must be solved in a few days or California and the Nation will suffer a serious economic loss. Almost every State is closely tied—even dependent upon—California agriculture.

Stephen D'Arrigo, Jr., in a recent letter to the editor of the Salinas, Calif., Californian, makes several points that deserve the consideration of Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz and reiteration for Members.

The text of the letter follows:

To the EDITOR:

The Secretary of Labor, Willard Wirtz, has stated that California must employ all the unemployed Americans before he allows the use of braceros. California agriculture has no quarrel with this. There is no justification for doing less.

However, agriculture does not believe it should become a social welfare agency or do the work of Alcoholics Anonymous. To this end agriculture contributes more than its share in property taxes from which welfare agencies receive their funds.

Nor does California agriculture believe it must hire and provide jobs to those who will not or cannot qualify or maintain the standard and quality of work his fellow American worker is capable of performing. Certainly, no other industry permits this. A mechanic

whose quality of work is poor is not kept on the job. The same applies to engineers, plumbers, electricians, carpenters, salesmen, etc. * * * Even civil service jobs have qualification tests. Why should agriculture be different?

But different it is because agriculture is forced by the Secretary to employ anyone and everyone whether qualified or not. So that there be no misunderstanding or words put into the text of this article other than that intended, let me make it clear that there are many mighty fine American workers. We have our share of such employees as do the other growers. Unfortunately, due to sociological, physical, and other reasons there simply are not enough of this kind of worker and agriculture should not bear the brunt of solving the social and physical problems of the Nation or absorbing the gap in the administration's war on poverty. The President said these problems belong to all of us and agriculture believes it should remain the problem of all of us. We don't want the whole mess shifted onto our backs.

If the principle of total employment is to be applied to agriculture, then we suggest it also be applied to all industries. At present, under the very law agriculture is now seeking relief for its labor shortage, chorus girls are imported temporarily for shows in Las Vegas and other nightclubs while many American girls are unemployed and waiting to get to the "top" in American show business. Foreign ski instructors are in this country temporarily under the same law while American ski instructors must take other jobs if available. Foreign engineers and technicians are in this country on temporary basis under this same law while unemployment insurance is being paid to our own American unemployed engineers and technicians. While row crop farmers are forced to train anyone who can walk, Basque sheepherders are imported under this same law to herd sheep. Cannot Americans be trained for this work?

The American farmer is an ingenious individual. He'll solve his problems and the labor shortage problem is no exception. He simply won't plant what he can't harvest. True, his income will diminish which is a loss to him; but he'll have plenty of company. Teamster incomes will drop with the need for drivers reduced. Suppliers won't need as many employees. Canneries won't need as many cans and cartons and labor to pack what little is grown. Railroad revenues will go down, etc.

We should all pray that the Secretary is right for if he isn't, this Nation will suffer such serious economic losses that it could trigger a depression. Economists agree it was the agricultural depression that triggered the great depression of the thirties.

STEPHEN D'ARRIGO, Jr.

Assistance on Cost of Water Pollution Control Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith a resolution which was adopted on April 6, 1965, by the Common Council of the City of Buffalo, Buffalo, N.Y., relative to assistance in the cost of water pollution control facilities:

RE ASSISTANCE ON COST OF WATER POLLUTION CONTROL FACILITIES

Whereas each year the incidences of water pollution along the Niagara frontier becomes more and more hazardous to the health, welfare, and well-being of the people of the Niagara frontier; and

Whereas the Honorable Henry P. Smith III, Representative of the 40th District, introduced H.R. 5317, a bill "to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the prevention of water pollution by allowing the cost of water pollution control facilities to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income tax purposes": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this common council memorialize and urge the U.S. Congress, on behalf of the people of the city of Buffalo, to pass the bill known as H.R. 5317 and that the city clerk be authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this resolution to both Houses of the Senate and the Congress and to our respective two U.S. Senators from New York State and our Congressmen from this area.

JOHN A. RAMUNNO.

AID–PEP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES A. MACKAY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, recently, the Agency for International Development has put into action a new program with a spicy name and a laudable cause—it is called AID–PEP for private enterprise promotion. PEP is designed to put some of the zip of our modern industrial system into Latin America, according to AID coordinator for Latin America, William D. Rogers. The program brings Latin American businessmen into the United States to show them what we do to make industry grow in our underdeveloped or lagging areas. Several groups of Latin Americans have already visited the United States under PEP's auspices, and their response has been enthusiastic. The program has become an important part of the Alliance for Progress, and I am proud to be able to say that a citizen of my district, Mr. H. McKinley Conway, Jr., of Atlanta, is responsible for showing our industrial system to these distinguished visitors. Mr. Conway, publisher of "Industrial Development," and president of Conway Research Inc., arranges and helps conduct the PEP tours, and, I might say, is doing an excellent job.

I am inserting an article from the Washington Daily News dated March 26 concerning this program, and recommend its reading to my colleagues:

[From the Washington Daily News, Mar. 26, 1965]

PEP PUTS ZIP INTO ALLIANCE PLAN

(By Virginia Prewett)

The Alliance for Progress is getting new zip from PEP. This is private enterprise promotion, a new agency for International Development activity teaching Latin Americans what U.S. businessmen do about their own "underdeveloped" areas.

PEP brings grassroots Latin American businessmen to see how their opposite numbers in the United States make the grass grow green outside our big-city industrial complexes.

"PEP helps put some of the zip of our modern industrial system into Latin America," says William D. Rogers, AID coordinator for Latin America. Mr. Rogers' own conviction that private enterprise must play an important Alliance for Progress role sparked PEP's emergence.

"When you describe the new thing in the United States called area development, Latin Americans just can't take it in," says AID officials. "They have to see it."

NEW METHODS

The cooperative community development programs that are diffusing modern industry to this country's byways are in fact so new that no university teaches their methods. Yet the U.S. Industrial Development Council has 55,000 members representing towns, cities, States, port authorities, railroads, public utilities, banks, and large U.S. corporations which are concerned with area development.

What the Latin American visitors see gives them a jolt. They have learned, for instance, that 10 years ago thousands of towns like Gallatin, Tenn., and Sulphur Springs, Tex., were dying. In Gallatin, a local businessman, W. Dan Calgy, Jr., got busy bringing new plants to town. In Sulphur Springs, Judson R. Perkins became "Mr. Bootstrap." Community action has brought both towns as many new plants as their labor can serve and a new boom. And this has happened all over the United States.

Simon Gonzalez, head of Colombia's Manufacturing Association, said after a PEP tour:

"I've spent 6 years in big U.S. cities. But I never knew what makes the United States great till I saw Sulphur Springs, Tex. If I could take Sulphur Springs to Colombia to show how your people work together, I could transform my country."

VISIT UNITED STATES

Eight parties of Latin Americans numbering from 5 to 15 men have already visited over 100 U.S. communities. They came from El Salvador, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Honduras, Costa Rica, Colombia, Peru, and Brazil. Others are tentatively scheduled from Panama, Paraguay, Nicaragua, and Guatemala. The tours are conducted under contract for AID by H. McKinley Conway, Jr., of Atlanta, Ga., publisher of "Industrial Development."

Mr. Rogers reports that PEP is catching on. Already 36 area development projects have resulted in Costa Rica, El Salvador, Nicaragua, and Colombia. And more and more Latin Americans want to learn PEP methods.

The Castle Point Veterans' Administration Hospital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH Y. RESNICK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the honor bestowed upon the Castle Point Veterans Hospital in my district for their "excellent performance" in a recent agency cooperative study. This progress in advanced study, as reported in "The Gateway-to-Dutchess" papers on April 1, clearly proves my contention that this hospital

is not, as the Veterans' Administration put it when they announced its closing, "obsolete."

The newspaper article follows:

LOCAL HOSPITAL CONGRATULATED

The Castle Point Veterans' Administration hospital has been congratulated by Dr. James H. Matthews, Chief, Clinical Research in Pulmonary Disease, VA Central Office, Washington, D.C., for its excellent performance in participating in an agency cooperative study. The local hospital's clinical laboratory submitted a report which confirmed, in essence, the findings of other institutions also participating in the study.

In October 1964 the VA Tuberculosis Study Control Laboratory, Atlanta, Ga., submitted a number of cultures for evaluation on drug susceptibility. The clinical laboratory at the veterans hospital, in performing the tests, utilized a new type of media which was prepared at Castle Point by the microbiology staff. This was necessary because media older than 4 weeks would be subject to deterioration through aging.

As a result of this development the microbiologist is now able to recover positive findings at the end of 4 weeks. With this reduction in the time required for growth of the bacilli, sensitivity studies which also require an additional 4 weeks are now reportable at the end of 8 weeks in 48 percent of the cases confirmed as positive. This method has proven beneficial by obtaining results in one-half the time previously required.

King's Boycott of Alabama Called "Alarming" Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat entitled "King's Boycott of Alabama Called 'Alarming' Proposal":

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat]

KING'S BOYCOTT OF ALABAMA CALLED "ALARMING" PROPOSAL

Dr. Martin Luther King's call for a national and international economic boycott against Alabama is perhaps the most alarming action this civil rights leader has ever seriously proposed. Could he have considered all the consequences?

Dr. King is asking other Americans to set themselves against Alabama and deliberately discriminate against the goods produced by the more than 3 million Negro and white fellow Americans who happen to live within the geographical boundaries of that State.

It would be the poor Negroes and poor whites of Alabama who would bear the worst brunt of this proposed boycott.

Alabamans are not unlike other Americans in that they are a people proud of their State. Does Dr. King think that the effect of this boycott will be for the millions of whites in Alabama to cry "enough," denounce the Governor they have elected and confess their sins to the Nation?

Rather we would think that every Alabaman, and other southerners, including those now employing their time and sweat to work out some peaceable solution to this racial crisis, would rally around Alabama and reject this implicit denunciation of an entire State—and a region.

Bringing Alabama to her knees is hardly the way to bring her to fuller acceptance of the new rules and laws of this land. Rather the opposite.

Dr. King has lost his perspective—and patience. He must remember that not until 1954 was it illegal to segregate public schools; not until 1964 was it unlawful for motels and major restaurants to keep out Negroes.

Because of the rulings and laws of this past decade, a century of tradition and an entire way of life must be discarded in the South. It is folly to think that such a radical change will not produce tension and, among the ignorant and reactionary, some violence.

As we are all Americans, it should be our objective to keep that violence to a minimum, to understand Alabama's agonizing problem while insuring that she moves into compliance with the law.

To clamp an economic boycott upon Alabama—which we lack the courage to clamp upon the Communist states of East Europe where all rights are denied indiscriminately—would be to declare the elected government of Alabama an enemy of the United States. That act would deal a crippling blow to the Union itself.

Using the example of the murdered Detroit woman and the murdered minister, Dr. King asked the boycott to end what he called the "reign of terror." Two murders by bigots, vicious and reprehensive as they were, do not make a reign of terror. Some of our larger cities, such as New York, can better come under such a definition.

In Alabama, as in every State, there are potential killers, both black and white, stupid, backward, brutal men, easily excitable, who would kill and have killed for little more provocation than the different color of a man's skin. Dr. King knows there are such men in Alabama.

As a man of nonviolence, he should keep his demonstrations strictly within legal bounds—and discourage the participation of unnecessary outsiders, recognizing full well that it is these outsiders who trigger the murderous instincts of the criminal white bigots.

As for the priests, nuns, ministers and students—many of whom have the finest of motives in going to Selma or Montgomery—we suggest that the rights movement has now all the publicity it can handle.

We ask that they recognize the hard fact that their presence serves more to exacerbate the situation and incite violence than anything else, and that God will hear their prayers as clearly from St. Louis as He will from Route 80 in Alabama.

Redtape Required To Obtain Farm Labor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, few people will believe how difficult it is to obtain farm labor. No other industry is burdened with such barriers. The minimum wage for unskilled workers is $1.40 per hour. None of these workers can earn this much in any other work anywhere in the United States.

The Department of Labor is not oriented to agriculture. Department of Labor officials do not have a thorough understanding of agriculture—especially the growing of fruit and vegetables. The Department of Labor is primarily interested in solving labor, social, and moral problems of the big cities—but is not working for agriculture.

The Department recognizes its lack of knowledge and understanding and is now resorting to polls, questionnaires, surveys, and reports. Even these demands for reports and detailed information demonstrate a lack of understanding of the row crop vegetable industry. By the time the doctors in the Labor Department finish their surveys and examinations and the diagnosis becomes clear, the patient may be dead. Local farm labor specialists should be consulted and their advice utilized.

The California Farmer, of April 3, 1965, explains in an article, entitled "The New Redtape Involved in Getting Labor," the unbelievable difficulties confronting California growers in obtaining help to harvest their crops—which now are beginning to spoil in the fields.

The article follows:

THE NEW REDTAPE INVOLVED IN GETTING LABOR

Albert Tieburg, director of the California Department of Employment, has requested 5,100 braceros under Public Law 414 for use in Monterey County for the next 4 months.

Glenn E. Brockway, regional administrator of the U.S. Labor Department's employment security bureau in San Francisco, has demanded more detailed information before he will make a recommendation to Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz.

Brockway has told Tieburg that the $1.40 wage should be given a chance to prove its drawing power in recruiting Americans before foreign labor is authorized.

Brockway maintains there are American farmworkers available in several other States, and that the California Department of Employment should intensify its efforts to obtain such workers for California through interstate recruitment.

And finally Brockway feels that recruitment in California by special Federal-State teams has produced good results. He says to date these teams have placed 7,177 workers.

"Before I can make a fair and intelligent recommendation to Secretary Wirtz on this request, and on any future requests for farm labor, I must have more detailed justification from the California Department of Employment," Brockway said.

Brockway is asking Tieburg to supply more detailed information on recruitment efforts, retention experience with American workers, working conditions offered, training, housing, crop reports and the basis of the requested duration of need. He emphasized that Congress ended Public Law 78 as an expression of its desire that American farmers use U.S. citizens rather than foreigners in their fields.

"Unemployment in the United States is now 4 million," Brockway says, "and 10 percent of these (400,000) are in California. We have a clear obligation to do everything humanly possible to seek out these men and women and offer them farmwork before we consider labor sources beyond our borders."

In a March 16 letter to Tieburg, Brockway says he must have information not available to him now. He tells Tieburg it would be desirable to have this information on each potential grower-user but says he realizes this is not possible and therefore asks for the information by crops.

Additionally, Brockway asks that this type of information be kept flowing to him currently, so that the period of employment can be limited, and in no case be extended beyond 120 days.

Brockway closes his letter to Tieburg by saying, "In the future, whenever a request is issued to me for referral to the Secretary of Labor with my recommendations, I will

want the type of information indicated below. Greater, rather than less, detail will be most helpful."

In order to evaluate a request for authorization of foreign supplemental farm labor, Brockway says, the request must be accompanied by supporting data covering each of the following items:

Describe fully the recruitment effort made to date by the user with respect to each of the following items: Local recruitment of domestic workers, interstate recruitment of domestic workers, intrastate recruitment of domestic workers. In each case Brockway wants to know when and by whom, where and by whom, and the results.

Then with respect to each item listed above, Tieburg must describe the publicity campaign used to recruit domestics. He is to attach copies of all publicity used, and list all media used with time and place used.

The nature of the hiring authority used is demanded. Under positive recruitment it says to indicate date, place, and time of day of actual positive recruitment. Item b. under this section says (we quote it, but you figure it out): "Delegated authority to hire to public employment office, indicating specific delegation and authority given."

Under the general heading "Retention experience with domestic workers," the following information is requested: With respect to each of recent payrolls (three most recent pay periods, if payroll on a 2-week basis; five most recent pay periods, if payroll on a 1-week basis; covering the most recent 30 days, if on any other payroll basis) show: The number of domestic workers on the last day of each of the above payrolls and the number of domestics hired during the period.

Here is the information under the heading "Working conditions offered": With respect to each of the following items show or describe fully the information requested: Wages. For each activity for which supplemental foreign farmworkers requested show for each of the payrolls in the past 4 weeks (showing the dates of these pay periods).

1. Average hourly earnings, excluding any makeup payments to meet guarantee, computed as total wages earned divided by total hours worked by all employees engaged in that activity. Also show total wages earned and total hours worked on which this computation based.

2. Average hours worked per week computed by counting only those domestic workers engaged for the entire payroll. Include total number of workers and the hours they worked.

Under deductions, Tieburg is to list all deductions from workers' wages, including the amount deducted for each item.

Also requested is a description of each of various types of fringe or other benefits given workers, the value and the eligibility required for those benefits.

Training is to be fully described, covering the nature, timing and duration. Indicate also the length of training period during which the worker is expected to attain average acceptable production and the amount of or method of measurement of that production. This information is to cover both workers and foreman.

Housing is to cover the single-worker type and the family type available and give the capacity and the condition of both as well as the date of the last State inspection.

In addition to the above information on workers a detailed crop report is demanded. We'll not bore you with all the details but here is what is requested for each activity and for each area for which it is proposed to use supplemental foreign farm labor:

They want information as to acreage, production, harvest season and when the season peaks.

They want employment figures. They want the average number of workers used 1960–63, the number used in 1964 and the 1965 estimate.

They want harvest progress information in terms of crates, tons or carloads for the 1959–63 average, 1964 and 1965 covering the second preceding week, preceding week, current week (show date and week ending), cumulative shipments this season to date and the percent of harvest to date.

Under duration of need, Brockway wants the maximum period of employment and the number of supplemental foreign workers required for each activity for which foreign workers requested. Where overlapping or combinations of crops are involved, show date and need for each activity.

Brockway notes that the regulation of the Secretary of Labor prohibit the use by any employer of supplemental foreign farm workers for a period exceeding 120 days, or the employment of any individual alien for more than 120 days in any calendar year.

And finally, the instructions say to describe the basis upon which the labor needs were arrived at.

Growers can only hope that if Tieburg starts now, he'll have the form completed in time for harvesting 1966 crops.

Inaugural Address by Lewis Carnegie Dowdy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HORACE R. KORNEGAY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, April 3, 1965, I was honored to attend the inaugural of the sixth president of the Agricultural & Technical College of North Carolina in my hometown of Greensboro, N.C. This great institution of higher learning since 1890 has provided education for many young men and women of the State of North Carolina. It occupies a great place in the tradition of education in our State and augurs well for the future of our people as it continues to improve the mind and body and spirit of the many thousands of young students who share in the learning process.

In his inaugural address, Dr. Lewis C. Dowdy called attention to the vital role the modern college plays in the arena of human thought.

Because of my feeling that Dr. Dowdy's timely and wise remarks should be shared by all who value learning under unanimous consent I include the full text of Dr. Lewis C. Dowdy's inaugural address as part of the RECORD:

INAUGURAL ADDRESS

(By Lewis Carnegie Dowdy, sixth president, the Agricultural & Technical College of North Carolina, Greensboro, Apr. 3, 1965)

Thank you Mr. Frazier, Lieutenant Governor Scott, distinguished platform guests, delegates, faculty, students, alumni, and friends, I accept with great humility the responsibilities and the great challenges of the office of the sixth president of the Agricultural & Technical College of North Carolina. I am fully aware of the excellent leadership which my predecessors have provided this great institution. I approach this assignment with immeasurable humility because of the demanding times in which we live and the high expectations you have of this institution. I shall do my best to fulfill your lofty expectations. May I hasten to remind you, however, that, because of the present state of the world and the demands which are now being made upon higher education, no one could approach this assignment without a little fluttering of the heart. What Ben Franklin, as our Ambassador, wrote home of the King of France might well be said of education in our time. Under normal circumstances, he would have made a great king, but he inherited a revolution. Revolutions do have a way of dwarfing our best efforts of normal times, and leaves us feeling as the red queen admonished "Alice in Wonderland." In this country, you must run twice as fast to stand still.

The revolutions of our time—economic, social, political, and scientific, like so many others of the past, strike more deeply at the heart of education. Our real problem is not merely whether we can pass on the culture of one generation to another, or create a new one fast enough. It is whether we can educate a new kind of man adequate to survive at all. The fact is that shrinking space and telescoped time have compressed the world's melting pot of cultures, creeds, colors and conditions of men into a pressure cooker. The revolutions in science and technology have given us one world physically, before the social scientists have readied us to live in this one world intellectually, socially and spiritually. Moreover, the power of the first can, and if higher education fails, may indeed, liquidate the second. This single fact dwarfs all others. It focuses education's final test on the speed and competence with which it deals with human nature, its understanding and transformation in attitude, affection and action as well as mind.

In the light of these developments, I wish to present what I believe to be the three most important characteristics of colleges for our times.

Colleges for our times must be dynamic and aggressive in the arena of human thought. In the contemporary surge of creativity and discovery, knowledge doubles and redoubles. Each new fact or proposition lights new paths for exploration and revelation beyond the anticipation and imagination of the most sophisticated. Long divisions of established related knowledge, characterized for convenience and manageability, are stretched beyond the original concepts. Subsequent splintering into specialization and subspecializations are soon made to seem arbitrary as changed awareness of the grand pattern follows each discovery and insight. The function of our college, the function of colleges of our times, becomes more important as the accumulation of what we know defies the individual mind to contain it and frequently challenges the human mind even to classify it, so that it may be retrieved with the aid of our wondrous new machines.

At the pinnacle of new specializations, new discoveries burst forth and new relationships suddenly reveal themselves. That, which was a research device, becomes the heart of a production machine. That, which was a theory, becomes a fact. The processes of research and development, across the whole spectrum of knowledge, have pushed colleges into a new eventuality in our lives and times. Exploring the unknown has always been at the heart of all that education stands for, but the products of its own efforts have placed upon the colleges immense responsibility for the future of our civilization. All of the worthy goals which we desire for man

in this country—justice, knowledge, human dignity, economic vitality, international harmony, the conquest of space, government by and for the people, find ignorance to be a barrier, but education is the gate through which we can reach these goals.

Colleges which are dynamic and aggressive in the arena of human thought provide experiences which help to perfect the natural powers of the mind, powers which distinguish us from brutes, and when perfected, we are able to lay hold upon the intelligible structure in the nature of things. In addition, these colleges attempt to humanize man by perfecting his reason, which becomes his natural dignity, his real greatness. Then, he loves grounded theory, responsible vision, he moves among ideas, able to apprehend them in their distinctness and to work out their communion. All topics then become his food from the simplest to the highest intellectual vision in science.

Colleges with this characteristic will not relax their energy in the years ahead or fall into a state of complacency. They know that the future demands their ever-increasing effort at academic improvement. They remember that, as Arnold Toynbee said some years ago, "Civilization is a movement and not a condition, a voyage and not a harbor."

It is the distinctive feature of our era to be marked by a raical speedup of this movement of change. Nowhere is this fact more important than in the mission of colleges for our times. With these colleges rest the burden of stimulating and promoting that spirit of intellectual curiosity, which alone can sustain this movement of progress. They are not committed to seeking expression through large student bodies or through a growing complex of buildings.

The true worth of these colleges is measured by the quality of their scholars and teachers, and by the vigor, creative boldness, and precision of their intellectual endeavors, as reflected in the growth of true understanding by their students. The task which they undertake is the hard disciplining of the mind and the aggressive training of individual intelligence and discrimination. College for our times have no place for weakening or debasement of academic standards.

They offer no recreational interlude preliminary to entry into life's cold competitive race. Rather, it offers the stern intellectual training essential for successful competition and provides experiences which harden the intellectual muscles with exacting exercises.

These colleges know that the greatest danger of our society rests in the complacent or stagnant segments of our society, which are possessed with a spirit of frustration that numbs innovations and engulfs us in the valley of desparing lethargy which narrows the horizons of tomorrow. Colleges for our times will not let this happen because they know their responsibilities and they must provide leaders of men who will lead many within our society out of their caves of stagnation into the glorious sunlight of an age of realization and an age of change, movement, and within this change must be found achievement, opportunity, progress, and direction.

Colleges for our times have not been reluctant about experimenting with new ideas. They have faced squarely classroom revolutions and their students are now masters of a new mathematics from Set Theory and Non-Euclidean Geometry to probability and statistical thinking—of new physics, biology, and chemistry, or the language laboratory or the teaching machine. They are demanding—and are ready for—far more advanced work than their predecessors. They have new patterns of organization, new uses for such hardware as televisions, computers and tapes. And they have kept abreast of the new experiments which cut across the country from California to Maine, and across the centuries from the founding of Harvard to the newest institution for higher education in the country.

The second important characteristic of colleges for our times is that they must be conversant with the important problems and aspirations of our society. Education looks to the future, and is inevitably an attempt to shape the future. Today, the road ahead is crowded by the danger of nuclear war, and the enormity of this threat blocks our vision. We have the difficult task of facing this threat, and at the same time looking beyond it. If we fail to look beyond it, the long-term future loses all reality for us, then educational strategies degenerate into spasmotic responses to the alarms of the moment—as they have today. If we free ourselves for a moment from preoccupation with the nuclear problem, we encounter another spector that haunts the modern mind.

When archeologists unearth ancient civilizations that have flourished in the past and now have died, the modern mind, acutely conscious of the sweep of history and chronologically apprehensive, is quick to ask, "Is it our turn now?" It is our turn to provide a new thrust for our society. A revitalization for the youth of our society. And this must come from new ideas which will produce for us a different kind of education; an education that takes persons into account, that seeks, fosters, and builds on the universal human quest.

An education guided by unattainable values, creating its own procedures from insights which reflect detailed knowledge of aspirations, needs, and desires of our society.

In order to do this, we must be aware of the rapid changes which are taking place in the world around us. We must seek to know the changes, study them, analyze them, interpret them and try to understand them.

Colleges for our times are conversant with the important problems and aspirations of our society and are fully aware of the fact that we live in a changing world and that change will be with us always. We must admit that we live in a world characterized by an intricate webb of different economic systems and cultures and that we are dependent upon systems and cultures other than our own. We must not close our eyes to change. This will not stop it. The great social change which has been brought on by the contributions of science and technology is tremendous but many of us have not accepted this in the reorganization of our programs. The success of colleges for our times in producing change in society is contingent upon their willingness and ability to adapt themselves to changes. These colleges must be institutions which change society and which are also changed by our society. If these colleges falter in adjusting themselves to new conditions and new challenges, their ability to give direction to and to affect social change will be diminished on all levels.

As science and technology build our world, as specialization and mechanical refinement create for us a material paradise, colleges for our times must not completely surrender to material accomplishments as desirable ends in themselves. Somehow at the core of man's being, there must be a sense of oneness and wholeness.

Emerson expressed this idea in 1837: "There is one man—present to all particular men only partially, or through one faculty; and you must take the whole society to find the whole man. Man is not a farmer or a professor, or an engineer, but he is all. Man is priest, and scholar, and statesman, and producer and soldier. In the divided or social state, these functions are parceled out to individuals. Each of whom aims to do his stint of the joint work while each other performs his."

It is the function of education to restore to man his sense of wholeness. If we are to have men with a sense of their intrinsic value with the belief that meaning exists in the universe and with a commitment to the mission in life, we must look to higher education to produce them. Such men so educated can make vital again the promise of the American dream, which Thomas Wolfe spoke of when he said, "So then, to every man his chance—to every man, regardless of his birth, his shining golden opportunity—to every man the right to live, to work, to be himself and to become what his manhood and his vision can make him—this, seeker, is the promise of America."

Colleges for our times are aware of our loss of individuality as we have become a part of the lonely crowd and our surrender to the social rather than the individual ethics as we have become organization man. In addition, they know that John Galbraith in "The Affluent Society" has said that we have become materialistic and this threatens the stability and integrity of our society. John Keith and Vance Packard have viewed our uniformed housing developments and detected the crack in the picture window and have seen our material possessions as bolstering our uncertain egos and have seen us as status seekers, yielding without reason to the hidden persuaders. Colleges of our times, however, have a program which restores this wholeness to man and ends his desperate search for meaning.

The third important characteristic of colleges for our time is that they have a clear sense of direction and a constant, rigorous evaluation program. A college can be established almost by accident. It can continue to operate by the force of habit, but it can thrive only on purpose that is clear in the minds of all who work with it. There must be clearly defined purposes and objectives which give direction to the development of the institution and which make it possible to develop a coherent and consistent program with a unity apparent to students, faculty, and the clientele generally.

A well conceived statement of purposes suggest directions of development and requires consideration of the future as well as the past. The earmark of a college with clear purposes is that it knows why it is doing whatever it is doing, and it also knows where it is going. A college must do its level best to produce competent graduates, intellectually competent in major branches of human knowledge, vocationally competent in their chosen field of work, socially competent as members of the human society. The concept of competence as a major goal of a college is not utilitarian or narrow. It is simply another way of describing what has been historically called scholarship.

The college graduate should be proud to answer to the name of scholar, since scholarship is a chief aim of a college education. But scholarship has meaning only when it is translated into action as habitual modes of thinking and a lifelong way of living. In our increasingly materialistic society, mere competence without conscience may produce specialists who are irresponsible, technicians who are uncommitted, or educators who are snobs.

Colleges for our times, therefore, should be concerned about the development of graduates of distinctive conscience, ones who have very strong, positive and active ideas about values. Personal commitment to ethical and aesthetic principles of individual and social importance will make a difference in the way one lives. This commitment to conscience, as a major goal of a college means that it must ascribe to intellectual freedom. Teachers without integrity to stand boldly with their own convictions cannot hope that their students will dare to be men and women of personal integrity themselves. Only on the basis of personal integrity can an individual social conscience be built.

Colleges for our times must be able to develop young minds that are powerful in their analysis, accurate in their judgment,

positive in their identification, original and creative in their approach to the solution of problems, and intelligent in the application of knowledge. No aim in higher education should be short of this mark. Colleges for our times have high expectations of themselves and are constantly engaged in brutal scrutiny of their programs. And from this incessant self-analysis, the compass of educational objectives is adjusted for new directions and new expectations on the high seas of educational endeavor.

In summary, therefore, the three most important characteristics for colleges of our times are that (1) they must be dynamic and aggressive in the arena of human thought, (2) they must be conversant with the important problems and aspirations of our society, and (3) they must have a clear sense of direction and a constant rigorous evaluation program.

A. & T. College takes its place today among these colleges for our times. We hope that we can keep before us these three important characteristics. This college is known in every corner of the globe. It commands the respect and admiration of scholars the world over. Its alumni have significant influence, not only in the realm of learning, but also in business, industry, government, and the professions. Its graduates stand tall among some of the most illustrous scholars and citizens of our time, both in this country and abroad. We are, therefore, encompassed by a cloud of witnesses, men and women whose loyalty, intelligence, integrity, usefulness, and influence—nearly 11,000 of them, who carry the torch high for A. & T. College in every corner of the globe.

This college, however, like all colleges, is not perfect. It has not reached its zenith in improvement. The hunger of our aspirations still pain us, and the dreams of our institution have not all come true. In the years ahead, if God be willing, we shall carry forward with all our strength the great work in which we are engaged, building upon the splendid foundation erected by our predecessors, striving for excellence in all we do. We shall be alert to the complex problems, the deep conflicts and the tremendous challenges in the world, and keep before us the vision of bringing light to our youth, knowledge to our people, progress to our State, strength to our Nation, and, hopefully, wisdom to ourselves.

"O Lord God, when Thou givest to Thy servants to endeavour any great matter, grant us also to know that it is not the beginning, but the continuing of the same until it be thoroughly finished, which yieldeth the true glory; through Him that for the finishing of Thy work laid down His life, our Redeemer Jesus Christ. Amen."—Sir Francis Drake's Prayer.

Wisconsin Legislature Opposes Closing of Veterans Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the Wisconsin State Legislature has passed a joint resolution (S.J. Res. 35) memorializing the Congress of the United States to prevent the proposed closing of many veterans hospitals and other veterans facilities.

Under unanimous consent, I include the text of the joint resolution at this point in the RECORD.

The resolution referred to follows:

A JOINT RESOLUTION BY THE STATE OF WISCONSIN LEGISLATURE—S.J. RES. 35

Resolution memorializing Congress to prevent the proposed closing of many veterans hospitals and other veterans facilities

Whereas the Veterans' Administration has recently announced plans to close 11 veterans hospitals, 4 domiciliaries, and 17 regional offices throughout the Nation; and

Whereas by closing these facilities in the name of "economy," the Veterans' Administration will throw the cost of providing welfare and health programs for ailing veterans who have no way of traveling great distances to a VA facility upon the local citizenry, and will deprive many veterans ready accessibility to the facilities which might mean the difference between life and death in emergency cases: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That the Congress of the United States is hereby memorialized to prevent the implementation of the recent Veterans' Administration directive to close these hospitals, domiciliaries and regional offices; and, be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration and to each member of the congressional delegation from Wisconsin.

PATRICK GLUY,
President of the Senate.
ROBERT T. HUBER,
Speaker of the Assembly.
WILLIAM P. NUGENT,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.
JAMES P. BUCKLEY,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

Wipe Out the Klan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. MACKAY
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. MACKAY. Mr. Speaker, the De Kalb New Era, one of Georgia's strongest weekly newspapers, published an editorial on April 1, 1965, commending President Johnson's decision to make war on the Ku Klux Klan. This newspaper has demonstrated courage on many issues and it often voices eloquently the thoughts and attitudes of many of the finest people in Georgia.

The editorial, entitled "Wipe Out the Klan," is reprinted here in full:

WIPE OUT THE KLAN

It has escaped attention of many American citizens that the Ku Klux Klan is listed on the Attorney General's roster of subversive organizations right along with the Communist Party in the United States. All decent Americans have a contempt for both.

Therefore we applaud President Johnson's decision to make war on the Klan and perform a surgical operation to eliminate it as a cancer on the American body politic. Although we do not always agree with the President's thinking in other realms of civil rights, he has our 100-percent backing in his campaign to wipe out the Klan.

The original Ku Klux Klan, founder in the Reconstruction period following the Civil War, had a noble purpose—to protect the wives and daughters of southerners from outrages. It served that end. After World War I it fell into the hands of those like the late Hiram Evans, of Atlanta, who used it to fill their bank boxes with money from people who hated Negroes, Catholics, Jews, and all minority groups.

Today one is inclined to view the bedraggled splinter groups of the Klan as a joke until some of their rabid members commit murder.

Klansmen wrap themselves in the American flag and pretend to be patriots. Actually they are enemies of law and order.

There are large numbers of Klansmen in De Kalb County. In Tucker the name of the Ku Klux Klan is emblazoned on an office window. In Stone Mountain, Jimmy Venable exercises his wizardry over a splinter group of the Klan. We know the names of others. So do many of their neighbors.

As President Johnson has warned, all honest men who have blundered into the Klan would be well advised to get out before the Federal Government cleans them out.

The Problem of Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I recommend for the attention of the House part of a letter I received in response to my questionnaire-newsletter. The writer, Lawrence S. Finklestain, an official of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, has obviously given a great deal of thought to the problem of Vietnam, and I know you will find his remarks penetrating and well reasoned.

The letter follows:

APRIL 5, 1965.

DEAR DONALD: Thank you for your letter of April 2 explaining your vote about the Appalachia bill. I think your reasoning is respectable, even though I am more impressed than you appear to be by the argument that pockets of poverty pose problems for the whole Nation to which a national response is justified. What is the available alternative to the kind of bill which was adopted? I am not sure the analogy is a good one, but would it really be in the interest of the Nation to wait for a national transportation program instead of tackling the glaring weak spots, such as the railroad situation in the New York metropolitan area?

Attached to your letter was your report to your constituents, for which I am indeed grateful, and your questionnaire, for which I heartily congratulate you. I think this is a splendid idea, and I am sure you will get a warm response to it.

The one question I didn't really answer was the one about Vietnam, about which, as you might guess, I have thought a great deal. My general conclusion is that I unequivocally support the administration's contention that we do have an obligation to help the defense of Vietnam, that our effort to do so is consistent not only with our national interests but with the principles to which we subscribe in the U.N. Charter and to the principles of international law, and that our failure to support our undertakings in this area would be corrosive to the will of neighboring countries and their capacity to survive.

Moreover, I agree with the administration that to talk of settlement in circumstances in which the balance of advantage in the field lies with the other side is harmful to our interests and to the interest of those objectives in Vietnam to which we are com-

mitted. I agree also with the administration belief that the will of this Nation can significantly influence the outcome of events. Thus, I support the basic purpose and philosophy of U.S. policy in Vietnam.

However, I begin to have difficulty with the administration over the question of the appropriate and effective means. I sincerely hope that the events prove me wrong, but as of this moment and since the beginning of the new line of policy, I have had serious doubts as to whether air attacks on the north would produce the results that are hoped for, because I have doubts as to their relevance to the real problems we confront. It may still prove to be the case that our air attacks can confront the North Vietnamese with the necessity to pay so high a price to continue their support of insurrection in South Vietnam that they would conclude that the best thing for them to do is to stop. Alternatively, the threat our military action poses to the peace of the region and perhaps of the world may be so great as to invite impartial intervention, making possible a negotiated settlement that takes adequate account of our concern for conditions permitting a viable South Vietnam to emerge and prosper. At this juncture, the latter seems obviously a more likely outcome than the former. However, as you will no doubt already have noted, these are not really alternative conclusions but different forms of the same conclusion, namely, North Vietnamese willingness to stop supporting insurrection in the south.

My doubts stem from the known facts. While it is not true that the South Vietnamese Government has shown itself militarily incompetent, it is true it has not shown a capacity to govern and to attract the support of its populace which are necessary conditions for a viable outcome. It is certainly true that a viable situation in the South requires that the Vietcong use of terror be neutralized. That is a problem which is partially met by relevant military responses. However, it will not be adequately met unless the population wants to support the Government in the campaign. That requires political capability as well as military capability on the part of the South Vietnamese Government.

If I am correct in my judgment that the relevant competence does not adequately exist, serious questions arise. The first is why the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese Government (insofar as these are separable factors) should decide to give up a winning campaign. The evidence seems to be that the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese Government believe it worth their while to persist because they believe that, despite the air raids, they are likely to win. Second, supposing that the air raids do succeed in putting an end to the support the North Vietnamese are giving to the insurrection, what happens then?

I don't see much evidence as to what it is the U.S. Government would expect to have happen in those circumstances. Perhaps, it would be possible to have a foreign presence—U.S. forces, an international commission of control such as those which have supervised the 1954 Geneva agreement, or a U.N. peacekeeping mission of some kind—to try to prevent a resumption of the flow of outside support. In my judgment, such an arrangement would be useful but could never be more than partially effective, given the will to evade the agreements reached, in the circumstances and the terrain of Vietnam. However, even assuming a relatively high degree of effectiveness of such a control arrangement, what would happen among the Vietcong? Why should it be assumed that they too would renounce their objectives? It is worth recalling that, after the 1954 agreement, there was a period of relative calm in the South which led to the outbreak of terror and violence after the passage of some years. Should we not anticipate the same sequence, as the most optimistic situation we can hope for?

I agree, therefore, that there is ground for disagreement among responsible people as to how the United States should behave. If I had access to the information and experience available to those in the Government who make these decisions, I might perhaps agree with them. However, from my existing perspective, I find it difficult to believe that the means that have been chosen are the right ones to achieve the results we would like. My own view is that the correct course of action would have been to continue doing what we were doing, before the air strikes were launched, but more vigorously and more effectively. If an American intervention is needed, it seems to me that it is needed in support of the South Vietnamese effort to contain the guerrilla war in the South and to strengthen the capacity of the South Vietnamese Government to govern and to contribute to the welfare of the people. (Incidentally, I doubt that experience supports the belief that air attacks will actually cut off the flow of external support. I think that requires effective ground action also.)

My conclusion, therefore, is that the U.S. commitment to the support of South Vietnam really requires even more difficult decisions than we have taken. The decision to resort to the air weapon is attractive because it superficially converts the war into the kind of war that we are best at. I wonder whether the real problem is for us to do better at fighting the kind of war we are not so good at, even if that means the politically difficult decision to accept a major commitment of American ground forces to Vietnam. Such a commitment, in my judgment would be more relevant to the real needs. It would be a significant indicator of the intention of this country not to suffer a defeat in the area. It is, obviously, an unattractive decision to have to take, but the situation we confront is in no sense an attractive one.

I recognize, incidentally, that the approach I advocate has a major disadvantage, in addition to the obvious ones that we would surely suffer important casualties and would run some risk of not being adequate to the task. That major disadvantage is that the kind of war I would have us fighting would be very difficult to run without a higher degree of American responsibility for the conduct of the war and hence of intervention in South Vietnamese affairs than now exists. South Vietnam would be an American appendage, with all the political and propaganda disadvantages that would involve, and we would find it very difficult to disengage ourselves from South Vietnam for a long time after the fighting had successfully stopped. However, it should be clear that I don't believe there is any easy way out of this mess, and I think we might well be facing up to the full measure of the trouble we are in and to the responsibility we have accepted.

I'll bet you didn't expect to get this kind of a response when you sent around that printed questionnaire. I apologize for it. I am sure you have a circular file available for such contingencies as this.

With every good wish, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LAWRENCE S. FINKELSTEIN.

Teenage Drinking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, drinking on the part of teenagers has become a national problem. I have sponsored H.R. 5418, which would raise the minimum drinking age in the District of Columbia for all alcoholic beverages to 21. I have also sponsored House Concurrent Resolution 355 urging my own State of New York to change its law to prohibit drinking by anyone under the age of 21.

The Saturday Evening Post of April 10, 1965, contained an article about this problem which I commend to the attention of our colleagues.

The article follows:

TEENAGE DRINKING

(By Bill Davidson)

Shortly after 7 o'clock one evening last May, Gary Hanlon and another 17-year-old boy left Southbury, Conn., to drink in nearby Putnam Lake, N.Y. For a 17-year-old, New York's minimum-drinking age of 18 is more easily circumvented than Connecticut's minimum of 21; the boys, in fact, had already made three drinking expeditions, across the State line that day.

At 7:34 p.m., a gas-station attendant saw Hanlon's car speed up Connecticut's winding Route 39 at about 75 miles an hour, approaching from the south a dangerous curve known as Taylor's Corner. At the same moment, a New Fairfield, Conn., banker named Louis Tanzella was heading into Taylor's Corner from the north, driving his brand-new automobile at a sedate 35 miles an hour. With him were his wife and daughter.

Hanlon's car couldn't make the curve. It hurtled into the left lane, out of control. Tanzella, seeing the car coming at him headlong, tried to steer up the steep bank beside the road. Hanlon hit him broadside. The crash was heard half a mile away. Tanzella and his wife were killed instantly; their daughter died the next morning. It took hours of work with blowtorches to free Tanzella's body from the wreckage. Scanning the banker's blood-soaked driver's license, a highway patrolman noted that it was Tanzella's 54th birthday.

Hanlon's companion survived the crash; Hanlon did not. "A sample of Hanlon's blood," the coroner reported, "revealed a blood-alcohol level of 0.14, a high reading. It was the equivalent of nearly seven ounces of 86-proof whisky in his system."

The Hanlon tragedy made headlines in the local newspapers, but it received almost no notice elsewhere. A month later, however, a similar case—that of 18-year-old Michael Smith—did get national attention. After drinking 12 Scotches at a party in the affluent New York City suburb of Darien, Conn., Smith wrecked his car; his date, 17-year-old Nancy Hitchings, was killed. The incident gained notoriety not because of the teenage drinking so much as because the parents and other adults who had supervised the party were arrested under an unusual and seldom-enforced law.

For every celebrated case such as Michael Smith's there are a thousand obscure cases like Hanlon's tucked away in police files across the Nation. Perhaps because the statistics are hard to get at, the phenomenon of adolescent drinking has not been intensively researched. In the past 20 years there have been perhaps five major studies by outstanding sociologists, and all have tended to play down the problem.

The studies acknowledge that a good many teenagers drink—as few as 50 percent of teenagers in some parts of the country and as many as 86 percent in others. But the studies maintain that, as one authority put it, "most of them don't drink much." Dr. Selden D. Bacon of the Rutgers University Center of Alcohol Studies likes to point out that more 12- and 13-year-old drunks were admitted to New York City's Bellevue Hospital in 1890 than have been brought in for drunkenness in any recent year. When

learned societies discuss the subject, one speaker or another is sure to elicit chuckles by quoting an anicent Egyptian or Sumerian inscription that laments youthful imbibing in the same alarmed phrases used by the press today.

The social scientists say that since 7 out of 10 American adults (or nearly 80 million people) drink, it should not be surprising if proportionately large numbers of children follow the adult example. Nevertheless, they add, the percentage of teenage drinkers hasn't changed much in the last 20 years. Of the 10.9 million American youngsters between the ages of 15 and 20 who are "users" of alcohol, "only" about 3 percent have difficulty with drink—that is, "only" about 3 percent are prealcoholics or turn to alcohol because of deep-rooted emotional problems.

To the social scientist this percentage is "not statistically significant." To the average American, however, it most certainly is. As one Pennsylvania educator put it: "That so-called statistically insignificant 3 percent means that a third of a million kids are running around the United States capable of killing themselves or innocent people and causing millions of dollars worth of damage. * * * Statistically insignificant? I wonder what the smug sociologists would say if we had an invading army of about a third of a million men loose in our country with the same potential of causing death and destruction."

It is the behavior of this troublesome 3 percent that has stirred most of the new national concern over teenage drinking. The problem drinkers, of course, are not evenly distributed across the country. There are fewer, for instance, in midwestern communities with Baptist-Methodist traditions of abstinence, and more in east and west coast communities where the country-club ethic prevails. But few areas have escaped altogether the rampages of young drinkers.

For example, the much-publicized case of the socially prominent youngsters who ransacked a Long Island mansion after a coming-out party in 1963 was matched several months ago in little Hastings, Nebr., where some 40 boys and girls commandeered a vacant farmhouse for a drinking party. Before the night was over they had wrecked the place in an orgy of wanton destruction. In the exclusive Portola Valley suburb of San Francisco 13 boys—aged 12 to 17 and all from wealthy families—engaged in a yearlong alcoholic spree in which they set a school on fire, shoplifted, broke into a dentist's office to find novocain, robbed houses, and stole the hubcaps and smashed the windows of parked cars.

In California, teenagers often induce derelicts to buy alcoholic beverages for them. Not long ago three boys in their mid-teens paid a bum to buy them a case of beer. After they had drunk with the old fellow for an hour or so, the boys got rambunctious and started to stone his shack. When the derelict tried to chase them away, the youngest boy threw a brick at the old man, hitting him on the head. The police found his body several hours later, his skull bashed in. Capt. W. L. Richey, commander of the Juvenile Division of the Los Angeles police, said, "This is a clear case of where teenage drinking led directly to murder."

More and more concerned Americans are coming to realize that underage drinking frequently leads to murder of a sort—to slaughter on the highways. In the last 2 years more than 10,000 persons have been killed in accidents caused by drunken drivers; and more than 4,000 of those fatalities were caused by teenaged drunks. In 1963 there were 112 such fatalities in California alone.

Social scientists who study adolescent drinking tend to deplore the recitation of statistics like these. They say that since 97 percent of drinking teenagers drink moderately, the misdeeds of the immoderate 3 percent should not be emphasized. Some argue that the 3 percent are emotionally disturbed and would be getting into trouble even if they didn't drink.

Sociologist George L. Maddox of Duke University disagrees. "If a youngster is in trouble," he says, "with drinking he's in worse trouble." Another dissenter is Dr. Robert E. Gould, head of Adolescent Services of the Psychiatric Division at Manhattan's Bellevue Hospital. "With the widespread and socially accepted pattern of teenage drinking in America today," Gould says, "you can never tell when deviant or pathological drinking is going to develop out of emotional disturbances and pressures already within the adolescent. If the soil is ready, problem-drinking will grow out of it."

There are several reasons why teenage drinking has become so widespread and so accepted in recent years.

"This current crop of teenagers," says sociologist Harold Hodgkinson, dean of Bard College, "was born in the period following World War II. Their fathers had recently returned from the horror and boredom and deprivation of military life, and their mothers, too, were suddenly released from the overall tension of war. The result was a feeling of elation and relief, and a compulsion for wanting everything to be pleasant. This led to an unusual relaxation of discipline by parents in the governing of their own lives and also in their rearing of their children. We went through a period of extreme permissiveness in dealing with youngsters; the drinking went along with that. Parents drank more themselves, and as their kids grew up the parents didn't seem to care whether their youngsters were experimenting with alcohol or whether they were setting a bad example for their children."

Richard J. Hughes, who as Governor of New Jersey, has crusaded for firmer controls on teenage drinking, explains the increase somewhat differently. "It seems strange," says Hughes, "to blame a situation like this on the general prosperity we're all enjoying in America today, but I'm afraid that's at the heart of the problem. In the 1930's, during the depression, youngsters didn't have the money to buy beer or whiskey or cars. In the early 1940's most of our young men were at war, and those who reached adolescence after the war were struggling along in family situations in which their fathers were trying to reestablish themselves economically after serving in the military. It wasn't until the 1950's and 1960's that the trouble started. With good times, kids got sizable allowances, or they got well-paying jobs after school. Suddenly they had money to experiment with things like drinking. The wealthier kids got cars from their parents; the poorer kids had enough money of their own to buy a jalopy. So for the first time on a large scale we had that very dangerous combination of inexperienced drinking and inexperienced driving."

(Medical authorities have discovered why the combination of drinking and driving is especially dangerous for young people. "The younger age group," says Dr. Johan Lofthus of Norway, one of the world's leading experts on alcoholism, "has on the whole a lower blood-alcohol level. This seems to mean that the younger people [who drink] tend to get into trouble more easily while driving a car, since they have a lower alcohol tolerance than older drivers.")

A third and important explanation for the surge in teenage drinking is that our adolescents are reflecting the persistent tensions of American society itself. Today's youngsetrs have never known a world at peace. The boys face the military draft and also increasingly bitter competition to get into college or to get and hold good jobs. Many girls, too, face the struggle of getting into college, and many drift into unhappy early marriages. Like the adults around them, these boys and girls often resort to alcohol to help them cope with their tensions.

Even for the vast 97-percent majority of youngsters who drink without incident, drinking becomes what Duke University's Dr. George Maddox calls a natural form of "adult role-playing." Battling to be recognized as adults and not children, the youngsters seize upon drinking as a widely recognized symbol of American adulthood. Maddox points out that when a drinking teenager proves his maturity in more substantial ways, such as marrying happily or acquiring and holding a good job, he is likely to stop drinking.

Nearly all experts agree that "adult role-playing" is the key factor in today's widespread teenage drinking phenomenon. Sometimes it takes extreme forms. In San Francisco, for example, a 15-year-old boy, having observed his parents drinking heavily every night, assembled six of his friends, found a bottle of bourbon in his fathers' liquor cabinet and downed it all at once. Nothing happened, so his friends suggested he try "cocktails." The boy then drank two water glasses filled to the brim with a mixture of Scotch, bourbon and vermouth. An instant later the boy fell to the floor unconscious, and his friends rushed him to Junipero Serra Hospital. He was in danger of drowning in his own vomit, and so a doctor performed a tracheotomy, opening a hole through his throat into his windpipe, enabling him to breathe. Eighteen hours later the boy finally came out of his coma and survived, but just barely. Sixteen normal drinks of whiskey taken at once can be a fatal dose. This boy had swallowed the equivalent of nearly 50.

"Teenage drinking," says Dr. Maddox, "usually follows the old adage, 'Like father, like son.' If the child sees his parents drinking excessivelly and compulsively, he'll believe that's the way adults act, and in his adult role-playing he'll act accordingly. If the parents drink just socially and in moderation, the chances are the child will drink that way too."

Most psychiatrists agree, but they point out that the adolescent's concept of the adult role is also affected by what he reads in books and sees in movies and on television. The fictional drunk is often a romantic figure—the surgeon who could be the best in the world if he didn't tipple; the attractive, comical life-of-the-party drunk; and the very masculine, hard-drinking hero of the James Bond stripe. "The danger of these influences on a teenager who has feelings of inadequacy," says Bellevue Hospital psychiatrist Dr. Robert E. Gould, "is that the youngster will drink as an excuse for his deficiencies, like the drunken doctor; or he will drink because maybe that will make him the life of the party, which he couldn't hope to be ordinarily; or he will drink to prove his masculinity. He doesn't realize that excessive drinking frequently connotes just the opposite of masculinity. Often it is used by adults to cover up latent homosexuality or sexual impotence."

These, in sum, are the major findings of the experts. Do these views coincide with those of the individuals directly involved—the teenagers themselves? In hundreds of interviews all over the United States, startlingly similar opinions were repeatedly expressed by youngsters who had never heard of the experts or their opinions.

Take, for example, these three young residents of Danbury, Conn. Seventeen-year-old Mary Lou Chambers unwittingly documented the adult-role-playing theory when she said, "The kids I've seen drinking hard liquor don't really like it. They take a deep breath and force the stuff down their throats. They're just doing it because they're trying to prove how grownup they are." Paul

Carroccio, 16, seemed to echo Gov. Richard Hughes' speculations about automobiles and prosperity: "Overall," he said, "I think that kids who become heavy drinkers are also heavily indulged by their parents. For example, one of my former friends was given an allowance of $20 a week—at the age of 17. His parents also gave him a new car. When he started in high school, he was a straight A student. Then he began driving over the New York border to drink with his friends. By the time he was 19 he had smashed up a couple of cars, he had dropped out of school, and now his parents have thrown him out of the house." And 17-year-old Dorothy Battista gave a perfect illustration of Dr. Gould's life-of-the-party theory: "This girl friend of mine was very unpopular. She started to go over to New York to drink in bars so boys would pay attention to her. Now she goes with a divorced man, and I think she's beginning to sniff dope. Her grades have dropped so that I don't think she'll ever finish school."

In Chicago, an 18-year-old boy unknowingly admitted drinking to cover up for sexual inadequacy. "I don't know what's wrong with me," he said. "When I go with a girl and it's getting serious, and I have a big date with her, I'll go out with my friends and get drunk and I never make the date."

No social scientist could ask for a better example of drinking to excuse failure than that of the 17-year-old in Lansing, Mich., who said, "You gotta have straight A's to get into any of the good engineering schools. This year, when the cops picked me up for drunk driving after that accident I had, I figured I'd never get into a good school anyway, so I gave up even though I'm sure I could have made it without that black mark on my record."

The interviews with young drinkers compellingly depict the failure of State laws prohibiting the sale of alcoholic beverages to minors. Every single youngster told of the ease with which he was able to obtain whisky, wine, or beer through various stratagems. The situation is particularly acute in the States adjacent to New York, which allows 18-year-olds to buy all forms of alcoholic beverages. Teenage spas have sprung up all along the border—in towns like Port Chester and Brewster, N.Y.—to which adolescents from neighboring States flock to drink. Governor Hughes, of New Jersey, and Gov. John Dempsey, of Connecticut, are leading an intensive and so far unsuccessful campaign to get New York to raise its drinking age, too, to prevent the slaughter of out-of-State teenagers returning home in their cars from drinking bouts across the border.

Recently the New York border situation has deteriorated into near-open warfare, with State-police road blocks sometimes making border crossings as complicated for teenagers as those at Berlin's Checkpoint Charlie. Not long ago a New England Governors' Conference in Boston passed a fiery resolution deploring the "ever-widening impact of personal tragedy," and calling on the New York Legislature to see the error of its ways. Last month Gov. Nelson Rockefeller of New York reluctantly declared that he would sign a bill raising the State's minimum drinking age to 21, if the legislature passed one; at this writing, the legislature is considering several.

Throughout the Nation there is a trend toward more stringent legal solutions to the teenage drinking problem. In Redwood City, Calif., last January, Municipal Court Judge Roy Seagraves sentenced Mr. and Mrs. James Melton to spend 10 days in jail and a year on probation for allowing their teenage sons to give a beer party. After the death of the Hitchings girl in the Darien tragedy, Judge Rodney S. Eielson levied stiff fines against adults who had served liquor to the teenagers. Ohio now has a law imposing a fine and even a jail sentence on any teenager misrepresenting his age to a bartender through "false identification or other information"; other States are following suit. Several States now suspend a car's registration if a teenager drives it while drunk. This causes the parent as well as the youngser to lose the use of the car, and it is proving to be a serious deterrent.

Complicating the job of controlling teenage drinking are the tavern and nightclub owners in many parts of the country who cater to the teenage trade. On Long Island, for example, there are clubs that aim directly at the teenager with cash to spend. They even advertise on rock 'n' roll stations, assuring listeners that teenagers' clothing is perfectly acceptable and promising the best in wham-bam music. The tough, young crowd they draw suggests that they are favorite rendezvous for local dropouts.

Many places have set up nonalcoholic nightclubs exclusively for young people. These clubs seldom last long. Notable exceptions are southern California's Cinnamon Cinder clubs (there are four of them). Waitresses serve cola drinks and coffee, and certain informal clothing (levis and capris) is outlawed. Still, despite the restrictions, the clubs are always jammed.

The success of the Cinder clubs notwithstanding, it seems strongly apparent to most observers that the best answer to the teenage drinking problem is sanity in the home. Few authorities suggest that parents practice total abstinence. Most psychiatrists believe that social drinking by parents is harmless so long as it does not become a fetish, and so long as the child is brought up reasonably well. The strong family unit, they say, is the strongest defense against problem drinking. It is a recorded phenomenon, for example, that the children of Italian-American and Jewish parents begin sipping wine ceremonially with their families at an exteremely early age. And yet problem drinking is rare in these groups because of the strong parental influence that frowns on excesses of any kind.

"Unfortunately," says Dr. Selden Bacon, of Rutgers, "not too many American parents apply this sort of restraint on themselves, let alone their children. Today, most Americans are afraid to tell anyone he is drinking too much, for fear of being called a square or a bluenose. We're the only nation in the world where it is not a disgrace for someone to be sloppy drunk in public. If parents rid themselves of this attitude, it would immediately reflect itself in their children. The tragedy of the Darien, Conn., incident was not that the boy got drunk and killed the girl in the car crash, but that not a single adult had the courage to stop him when he was getting drunk."

"After 12 Cans of Beer, I Feel Like a Man"

"I'm a beer drinker," said the boy, a handsome 17-year-old in beige chino trousers. "I don't like any kind of hard liquor. When I was 15, this friend of mine and I got together after school one Friday afternoon and started drinking vodka and orange juice. I got so sick I couldn't even go to school on Monday. So I stick to beer. I usually drink two six-packs at a time, maybe twice a week. I still feel good after the two six-packs, and I still can drive.

"We got a 21-year-old minimum age for drinking here in California," he said, "but it's a joke. You can buy a fake draft card or driver's license for about $5 right here in town. Most of the time it isn't worth the trouble to do that, though, because liquor's so available. All I'd have to do is call the liquor store down on the corner, and they send a bottle or a case of beer over with a 12- or 13-year-old kid, and you give him a quarter tip, and he doesn't say anything. Or, if you're driving around, you wait until you see a wino, get him to go in and buy it for you, and then you give him a quarter."

Asked how drinking affected him, the boy smiled and ran his hand through his thick, curly blond hair. "After polishing off 12 cans of beer, I feel happy," he said. "I feel like a man instead of a kid. Nothing bothers me, and everything is funny. You know, it builds up your courage and your ego. It's fun. You forget about everything else.

"One night, four of us got together and bought three cases of beer. We started about 5 in the afternoon and kept drinking until 11.30 that night. Tom had his car, but he wasn't sober enough to drive, so he just said to take him home and bring back the car in the morning. We dropped him off at his house, but when we looked back, he was walking in the wrong direction. So we got out and led him back to his house and pushed him through the front door. He told us he woke up on the kitchen floor at 3 in the morning. When he first got up the next day, he almost called the police because he forgot about loaning his car. It was a howl.

"Most of the cops are pretty cool. When they see you drinking beer in a car, they'll make you pour it out, but they won't do anything beyond that. The worst they can do is suspend your driver's license temporarily, but then, of course, you can tell them you have to drive to school. Then they blame it on the parents, but you usually get the license back.

"My parents? All my life they tell me 'no' about drinking, and then I come home and see them so loaded they're bouncing from wall to wall. They worry about me? OK, so they worry. It's too bad. They don't like to admit it, but I'm as grownup as they are."

The Cyprus Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on April 1, 1965, I communicated with Secretary Rusk concerning our policy in the eastern Mediterranean. My inquiry was based on reports of intensified military preparations by military powers particularly in the Cyprus area. It is obvious that the U.S. position in the eastern Mediterranean is to preserve the right of self-determination within the geographical boundaries involved. Our NATO commitments as well as our United Nations efforts are all involved.

Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the reply I received from Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations, Douglas MacArthur II. I subscribe to the statement of policy that—

What is needed is a really serious spirit of accommodation which could revive cooperation and ultimately friendship among the nations and communities concerned, and which at the same time could relieve the United Nations and the world from the burdens and dangers which this strike has too long imposed upon them.

The letter follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, April 7, 1965.

The Honorable JOHN M. MURPHY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MURPHY: Thank you for your letter of April 1 enclosing a letter from Mr. James T. Triveley of Staten Island, N.Y., concerning the situation in Cyprus.

We have noted the newspaper articles cited by AHEPA and agree fully that peace must be preserved between Greece and Turkey. The Cyprus crisis, now more than a year old, has had increasingly serious effects on the security of the eastern Mediterranean, on relations between our two NATO allies, Greece and Turkey and on the Western Alliance. We have actively supported the United Nations peacekeeping force on the island in its delicate and difficult task. It is due both to the efforts of the U.N. and to the efforts of the United States in continually urging moderation and restraint upon all parties that a relative calm has existed on Cyprus over the past 6 months and peace has, in fact, been preserved so far between Greece and Turkey.

Simply preserving the peace, however, is not enough. Our objective is not just peacekeeping, but peacemaking. In addition to our efforts at preventing war, we have firmly supported the U.N. mediation activity and have been alert to every opportunity to encourage movement toward a reconciliation of differences and a start to discussions which could lead to a settlement both equitable and permanent.

Recent days and weeks have seen developments which are in some ways ominous and in others promising. We have noted reports of a buildup of Soviet-supplied arms in Cyprus and a certain bellicosity in press reports from the area. However, we have also noted reports that may indicate more willingness to ease tensions or to entertain some thought of conciliation. We believe this is vitally necessary. As Ambassador Stevenson said before the United Nations Security Council on March 19, "What is needed now is not a stale repetition of charges and countercharges or a grim adherence to every detail of traditional positions but, on the contrary, a really serious spirit of accommodation which could revive cooperation, and ultimately, friendship among the nations and communities concerned, and which at the same time could relieve the United Nations and the world from the burdens and dangers which this strife has too long imposed upon them." This is our policy and it is toward this end that all our efforts are directed.

If I may be of any further assistance to you, please do not hesitate to call on me.

Sincerely yours,

DOUGLAS MACARTHUR II,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations.

GOP Comeback

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD RUMSFELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the recent success of the Republican Party in local elections in the State of Illinois, as related in the following editorials of the Chicago Sun-Times and the Chicago Tribune, indicates that the GOP is very much alive and can win when capable candidates are offered to the voters and party workers put forth the necessary effort. These elections were clearly a test of strength between the Republicans and the Democrats who have been entrenched in office for many years, and the margin of votes gained by Republican candidates clearly points out that an aggressive campaign can bring victory. The recent results of the local elections in Cook County, Ill., are a good sign for those who believe in a two-party system.

The articles follow:

GOP COMEBACK IN BERWYN

Republicans concentrating on rebuilding their party at the grassroots level should be encouraged by some of the results of local elections in Cook County Tuesday. Berwyn, particularly, made party leaders happy. Fourteenth largest city in Illinois, Berwyn elected its first Republican mayor since 1929. It elected a Republican city treasurer and cut a 14-to-2 Democratic majority in its city council to 9 to 7.

Republicans also were encouraged by a Republican sweep in previously Democratic Niles Township and defeat of the mayor of Skokie, backed by the Democratic organization. The Skokie election, however, may have been influenced by other than partisan considerations.

The Berwyn and Niles Township elections were particularly gratifying to Sheriff Richard B. Ogilvie who is trying to build up the GOP from the precinct level. Berwyn's Republican township committeeman is Harry Magers, who is the sheriff's chief deputy. The new Niles Township supervisor is John J. Nimrod, chief custodian in Ogilvies' office. Niles Township voted 3½ to 2 for President Johnson last November and for Democratic State's Attorney Ward. It voted Republican for Governor by a small margin.

Although Democrats have been strongly entrenched in Berwyn city hall, the voters have been inclined toward the Republican Party recently. President Johnson won in Berwyn by 25 votes last fall but all State and county Democratic candidates trailed. Charles Percy, GOP candidate for Governor, carried Berwyn by 4,743.

Berwyn's mayoral winner, George E. Dolezal, former State representative with a good record in Springfield, won by 4,086 votes. He undoubtedly brought personal strength to the Republican ticket Tuesday. But there were many issues involved, including charges that the Democrats, long in office, were behind the times and inefficent in such matters as garbage collection.

Many voters undoubtedly were moved to vote Republican solely as a protest against the sponsorship by Democrats generally of open occupancy legislation, such as was approved by the house executive committee in Springfield Tuesday. Homeowners do not want to lose their freedom of choice in the sale or rental of real estate. The Berwyn vote should make Democratic leaders in Springfield more aware of this.

Winning in Berwyn gives Republicans an additional 300 political patronage jobs. Thus practically as well as psychologically the vote helped the Republican Party.

WELL, LOOK WHO WON AN ELECTION

The only Cook County suburban election Tuesday which was a clear test of strength between the Republican and Democratic parties was in Berwyn, a pleasant western suburb where the Democrats have been entrenched for many years. They controlled the city council, 14 to 2, and all the other city offices. The Republicans had not elected a mayor for 36 years.

Tuesday's election showed that the GOP is not so dead at the grassroots as its enemies hoped. George E. Dolezal, an attorney and former State representative, was elected mayor, 15,559 to 11,473. The Republicans also won six of eight aldermanic seats being contested, and elected the city treasurer and three township auditors.

Berwyn Township has the same boundaries as the city of Berwyn; so the election was a clash between the Democratic committeeman, State Representative Frank Broucek, and the Republican committeeman, Harry Magers, chief deputy sheriff of Cook County. Broucek had the support of the rich and powerful Democratic county organization; Magers had backing from Sheriff Richard Ogilvie, the only Republican county officeholder.

The Republicans were fortunate in their candidate for mayor, former Representative Dolezal, who made an excellent record while he was in the legislature. He served as chairman of the election laws commission which presented election reform measures scuttled in the house on orders of Mayor Daley.

The Berwyn Republicans conducted a smart and aggressive campaign. They directed voters' attention to the fact that the Democratic township leader, Representative Broucek, is one of the sponsors of Mayor Daley's reapportionment bill which calls for House districts overlapping the city and suburbs. The election therefore was, in part, a referendum on this issue, and the results support the Republican view that there should be no overlapping.

The Berwyn Republicans were handicapped by their lack of jobholders to man the precincts and by a shortage of campaign funds. In these respects the Democrats felt no pain.

The election was a demonstration that the Republicans can win in a community composed largely of homeowners, if the party presents able and attractive candidates, works hard, and capitalizes on the other party's mistakes.

At any rate, Republican is not such a dirty word as some of the analysts of the 1964 election would like to believe.

Greek Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, as a Nation which fought bitterly for its own independence, we are always happy to join with other countries to celebrate their similar battle for political freedom. But we must feel a special kind of satisfaction on the anniversary of the independence of Greece.

For Greece and its cultural heritage stand at the base of everything we revere in western civilization. Certainly the culture of our own United States owes more to this tiny country than we could ever repay.

The story of Greece's fight for liberation is a stirring tale of courage and resolve. From the day when they raised the banner of revolt against the Turks on March 25, 1821, until the famous battle of Navarino in October of 1827, they faced their more powerful and ruthless foes almost alone, and at times it looked like these courageous descendants of ancient Greece were doomed. The whole civilized world watched the Greek war of independence with keenness and anxiety. But they could not remain in the spectator's role for long. In the fall of 1821, when the Greek position seemed desperate and their foes more ruthless, then European governments stepped in, restrained the Turks, and thus insured Greek independence. In their finest hours the Greeks fought gallantly for their freedom, and the European gov-

ernments rendered a great service to humanity by helping the Greeks in their desperate struggle.

It is with great pride that we join with our 1½ million fellow Americans of Greek origin to celebrate this 144th anniversary of Greek Independence Day.

Social Security Disability and Increases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, for some time now I have been greatly concerned about certain interpretations by the Social Security Administration that have resulted in turning down a relatively large number of applications for disability benefits based upon what is in most instances essentially permanent and total disability.

Under the Social Security Act, the antecedent disability is defined "as of long and indefinite duration" and which prevents the individual from engaging in any substantial, gainful activity.

I believe it is the restrictive interpretation of this latter phrase which has resulted in the denial of many applications that would appear on their face to warrant favorable action.

I have personally known of numerous instances where persons were suffering from some serious heart condition, paralytic shock, or from serious personal injury, or other conditions which left them, not only completely disabled to perform any substantial gainful work, but completely and permanently disabled them from performing any work for the rest of their lives, and yet their applications were not favorably acted upon by social security.

I do not think that this result is in keeping with the intent of Congress, the spirit or the letter of the act, because I think considering the way the act has been written, it would be possible for the agency to make administrative interpretations that would cover cases which on the record and on the evidence would plainly appear to be instances of total, permanent disability without any question.

It is apparent to me that there are other deep-seated problems relating to social security that the Congress will have to continue to consider, such as the adequacy of current benefits. I appreciate, of course, that while that is of greatest moment to the recipients, it is also presenting extremely difficult, challenging problems to the Congress, since we must maintain solvency of the social security trust fund and we cannot take action that will result in impairing this fund in any way.

The alternative is of course to make reasonable adjustments upward of social security benefits and pay the difference out of the ordinary revenue of the Government. This would be a very expensive matter, and when it is considered, together with other matters affecting social security, it can readily be appreciated that the problem before Congress is really one of overhauling the entire social security system to make it more effective and responsive to current high costs of living and the needs of the disabled, social security recipients, and the needs of ordinary social security recipients, who are finding in increasing numbers that their payments are woefully and painfully inadequate to sustain them in advancing years.

These problems cover a great deal of ground and will continue to require to my mind a great deal of intensive and extensive examination, consideration, policy determination and expert draftsmanship such as would be best assured by long committee hearings and painstaking study.

It is clear that the general revision of the Social Security Act is needed and I believe that it would be very unwise to defer this action which also should include the integration of other social legislation related to social security that the Congress may consider and adopt. We cannot allow this great, valuable system to become a sprawling administrative nightmare.

I submit that it is not sound public policy to delay further in vigorously tackling these problems, because with the increase in wages, prices, interest, rents, and the advancing, inflationary spiral which at all costs must be kept within tolerable bounds, that the growing needs of social security recipients will result in serious inadequacies and injustices, if the benefits are not equitably adjusted to meet current costs and standards, and if the Congress fails to coordinate all purposes germane and related to social security in the overall cost to those covered, the employers and the Government.

One approach to these questions might well lie in a careful, massive, prolonged study by some commission of Government authorized by the Congress to review these matters and come up with appropriate recommendations for legislation to be submitted to appropriate commitees of the House. But I urge prompt early consideration of these matters and meanwhile the effective adjustment by Congress of a proper legal formula that will insure prompt, reasonable disability benefits to those eligible members of the social security system, who can show by competent, medical evidence that current disabilities actually disable them from performing "any substantial work for the foreseeable future," and whose condition is tantamount in all practical respects so far as ability to work is concerned, to total permanent disability.

I want to express my thanks to the learned chariman of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Arkansas, Chairman MILLS, for his warm interest and his willingness to undertake a study of the problem of providing a suitable legal formula for the determination of disability benefits and for his many other contributions to this cause.

I propose to continue my interest and my labors in these matters in the hope that the Congress may take effective, equitable action in the not too distant future. It is mandatory if we are to make the social security system truly responsive to the needs, entitlements and deserts of the rank and file of the American people and after all, is that objective not our job?

Meanwhile, it is vital, as I see it, for Congress to move with all possible speed with the passage of the social security increases voted by Congress last year.

We must cut all red tape and end all unnecessary delay. The small relief this bill gives is sorely needed by very many fellow citizens who should have had these benefits, these small increases last year.

Resolution of California Assembly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 26, 1965

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, our National Government is only as strong as the communities that sustain it, and the effectiveness of those communities usually is the result of a few individuals dedicated to civic effort.

Congressman JEFFERY COHELAN and I are particularly proud of one such person, Mr. Norris Nash, of Oakland, Calif., a city which we both have the honor to represent. Mr. Nash is retiring from active business and civic life this month. He has unselfishly devoted his time and leadership talents to literally hundreds of civic and educational organizations in Oakland.

I must heartily agree with Edgar F. Kaiser's commendation that Mr. Nash is a truly great citizen. If all of our communities had people of this rare breed, our problems would be few. Because of his concern for his fellow man, the California Assembly has adopted a resolution of tribute to him. I recommend that recognition of such outstanding local achievement be extended to the national level, and I consider it my privilege to place that same resolution into the RECORD:

RESOLUTION RELATING TO THE RETIREMENT OF MR. NORRIS NASH FROM KAISER INDUSTRIES CORP.

(By Hon. Don Mulford of the 16th District, Carlos Bee of the 13th District, Hon. Robert W. Crown of the 14th District, Hon. Nicholas C. Petris of the 15th District, and Hon. William Byron Rumford of the 17th District)

Whereas the industrial and community leader, Norris Nash, will retire this year as vice president of Kaiser Industries and as director of community relations for that corporation; and

Whereas Mr. Nash has performed outstanding service in many national, State, and civic organizations, and is currently a board member of the National Municipal League, a member of the board and executive committee of Action, president of the Oakland Museums Association, a director of the Pacific School of Religion, and a member of the World Trade Club, selected insurance and financial equities, Oakland Symphony

Orchestra Association, international hospitality center, bay area urban league, Fukuoka Society, and the University of California hospitals auxiliary, and is on the advisory committee of the Junior League of Oakland; and

Whereas he is a former regent of the University of California, has been president of the California alumni association, the California alumni foundation, the Oakland Chamber of Commerce, the east bay federation of community chests, the united bay area crusade, the children's hospital of the east bay, and the Oakland renewal foundation, and is a past chairman of the citizen's committee for urban renewal, and a past director of the world affairs council, the regional export expansion council, the Oakland boys' clubs, and the Boy Scouts of America, and is a former member of the Salvation Army advisory committee; and

Whereas born in San Francisco and educated in Berkeley, Mr. Nash is a veteran of World War I, is a graduate of the University of California, and was vice president of Mills Estates, Inc., a corporation for which he worked for 17 years; and

Whereas in 1942 he joined the Kaiser organization as a director of public relations at the Kaiser shipyards in Richmond, 4 years later he was appointed director of special events and sales promotion for the Kaiser automobile plant at Willow Run, Mich., from 1949 to 1954 he was with Kaiser Services as director of customer relations, and in 1955 he was appointed vice president of Kaiser Industries Corp.; and

Whereas Mr. Nash's outstanding talent for leadership, his many achievements in business and in community life, and his wisdom in dealing with pressing problems of vital concern to all citizens have contributed greatly to the progress of this State: Now therefore, be it

Resolved by the Assembly of the State of California, That Norris Nash is commended for his many outstanding achievements and for the numerous significant contributions he has made to the well-being of this State, and that it is the hope of this body that he enjoy the fullest measure of happiness and achievement in his well-earned retirement; and be it further

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly shall transmit a suitable prepared copy of this resolution to Mr. Norris Nash.

JESSE M. UNRUH,
Speaker of the Assembly.

Attest:

JAMES D. DRISCOLL,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.

New York County Lawyers' Association's Committee on American Citizenship Endorses Administration Immigration Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following report of the Committee on American Citizenship of the New York County Lawyers Association favoring the Celler-Hart immigration bill.

The report is dated March 29, 1965, and gives an excellent summary of existing law and the changes proposed.

The report follows:

REPORT NO. F-1 BY NEW YORK COUNTY LAWYERS' ASSOCIATION ON S. 500 AND H.R. 2580

(Introduced by Senator HART and by Congressman CELLER)

Report of committee on American citizenship on S. 500 and H.R. 2580 of the 89th Congress, 1st session, which seeks to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C.) so as to provide that immigration into the United States be based on date of registration rather than country of birth, and for other purposes.

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL

Existing statute	*Proposed changes*
1. Section 201 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 175, 8 U.S.C. 1151) in its present form provides that, with certain exceptions, the annual quota of any quota area shall be one-sixer of 1 percent of the number of inhabitants in continental United States in 1920 attributable by national origin to such quota area, with a minimum quota of 100 for any area. The exceptions are the computation of quotas for quota areas within the Asia-Pacific triangle and for Chinese persons.	S. 500 as introduced by Senator HART and H.R. 2580 as introduced by Congressman CELLER, which are identical, seek to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act in the following respects: 1. It establishes minimum quotas of 200. It abolishes the national origins quota system over a 5-year period in the following manner: It reduces each quota by 20 percent a year; that is, 20 percent the first year; 40 percent the second year; 60 percent the third year; 80 percent the fourth year; so that by the end of the fifth year there are no country quotas. The numbers that become available by the annual reduction in quotas plus all unused numbers of the prior years go into a quota reserve pool. Numbers within the pool are to be allocated on a first-come-first-served basis with certain priorities provided for in subsequent sections. No quota area can receive more than 10 percent of the total (or 16,500), except that during the first 5 years no country shall have its present quota reduced by more than the annual 20 percent authorized. The President may, after consultation with the Immigration Board which the bill sets up, reserve (1) not ot exceed 30 percent of the quota reserve for persons whose admission is determined by him to be required (a) to avoid undue hardship resulting from the reduction of annual quotas and (b) in the national security interest of the United States, and (2) not to exceed 10 percent for allocation to quota immigrants who are refugees from racial, religious, or political persecution or persons uprooted by national calamity or military operations who are unable to return to their usual place of abode. After the 5 years all numbers go into the quota reserve pool and are allocated, according to the priorities, on first-come-first-served basis. The ceiling of 10 percent for any one quota area remains.
2. Section 202 provides that persons attributable by as much as one-half of their ancestry to a people or peoples indigenous to the Asia-Pacific triangle (which is, roughly speaking, the entire area of Asia) shall be chargeable, no matter where born, to quota areas within that triangle.	2. It eliminates the Asia-Pacific triangle.
3. Section 101(a)(27)(A) provides that spouses and minor children of citizens of the United States shall be nonquota immigrants.	3. It adds parents of American citizens.
4. Section 101(a)(27)(C) provides that persons born in Canada, the Republic of Mexico, the Republic of Cuba, the Republic of Haiti, the Dominican Republic, the Canal Zone, or an independent country of Central or South America shall be nonquota immigrants.	4. It adds persons born in any independent island country adjacent to North, Central and South America.
5. Section 201(a) provides that the first 50 percent of any quota shall be made available to persons determined by the Attorney General to be needed urgently in the United States because of their high education, technical training, specialized experience or exceptional ability and to be beneficial to the national economy, cultural interests or welfare of the United States.	5. It changes the words "needed urgently in" to "especially advantageous to."
6. Section 204 provides, among other things, that, in order that a person having the qualifications set forth in Section 201(a) may be classified as such, a petition on his behalf shall be filed by a person, institution, firm, organization or governmental agency desiring his services.	6. It eliminates the necessity for employment assurances and permits the classification on the proof of advantage to the United States and qualifications.

REPORT NO. F-1 BY NEW YORK COUNTY LAWYERS' ASSOCIATION ON S. 500 AND H.R. 2580—Con.

RECOMMENDATION: APPROVAL—continued

Existing statute	*Proposed changes*
7. Section 203(a)(2) provides that 30 percent of the quota shall be available to parents and unmarried adult children of American citizens.	7. It deletes parents from this group. (They would be included in the non-quota category—see (3) above.)
8. Section 203(a)(4) provides for a fourth preference category for married children, brothers and sisters of American citizens.	8. It adds to this category parents of legal residents. It also adds to this category persons "capable of performing specified functions for which a shortage of employable and willing persons exist in the United States," up to 50 percent of "visas remaining available for issuance under this paragraph after the preference to the named relatives of U.S. citizens and resident aliens is satisfied or exhausted" and provides for employment assurances on their behalf.
9. Section 1 of the act of July 14, 1960 (74 Stat. 504) defines a refugee-escapee who may be paroled into the United States under the terms of section 212(d)(5) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as an alien who because of persecution or fear of persecution has fled from a Communist country or from a Middle Eastern country bounded, among others by Libya on the west, who is not a national of the area where the application is made, and who is within the mandate of the U.S. High Commissioner for Refugees.	9. It eliminates the limitation to persons within the mandate of the United States High Commissioner for Refugees, and extends the western boundary of Middle Eastern escapees to Morocco.
10. Section 2 of the act of July 14, 1960, includes a provision for parole into the United States of 500 persons listed as "difficult to resettle."	10. It eliminates this provision.
11. Section 281 of the Immigration and Nationality Act provides for the payment of visa fees.	11. It makes certain changes in the amount of visa fees and the time and manner of payment. 12. Subdivision (c) is added to section 203 to provide that the Secretary of State may terminate a registration on a quota waiting list if an alien fails to give evidence that he intends to use the visa.
13. Section 212(a)(1) excludes aliens who are feeble-minded.	13. It changes the term "feeble-minded" to "mentally retarded."
14. Section 212(a)(4) excludes, among others, aliens afflicted with epilepsy.	14. It eliminates this exclusion.
15. Section 212(f) provides that an alien afflicted with tuberculosis who is the spouse, unmarried child or parent of a U.S. citizen or legal resident or an alien who has been issued an immigrant visa, may be issued a visa under terms, conditions and controls prescribed by the Attorney General after consultation with the Surgeon General.	15. It adds to those admissible under these conditions the same category of close relatives with various forms of mental health problems.
	16. It establishes an Immigration Board of seven members, three, including the Chairman, to be appointed by the President, two from the Senate and two from the House of Representatives, to implement provisions of the law, including the setting up of criteria for admission of persons specified in 6. and 8. above; to study and make recommendations with respect to other aspects of the law; to conduct investigations and hold hearings thereon, etc.
17. Section 221(g) provides that no visa shall be issued if a person is found ineligible therefor, with certain provisos.	17. It adds a proviso that, if a person is otherwise eligible to receive a visitor's visa or student visa, the consular officer may issue same after receiving advice from the Attorney General that a bond has been posted to insure the alien's departure and/or maintenance of status.
18. Section 272(a) provides for fines for the bringing into the United States of certain persons who are ineligible for admission.	18. It changes the category of persons to conform to the changes enumerated in 13 and 14 above and other changes made in prior laws over the last few years.

DISCUSSION

1. The national origins quota system is the system under which each country outside of the Western Hemisphere can only have a specific number, a quota, of immigrants admitted to the United States each year. This is allocated so that each country gets as its quota a proportion of the total equal to the proportion of the white population in the United States in 1920 whose national origin, including ancestry, could be attributed to that particular country. The present total annual quota is approximately 157,000.

Great Britain, for instance, gets 65,361 of the total quota of roughly 157,000 (of which it usually uses only about 40 percent). Poland, on the other hand, gets 6,488; Italy 5,666, Hungary 865, and Greece 308 (all of which have heavily oversubscribed quotas).

Under present law, the minimum quota for any country is 100. Moreover, persons of one-half Asian ancestry, unlike all others, regardless of place of birth, are chargeable to the quota assigned to the Asian area from which they originally derived by their Asian ancestry.

The present quota system is discriminatory and is based on the fallacy that persons from one part of the world or of certain colors would be more conducive to the welfare of this country than others. The proposed law provides for the gradual elimination of this system with only a slight increase in the total number of quota numbers available throughout the world; namely, 7,000.

The most important feature of the proposed legislation is the gradual change from the National Origins Quota System of selecting immigrants to another more equitable system. The bill retains a ceiling of approximately 165,000 quota numbers and increases from 100 to 200 the minimum quota for any quota area. The bill proposes that beginning with the first fiscal year after the enactment of the bill, and for each of the 4 succeeding years, the present annual quota of each country will be reduced by 20 percent. The quota numbers thus deducted are to be placed in a quota reserve and are to be made available to prospective immigrants according to certain criteria set out in the law, but not depending on their national origin. Each year as additional numbers are released from national origin quotas, they are added to the quota reserve mentioned above. Since it is recognized that this change will create hardship in countries with very small quotas, the minimum quota is raised to 200, but this will be reduced in the same manner as other quotas.

The bill provides for a quota reserve pool under which all numbers will be allocated by the fifth year. It also provides that quota numbers, not issued during the previous fiscal year, will be made available during the 5 fiscal years following the enactment of the law to quota immigrants from oversubscribed quotas.

The combined number of quota numbers issued to any one quota area may not exceed 10 percent of the total quotas authorized for that year.

Since these provisions might affect adversely the present quotas of Great Britain (65,361), Germany (25,814), and Ireland (17,756) which, because they are current, have no old registrations on file, a provision is made for a readjustment, up to 30 percent of the total quota numbers, to avoid undue hardship because of the reduction in annual quotas.

There is also a provision to allot up to 10 percent of the numbers available to refugees for whom up to now there has been no permanent provision and for whom special laws or Presidential directives have had to provide in case of emergencies.

2. The bill proposes to revoke a number of provisions which have been criticized as being discriminatory with respect to certain races. Among them are provisions which create the Asia-Pacific triangle and require persons who trace as much as one-half of their ancestry back to people or peoples indigenous to the Asia-Pacific triangle, an area defined in the law, with a total quota of 100, to be charged to that quota even if born in a more favorable quota area. For instance, a person of Indian origin, born in Brazil, is not nonquota as are other natives of Brazil, but is chargeable to the quota of the Asia-Pacific triangle.

3, 7. By making parents of American citizens nonquota, it furthers the policy which has been growing over the years of uniting families. At the present time, with some of the second preference quotas many years be-

hind, some parents have had to wait a long time to be reunited with their children, while others, whose quotas are open, are able to enter immediately. This change would put all parents on a par.

4. This provision would include, among those entitled to nonquota visas, persons born in Jamaica, Trinidid, or Tobago, or any adjacent islands which may hereafter become independent. At the present time persons born in other adjacent independent island countries; namely, Cuba, Haiti, and the Dominican Republic, are nonquota. At the time of the enactment of the Immigration and Nationality Act in 1952, those were the only independent adjacent island countries. Now that Jamaica, Trinidad, and Tobago have become independent, there is no reason not to include them. Furthermore, in the event that other adjacent island countries should become independent, they should likewise become nonquota.

5, 6. It provides for the granting of first preference petitions filed by persons who meet the requirements of the law, but without the necessity of having a specific employer petition for such immigrant. By maintaining the safeguards of high education, technical training, specialized experience, or exceptional ability, and the special advantages and the benefits to the United States, it would bring to the United States persons whom we need here, but often cannot get because they do not know an employer, nor how to contact one; the employer does not know them nor how to contact them, or the employer does not wish to employ a person sight unseen, or the employee does not wish to bind himself to an employer sight unseen. Furthermore, this would enable the employer to obtain a needed employee at the time he needs him and not a year or more later, for even if the first preference portion of the quota is open at the present time, the processing takes a minimum of 6 months and more often, close to a year; if the first preference portion of the quota is oversubscribed, it may take years to obtain an employee. As is well known, there are certain professions and skilled occupations in the United States for which there is a continuing need, and it is in the interest of our Government, our health, and our economy that this need be filled.

8. Today parents of legal residents are in the nonpreference portion of the quota, giving them no better status than a person who has no close relatives in the United States. In furtherance of the policy of reuniting families, they would be included in the fourth preference category putting them on a par with married children, brothers, and sisters of American citizens.

The provision to give a slight preference to persons performing specified functions for which a shortage exists in the United States is an extremely advisable provision, as there is often a great need in this country for persons who are either semiskilled or have certain skills which do not measure up to the requirements specified in the first preference category.

14. In view of the discoveries of modern science, the elimination of epilepsy as a ground of exclusion has long been needed.

15. This would provide for the admission, under proper safeguards, of persons who have or have had a mental illness and who would otherwise be separated from their families. With the developments in the cure and/or control of mental illness, and the enlightened policy of our immigration laws regarding tuberculosis, as evidenced by the act of September 11, 1957, it is logical and fair that we should go one step further and permit the entry of family members who have or in the past have had a mental illness. This would eliminate the heartbreaking situation which presently exists of requiring a parent to leave one member of a large family in their native country, sometimes because of a mental illness which has been cured, or causing an entire family to remain in their native country in order to avoid separation. Since the admission would be under safeguards, such as requiring institutionalization, hospitalization, giving of bond, etc., this Government would be fully protected.

Respetcfully submitted.

COMMITTEE ON AMERICAN CITIZENSHIP,
Hon. MAURICE WAHL,
Chairman.

Private Enterprise in Appalachia?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Duke Power Co.'s request to spend almost a billion dollars in Appalachia needs the same backing and support the Appalachia bill received and from the same Federal Government and congressional sources.

The following editorial appeared in the Wall Street Journal on April 13. I commend it to the attention of the Congress and to the people of the Nation:

UNCREATIVE FEDERALISM

When President Johnson signed the bill authorizing $1.1 billion for Federal programs in Appalachia, he hailed it as a true example of "creative federalism." Yet that same federalism is impeding possibly more significant developments of private enterprise in the same area.

Specifically, a private electric power company in Appalachia is ready to spend $910 million of its own money on two power projects. So far it is being held back from spending a dime by Congress and a Federal agency.

For several years the Duke Power Co., serving customers in North and South Carolina, has been trying to get Congress to approve a proposed $210 million powerplant on the Savannah River. Federal law provides that Congress must sanction any powerplant built on a navigable river or stream. Some Congressmen are insisting that unless approval of a neighboring Federal power project is tied to any bill allowing the Duke project, they won't vote for the latter, though it is hard to see why each should not be considered on its own merits.

The second project, in upper South Carolina, requires only a license from the Federal Power Commission. It would represent an investment of $700 million in an area now qualifying for aid-to-Appalachia funds, but the project is opposed by federally financed rural electric cooperatives on the ground that some day a Federal plant might be built there (none now is planned) from which they could get preferential treatment. Meanwhile the FPC amiably has granted a delay in further hearings on the project at the request of the Interior Department, which also wants to intervene.

Moreover, the Duke projects actually involve more than the $910 million plant cost. An industry rule of thumb is that for every $1 spent to generate power in an area, another $3 is invested by industrial customers there, old and new. That new business is gained by adequate power is reflected in the company's claim that, serving 25 percent of the Carolinas' land area, it has helped to attract 50 percent of the States' new industries in the last 5 years.

So if "creative federalism" is active in Appalachia, it does not seem to be doing much for what could be, by the $3-for-$1 rule of thumb, a revenue-producing private investment of much larger scope. Surely it is a strange niconsistency when federalism—which can create nothing without first taxing the rewards of private initiative—whoops it up for a $1.1 billion handout while it lets creative business, with its own spending program potentially three times as big, go begging.

Accomplishments of the Peace Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, many of us serving in the House of Representatives have constituents who have volunteered to go abroad to carry on the great work of the Peace Corps.

All of us are aware of the great accomplishments being brought about through the quiet pursuit of the program of this important agency of our Federal Government.

An article has recently been published in the San Leandro Morning News of San Leandro, Calif., for April 7, which relates the work of Miss Diane Mauzy who is one of these volunteers from my congressional district. The enthusiasm and dedication for her work permeates this article and I am pleased to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD because I think it is a fitting illustration of what is being accomplished, and also, it is a tribute to the many thousands who are serving their country abroad in the important role of Peace Corps volunteers.

The article follows:

PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEER DIANE MAUZY REVIEWS FIRST FEW MONTHS AS TEACHER IN MALAYSIA

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The women's editor has received a letter from Diane Mauzy, a graduate of San Leandro High School, and of San Jose State College with a journalism major. Miss Mauzy is serving with the U.S. Peace Corps. Stationed in Malaysia, the local girl has been making adjustments to a new country, its people and her demanding work as a teacher hampered by language barriers. Miss Mauzy, a highly articulate person, gives an excellent report on the challenges met and accepted by the brave young men and women who are attempting to understand the problems of other lands while presenting a vital picture of sincere, dedicated American youth to the people of another country.)

(By Diane Mauzy)

Time marches on like a well-drilled soldier and seems to trample on all my good intentions to write letters as I go about my work. I hope that all is well with you, yours and your work. I often think of my summer with the Morning News, the lunches you and I used to share * * * something nice to remember as I'm eating my daily menu of fried rice.

I am well settled in by now and still fully enjoying the "luxury" of not living out of a suitcase * * * it is nice to have a place where one can hang up one's clothes.

I have been posted in Sandakan, North Borneo, Malaysia. This is the largest town in Sabah by virtue of its timber industry and trade from the Sulu Sea. There are no

roads leaidng out of Sandakan. The city sits on the edge of the blue sea in a sort of cove with the green jungle forming the backdrop.

Sandakan is separated from the rest of Sabah by jungle, swamp, and high mountain ranges. The town vaguely resembles Hong Kong in the miniature. It is built on softly rolling hills interspersed with picturesque bay inlets that bring fingers of water up into the land.

The population is primarily Chinese, but there are Malays, Bajau, Muruts, and Dusans residing here.

I live by myself in a government house about 1½ miles from the city. I am teaching English at a Chinese primary school called Chi Hwa.

The children in the school are simply wonderful—alive, vigorous, and full of mischief. My students are roughly equivalent to second graders. I have just about conquered the initial discipline problems—the language barrier has played an active role in my adjustment to the students and theirs to me.

Malaysia is not adequate, but I am taking Mandarin lessons presently. This will not solve all my problems of communication as the majority of Chinese here speak Hakka and Cantonese.

I am gradually getting submerged in extracurricular activities. They are considered an important part of Peace Corps service. The neighborhood children have my Sunday afternoons booked for picnic trips to the beach.

I am also engaged in a library project for the Education Department and am trying to devise a method by which I will be able to catalog Chinese books for Chi Hwa School. Shortly I will begin working a couple of hours a week with occupational therapy for the tuberculosis hospital.

Malaysia is a fascinating new country. Everyone has such high ideals and such profound and sincere hopes for a wonderful future. This country is trying to solve all its many problems and burdens in such a hurry—time is just one of the factors that Maylaysia must battle as it seeks to establish itself among the world's nations.

Faced by Communist agitation on its northern border and by Sukarno's confrontation on the south, Malaysia is gamely hoisting the banner of democracy. It is not completely secure, this proud new banner. It will take time, tradition, courage, faith, and stability to make it truly so. But out here Malaysia is a shining beacon for the dignity of man in the seeming wreck of southeastern Asia.

Peace Corps life—it is not all glamour, romance, and adventure. Frustration, boredom, fatigue, and loneliness are part of the routine. Peace Corps work requires a firm mental and spiritual commitment to the task in hand.

At first after one arrives overseas, alone in a strange new land, you have to sit down and ask yourself, "Why am I here?" And then you have to start finding the answers to that question—answers that will give you satisfaction.

There are many adjustments to make—eating alone, people staring at the strange American girl. You cannot talk to them and they cannot communicate with you because you do not speak each other's language.

I dare say most everyone in a new land has their period of adjustment * * * the area here itself seems a million miles away, the isolation at first gave me a bit of claustrophobia and for a time I felt myself sinking into a depression which I carried to bed night after night like a disease, an empty loneliness.

Then suddenly something happens and you begin to appreciate life as never before, your mind begins to tingle, your very skin begins to tingle with the knowledge that gradually you are gaining confidence in your ability to handle the situations as they arise. You begin to see the true beauty of the country, the people seem friendly and not so strange, one begins to see so many places where you can begin to prove your individual worth to yourself and the people of this country.

The assigned job of a Peace Corps volunteer is only a portion of his commitment. The true task, the place where we will make the most worthwhile contribution, lies in personal relationships and human contacts. We must be dedicated to the advancement of understanding and cooperation between all the peoples of the world. This, I believe, is what President John F. Kennedy envisioned when he started the Peace Corps.

Naturally, being human, I expect to find myself frustrated and depressed every now and then, but I think that I am acquiring some glorious new mental vistas and attitudes that will serve me well all my life.

Kennedy believed in people and subscribed to the theory that man could solve his problems by hard work, honesty and courage, understanding and education, sincerity and humility. So when I ask myself why I am a Peace Corps volunteer in Malaysia there are some pretty important reasons even if I get lonely and depressed now and then.

As I become more and more involved in the work here, as I learn the languages and the children learn more English there will be more spoken communications and fuller understanding between us all. This sense of achievement, of mutual sharing will certainly conquer my brief spells of frustration which are based upon some of my personal inadequacies in the field of communication due to language barriers.

The Late Honorable James A. Shanley

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to the memory of Judge James A. Shanley, an eminent jurist and former Member of Congress from Connecticut.

Judge Shanley served in this House for a period of four terms, from 1934 to 1942. Those were the years of the first two terms of the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration, and during this period Shanley identified himself strongly with the New Deal program and was a staunch supporter of much of the reform legislation enacted by Congress at that time. He was a scholar in the field of foreign affairs and an outstanding exponent of effective international law during his service in Congress.

I was privileged to know him intimately and to discuss often with him various matters of mutual interest. He was a man of great intellect, charm, and wit. He was noted throughout Connecticut as a public speaker and toastmaster. He was also highly regarded as a judge and in recent years had the endorsement of both political parties in New Haven.

Connecticut has lost an outstanding citizen. We are all saddened by his passing. I wish to extend my profoundest sympathy to his wife and children in their hour of bereavement.

Statement of Hon. Frank T. Bow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, on April 7, 1965, my distinguished colleague the gentleman from Minnesota, the Honorable JOHN A. BLATNIK, received a National Clay Pipe Institute award for his outstanding contributions in the field of water pollution control.

I have had an opportunity to work closely with Mr. BLATNIK as a member of the Rivers and Harbors Subcommittee, of which he is chairman. He is rightfully recognized as the leading expert in the House on water pollution problems.

The National Clay Pipe Institute is cosponsor of the National Clean Water Campaign, which is being sponsored by another forward-looking organization, the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce. I commend both organizations for their leadership in combating water pollution.

Mr. BLATNIK received his award at a luncheon at which one of the speakers was another of my distinguished colleagues the gentleman from Ohio the Honorable FRANK T. BOW.

In an outstanding address, Mr. BOW paid tribute to Mr. BLATNIK and outlined the water pollution problem this Nation faces and the sacrifices required to solve them.

I think Mr. Bow's remarks merit attention by other Members of the House and for this reason I am placing his talk in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Bow's speech follows:

SPEECH BY REPRESENTATIVE FRANK T. BOW AT THE AWARDS LUNCHEON, NATIONAL CLAY PIPE INSTITUTE, MAYFLOWER HOTEL, APRIL 7, 1965

I am delighted and impressed with your recognition of leaders in this fight against the formidable and deadly enemy—water pollution.

The efforts of my colleague, JOHN BLATNIK, in this field are worthy of every commendation.

The fine work that Ralph Pickard is accomplishing in Kentucky is an outstanding example of activity at the State level, and he has gone on to a position of national leadership as the spokesman for the States and the architect of interstate cooperation.

And it is indeed heartening to see that a respected, dynamic organization of young men, the Jaycees, is supporting the cause all over the United States.

For this country needs all the help it can get to cope with this serious national menace.

We need all the brains and talent and energy we can muster to make certain that this Nation will have a safe, adequate, and dependable water supply.

We used to think of this as a problem for the future. But the tremendous growth of our population and the ever-growing demand for water for our industrial economy has made it an immediate problem.

The solution cannot be postponed.

Scientists and technicians used to warn of the threat, but we no longer need their warnings. We can see and we can smell, and when we find that one-fourth of the surface

of Lake Erie, one of the largest bodies of fresh water in the world, is filled with a nasty island of slime, we know there is no time for further delay.

And this week hundreds of thousands of tourists are coming to Washington to see our beautiful cherry blossoms—one of the great attractions of the entire Nation. Those blossoms are only a few hundred feet from the Potomac. Just a stone's throw from all of that springtime beauty is a river so filthy that no one dares swim it, so polluted that the health of our downstream communities is threatened. This river could be a tremendous asset for recreation, boating, swimming, fishing, but the sad truth is that anyone who dares to use the Potomac for these purposes risks a bad case of hepatitis, or worse.

This is an appropriate place to discuss water pollution for the problem of the Potomac is similar to that of many of our great rivers, and because the work that is being done here can serve as a pattern for solving the problem on the Hudson, the Missouri, and other streams. Through the cooperation of communities all along the river, and of the States of Virginia and Maryland, the Potomac is in far better condition today than it was 10 years ago, but we still have a long way to go.

Most of you know the facts about our pollution problem, but they can never be stated too often or emphasized enough.

Eighty percent of the Nation's water supply is pumped out of lakes and rivers that are functioning simultaneously as the Nation's sewer system.

The discharge of industrial wastes has increased to 16 billion gallons a day.

Twenty-five percent of municipal wastes are still dumped as raw sewage. Puting it another way, there are over 1,500 communities serving 13 million people that just dump thei rsewage into our lakes, rivers, and streams. Ten of these cities have a population of over 100,000.

Another 31 percent o fthe Nation's municipal wastes are given only primary treatment—removing the solids but doing nothing about contaminants in solution.

Still another 2,700 communities, serving close to 6 million people, don't even have sewers to collect waste materials.

In other words, more than half the municipal waste in the Nation is being permitted to contaminate our water supplies.

And in major cities where we have made adequate preparations to handle the normal volume of municipal waste, the problem is compounded by our failure to separate storm and sanitary sewers. When runoff from bad storms enters the combined sewer systems, untreated waste is carried off into rivers and lakes with a resulting heavy impact on an already serious problem. More than 1,900 communities with a total population of nearly 58 million people have this problem to solve.

I am pleased to note that Washington is well on the way to completing a separate storm sewer system, an important step toward cleaning up the Potomac.

And progress has been made in other respects.

Since 1956 Congress has appropriated $408 million for construction of municipal sewage treatment plants, $370 million of which has been allocated as the Federal share in sewage works with a total cost of $2.2 billion. These plants are serving or will serve some 40 million people.

Current sewage plant construction is moving ahead at the rate of more than $800 million a year.

A great deal of planning and research has been accomplished. The seven river basin projects are a case in point.

Intensive, comprehensive studies, reconnaissance surveys, recommendations for remedial measures, analyzing stream flow regulation, designing mathematical models to predict the impact of waste loads and evaluating proposed water pollution control activities, are being done in these areas.

Research centers in Alaska, Georgia, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Michigan, Oklahoma, Oregon, and Minnesota are gathering data and making surveys. At the Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center in Cincinnati we are making progress on new, economically feasible techniques for waste water renovation.

There has been progress, too, in interstate cooperation and uniform laws. Congress has given its consent to the formation of seven interstate compacts having substantial powers. The areas include New England, a joint effort by Connecticut, New York and New Jersey, a commission on the Potomac River, a Klamath river basin compact, a Delaware basin compact, a Tennessee river basin compact involving seven States, and Orsanco, the Ohio River Valley water sanitation compact.

Coming from Ohio, I am best acquainted with Orsanco of which Bart Holl is the chairman this year. Orsanco has made great strides toward cleaning up the Ohio River. Today 99 percent of the sewage emanating from communities along 1,000 miles of the Ohio is piped into purification plans. Now we are turning to the problem of Lake Erie, and Governor Rhodes has called a conference of the Governors of the seven Great Lakes States for April 28. They will review the problem and set the course for cleaning up the pollution problem in this vital area.

We have seen the scope of the problem and we have reviewed what has been done and is being done about it. Now, what more should we do?

Congress, as you know, is now working on additional legislation. The Senate had passed a bill that authorizes an appropriation of $60 million for 3 years for demonstration projects and for separation of storm and sanitary sewers. It also increases the amount that may be given a single treatment project to $1 million, and to $4 million for multicommunity projects. Planned metropolitan projects may receive an additional 10 percent above the new limits.

The bill creates a new agency within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to take over the Federal pollution control enforcement powers now in PHS.

Mr. BLATNIK's bill is more generous, raising the limit on single projects to $1.2 million and on combined projects to $4.8 million.

It authorizes a grant without regard to the dollar ceiling limitations with a full 30 percent to be made per project if the State matches the full Federal contribution. This kind of grant can be made only from the State's allotment of appropriated funds in excess of $100 million.

The Blatnik bill also provides that the allotment of funds to the State in excess of any appropriations over $100 million yearly will be made solely on the basis of population. Finally, it increases the annual authorization for this work to $150 million.

It seems to me that Congress must weigh carefully the impact of this larger authorization on the problem I have described.

Is $60 million for demonstration projects sufficient to tackle the problem of storm and sanitary sewer separation? Do we really need more studies and demonstration projects in this area? Is it not self-evident that combined sewers are a major source of contamination, and that any separation project is certain to alleviate pollution problems? I think this is one area where we could get on with the work with a much larger expenditure.

How about the treatment plant program? Will $150 million per year from the Federal Government do the job, or could more be used to advantage?

We know that there is a backlog of about $2.6 billion worth of waste collection and treatment projects. If our goal is to clean up municipal wastes by 1970, an annual expenditure of $830 million would be required. It seems to me that some careful study should be given to the ability of States and municipalities to match additional Federal funds. If they can do so at a rate greater than $150 million a year, Congress should consider very thoughtfully an appropriation equal to whatever can be used.

Beyond this, there is the problem of obsolescence. Many older systems must be replaced as the years go by; in particular, I might suggest, those systems that are now using inferior though inexpensive pipe. The wise planners who start with good clay pipe will not have that worry.

It may seem strange to some that the ranking Republican on the House Appropriations Committee, the man who is usually talking about cutting the budget, is talking today about larger expenditures. But I have often said that we must learn to distinguish our needs from our wants. We must review Federal programs on the basis of what is required for the Nation, and what may be only desirable.

If we agree that protecting our water resource is perhaps the most fundamental requirement for our future growth and well-being, then I suggest that we can devote maximum effort on this program, foregoing some of the things that are less essential.

Summing up, it seems to me that we have these things to do:

First, we must continue to dramatize and publicize the problem. The President has set the course by using the Potomac as an example of what can and must be done. If the American people recognize the nature of the problem, they will support any effort that is required to correct it.

Second, we must continue our research, but we must also be quicker to put our new knowledge into action. We have studied enough to know pollution when we see it. We know when it gets out of hand. We know what causes it. Now let us work to achieve standards in pollution enforcement measures that will pinpoint sources of pollution quickly and set up methods to correct them with dispatch.

Third, we must encourage the States to enter into interstate programs for control of entire river systems and lakes. Again I will mention Orsanco as an example of what can be done, and Governor Rhodes' Great Lakes Conference as an example of what must be done to tackle the job ahead.

Fourth, we must provide Federal support equal to the maximum capabilities of the municipalities and the States.

Competent authorities have testified that the States may be able to match up to $175 million in Federal funds next year and as much as $200 million in the years following. Certainly this should be thoroughly investigated.

And we should do it all with clay pipe.

It gives me a really deep satisfaction to come here today when you are honoring JOHN BLATNIK, and to join with you in recognizing his leadership in this field. As you all know, JOHN is a Democrat and I am a Republican, and on many issues we have quite different views. I'm certain that would be apparent in any study of the roll-call votes in the House. But there are also issues on which partisanship is not a factor, and we have been discussing one of them today. All of us in the House recognize JOHN BLATNIK as the expert and the leader of the causes and cures of water pollution. I am glad to support him every way that I can, and I am doubly glad to be with you today and to join in this well-deserved recognition of JOHN's magnificent achievement. Generations of Americans are in his debt.

High School Chemistry Teacher Awards Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, we often neglect to consider the great part that American industry plays in the training of scientists. This not only takes place in scholarship grants but also in direct training programs or incentives to existing educational programs.

The chemical industry has made tremendous strides in the past two decades. A major share of our present affluence can be traced directly to these farsighted scientists.

If American industry is to keep its present forward position in this highly competitive world, we must see that fine student chemists receive proper training.

The Chemical Industry Council, concerned with all things for the public good, has inaugurated a new educational policy called the high school chemistry teacher awards program.

Mr. R. E. Hanna of the chemical division of the Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., at Barberton, Ohio, is chairman of the CIC program in the Akron area. He has informed me that one of the two pilot programs has already been successfully conducted in the Akron, Ohio, district. This pilot program was conducted for the Manufacturing Chemists Association. I wish to commend the members of this association for their excellent work. I also wish to commend Mr. John F. Moore, a teacher at Cuyahoga Falls High School. He was cited by the Chemical Industry Council for his outstanding work in this field.

The Chemical and Engineering News magazine carried a very comprehensive article about this subject.

The article follows:

PILOT PROGRAM HONORS HIGH SCHOOL TEACHER: MCA BACKS LOCAL CHEMICAL INDUSTRY COUNCILS IN ESTABLISHING HIGH SCHOOL TEACHER AWARDS; AKRON AREA HAS FIRST WINNER

The educational gap between chemical theories and their industrial applications may have closed somewhat this month in Akron, Ohio. Eight companies in the greater Akron area recognized John F. Moore as the outstanding high school chemistry teacher in the area. Chosen from a list of nominees representing 14 local schools, Mr. Moore was cited for giving his students an outstanding appreciation of the relationship between chemical principles and their industrial applications. He teaches at Cuyahoga Falls (near Akron) High School.

The outstanding chemistry teacher awards program is the latest activity of the Chemical Industry Council (Akron region). Educational programs designed to aid local schools, colleges, and technological institutions have been conducted before by chemical industry councils in various States. But until recently, these activities have taken other forms. For example, career conferences, plant tours, and chemical caravans have been staged; speakers have addressed student meetings; laboratory equipment has been provided; and industry personnel have substituted for absent teachers.

Chemical industry councils in many States sponsor widely varying educational programs in cooperation with the Manufacturing Chemists' Association. But the Akron CIC–MCA high school chemistry teacher award is the first of its kind.

Encouraged by its successful college chemistry teacher awards program, MCA decided to conduct a pilot awards program for high school chemistry teachers during 1964–65. "High school science teachers generally receive even less recognition for their work than do college science teachers," says Dr. Walter S. Guthmann, chairman of the association's education activities committee.

"Yet it is at the secondary school level that students with capacity for scientific careers are often won or lost. Because the quality of teaching is a deciding factor at this time in students' lives, more must be done to encourage good high school science instruction," Dr. Guthmann adds.

LOCAL

For its first-year pilot effort, MCA sponsored one local activity in the greater Akron area, and a regional program in Texas. The Texas Chemical Council will make its selection within a few weeks. The participating councils were chosen from among those expressing an interest in the project. If this year's pilot programs are successful, MCA plans to expand its efforts to include more councils.

MCA hopes that its program will help fill a need "sorely felt by those in the chemical industry. Whatever the merit of modern chemistry instruction, it concentrates on the theories and principles of the subject and vertiually excludes their industrial applications," says Dr. Guthmann. MCA recommends some priorities in its new awards program in an effort to correct this situation.

PURPOSE

The principal purpose of the program is to promote high school teaching of chemistry with special emphasis on industrial technology. Its other purposes are to:

Honor outstanding high school chemistry teachers.

Call public attention to recognizing the need for good chemistry teaching at the secondary level. There is not only a need for training future scientists, MCA says, but also for preparing all high school graduates for intelligent activity in an increasingly technological world.

Inspire qualified students to choose careers in high school of college science teaching.

The Accomplishments of Full Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TENO RONCALIO
OF WYOMING
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding newspapermen in Wyoming is Bernie Horton, editor of the Cheyenne Eagle. He is a graduate of the University of Wyoming College of Journalism—was at one time the publisher of what may well have been the last remaining handset weekly in the Nation.

For many years, Mr. Horton has worked with the McCraken Newspapers in Wyoming and for the past several years has edited the Cheyenne daily, the Wyoming Eagle.

Few editors have a more objective grasp and an understanding of legislation than Bernie Horton, and I am pleased to include in the RECORD his recent editorial from the Eagle regarding the Manpower Development and Training Act and its effect on the Nation:

TOWARD FULL EMPLOYMENT

The Manpower Development and Training Act was passed only 3 years ago, but already it is proving to be a success.

It has provided employment opportunities for thousands of men and women.

Under this act, more than 300,000 unemployed men and women are being trained.

According to W. Willard Wirtz, Secretary of Labor, nearly 75 percent of those who have completed their courses have obtained jobs. An additional 60,000 economically and culturally deprived persons have received training in more than 100 special projects.

"These people," said Wirtz in a recent release, "are on the road to becoming productive members of the community, instead of remaining welfare recipients."

Under the program, special effort has been placed on training family breadwinners.

According to Wirtz, 60 percent of the trainees are responsible for families or households. Nearly half of the trainees had been out of work 15 weeks or longer when they entered their courses.

"The worth of the manpower training program," Witz stated, "was demonstrated by a recent independent study which reported that $623,000 in training costs on one program yielded a return of $3,300,000 in benefits."

Every State in the Nation has joined in the program.

But today, 20 million Americans reportedly do not have the skills needed in our technologically advanced society.

President Johnson and the Labor Department have recommended that the Manpower Development and Training Act, due to expire next year, be strengthened and made a permanent program.

Full employment is one of the goals of the Johnson administration and one of the hopes of the entire Nation.

The manpower training program appears to be moving the Nation toward that goal.

Armenian Martyrs Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, this year marks a half century since that infamous day in 1915 when the mass slaughter and deportation of some 2 million Armenians began in Turkey. Since then, April 24 of each year is observed as Armenian martyrs day in commemoration of this great tragedy which almost saw the annihilation of a whole people.

In the long and turbulent history of the Armenian people, the year 1915 undoubtedly stands out as the darkest year. By the end of that year only a handful of Armenians were left, spared miraculously from the scourge that swept over Turkey and destroyed nearly every Armenian community in that country. Clergymen, intellectuals, businessmen, artisans, old and young, men, women and

children—no was spared, all were slaughtered in cold blood, save for the very few fortunate survivors who lived to tell the world of the massacre of an innocent people.

The noted British historian Arnold J. Toynbee in his book "The Treatment of Armenians in the Ottoman Empire, 1915–16," describes the gruesome events in these words:

Early in February "a decree went forth that all Armenians should be disarmed. The Armenians in the army were drafted out of the fighting ranks, re-formed into special labour batallions, and set to work at throwing up fortifications and constructing roads. The disarming of the civil population was left to the local authorities ,and in every administrative centre a reign of terror began. On a certain date, in whatever town or village it might be, the public crier went through the streets announcing that every male Armenian must present himself forthwith at the government building. In some cases the warning was given by the soldiery or genarmerie slaughtering every male Armenian they encountered in the streets. The men presented themselves in their working clothes. When they arrived, they were thrown without explanation into prison, kept there a day or two, and then marched out of the town in batches, roped man to man, along some southerly or southeasterly road. They were starting, they were told, on a long journey—Mosul or perhaps to Baghdad. But they had not long to ponder over their plight, for they were halted and massacred at the first lonely place on the road. There was complete coordination between Talaat Bey's Ministry of the Interior and Enver Pasha's Ministry of War, for simultaneously the Armenian Labour Battalions, working behind the front, were surrounded by detachments of their combatant Moslem fellow-soldiers and butchered in cold blood."

(Arnold J. Toynbee, in "The Treatment of Armenians in the Ottoman Empire 1915–16," pp. 638–640.)

It is hardly necessary to add much to this description of what was probably the first genocidal act in modern days, except for the fact that the women and children, were either slaughtered, sold into slavery, or retained as servants in Turkish and Arab households.

To this day the people of Armenian descent have never forgotten the tragic events of 1915, nor can they ever forget them. On April 24 of each year they remember the martyrs who were struck down so savagely at the hands of a cruel regime. In this country, where several hundred thousand Americans of Armenian origin live in peace with their neighbors, this sad day of tribute is observed in many communities. Special memorial services are held in the churches and public meetings are dedicated to pay homage to the martyrs of 1915.

On this day, peace-loving Americans of all faiths and national origins join in this observance with bowed heads and heavy hearts laden with sadness at the inhumanities of man. We express our profound sympathy to a dauntless and heroic people, to Armenians in the United States and in other countries, who have risen from the ashes of annihilation to rebuild their culture and heritage. Let us hope and pray that never again will humanity be afflicted with such a tragedy as befell the Armenian people just a half century ago.

The Albatross New England Must Bear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I have said it before and I shall say it again that the continuation of restrictions on residual fuel oil is a blow to the industries of New England at a time when other economic pressures continue to rise. These restrictions must be removed.

Recently there appeared in two Massachusetts newspapers articles dealing with this albatross which the administration has seen fit to leave hanging around our necks. I believe that the articles reveal to a great extent the temper of New Englanders in reaction to this discriminatory move.

The articles to which I refer appear below:

[From the Boston Globe, Apr. 2, 1965]

L.B.J. RENEGES ON OIL: IT'S NEW ENGLAND'S TURN—BUT FOR WHAT?

(By Peter B. Greenough)

With considerable fanfare last year, President Johnson announced that he would keep his hands entirely off petroleum policy. It would rest, he gave his assurance, solely in the jurisdiction of Interior Secretary Stewart Udall.

If this is still true, then the President must now be washing with a particularly powerful brand of tar soap. It takes that, and kerosene too, to remove the odor of the recent decision regarding residual oil fuel imports.

Udall himself admitted that the White House had something to do with Wednesday's ruling. He also tossed in lawyers from the Justice Department, Budget Bureau, and Interior as justification for denial of a meaningful relaxation of resid controls.

Now, isn't that interesting?

Udall has had this matter under study for over a year. Yet he blames a change of plans on last-minute legal advice.

The Globe hears it differently.

Lee White, White House counsel, is the man to whom the finger points. In other words, L.B.J. himself, who has directly interfered in petroleum matters.

While we're at it, let's review more of the bidding.

Mr. J. was effusive in his campaign promises in Providence, Boston, and Portland last fall.

"It's New England's turn next," he assured one and all. He meant in connection with residual oil.

Some turn. Some promise.

What else, might we ask, does the President owe Appalachia? He's given the area special financial aid considerably over and beyond the rest of the Nation.

Why heed the false arguments about further injury in coal country from residual oil, when this line long since has been torpedoed by the Office of Emergency Planning? Residual, OEP points out is no menace either to national security or employment in West Virginia-Kentucky.

Defense Secretary McNamara reportedly is sitting on a second study fully confirming OEP's findings. Let's see it. Allow the public to judge whether economic good sense or plain political logrolling is involved here.

Representative SILVIO CONTE'S reaction best typifies New England congressional sentiment. He feels, in the wake of Udall's ruling:

"* * * duped and conned as smoothly as a hick in a shell game."

We all have, to the tune of $40 million a year. That's Udall's own estimate of what clamps on residual cost New England each year.

Can anything be saved from this sticky mess?

Just possibly. Our 12 New England Senators deserve a White House hearing. They have a score with Mr. Johnson. A face-to-angry-faces confrontation might just cause Udall's decision to be overturned.

Indeed, the President has little to lose by it.

How could he possibly be accused of interfering any further in oil policy than he already has been?

[From the Haverhill (Mass.) Gazette, Apr. 3, 1965]

NEW ENGLAND'S DISTRESS

New England business interests—and that also means everyone who works for New England businesses—got a raw deal in Washington this week when the administration refused to eliminate residual oil import quotas for this part of the country.

By importing all the residual oil they needed, New England businessmen could reduce their heating and power costs substantially. One estimate puts the added cost at $40 million annually.

The operation that resulted in the quotas being retained was not a savory one. Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall had already announced that he had worked out a tentative plan to remove the import quotas for Massachusetts, Maine, Vermont, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, and Florida.

Then, shortly before a scheduled news conference, word came from the White House that the quotas were not going to be lifted. The official line is that this move did not meet the legal test of "providing for the national security."

Udall had already gone on record, however, as saying he did not believe national security considerations warranted continuation of the program.

All 12 New England senators immediately joined in sending an indignant message to President Johnson, appealing for an end to the quota program. They feel, and rightly so, that this is discrimination against a section of the country which must fight continually to overcome handicaps imposed by distances from sources of supply.

Need for further strengthening of New England's interests in the Nation's Capitol, as proposed by seven House Members—including Representative William H. Bates—thus became even more evident.

Bates and six other Republican congressmen sought congressional approval for a New England regional development commission. They said, when introducing the legislation, that the commission would look into such areas as transportation, tourism, education health, industrial growth, power and seashore matters.

The residual oil ruling was a good example of the need for unity in this six-State area. New England must begin to protect its investments in Federal Government or it is going to see an acceleration of the trend toward using our tax funds to support other parts of the country.

The Appalachia program is one example of this. Representative SILVIO O. CONTE, who represents the western end of this State, brought this program into his reaction to the oil ruling. Protesting he had been "duped and conned," he said New England taxpayers are being asked to pick up their share of the "colossal cost" of the Appalachia program, but "what they are getting in return is a kick in the teeth."

For further illustration of all outgo and little return, we refer to the statement by BATES this week on the aid to education bill.

He said the bill will cost Massachusetts taxpayers $22 million, but other States, particularly Texas, will reap the harvest.

BATES said 26 States will get more money than Massachusetts. The $22 million, he said, represents the difference between what Massachusetts taxpayers will pay—$35 million—and what they will get back—$13.9 million.

Obviously, the Federal Government should do what it can to remove the "pockets of poverty," but it cannot continue to take all it can get from New England without returning a fair share. This corner of the country is reaching a point where it must stand up and fight for everything it can get from Washington.

Call for Boycott of a Whole State Is Alarming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES D. MARTIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, many thinking people across the country are beginning to wonder about the real motives of Martin Luther King. Is he really interested in the Negroes, or does he have a much broader purpose in mind in calling for continued demonstrations, violence, and a boycott designed to wreck private enterprise in Alabama? Is King working alone in advocating his destructive plans, or is there a hidden hand directing his activities? The people of the United States, including the Negroes, have a right to know what kind of man this is who places himself above the law and makes demands regardless of the misery they may cause the very people for whom he professes so much sympathy.

I think we should ask and demand an answer from the Justice Department: Who is Martin Luther King? Who finances his programs of destruction? What are his allegiances?

Some of the alarm he is causing is clearly seen in the following editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat which was reprinted in Human Events:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat]

KING'S BOYCOTT OF ALABAMA CALLED "ALARMING" PROPOSAL

Dr. Martin Luther King's call for a national and international economic boycott against Alabama is perhaps the most alarming action this civil rights leader has ever seriously proposed. Could he have considered all the consequences?

Dr. King is asking other Americans to set themselves against Alabama and deliberately discriminate against the goods produced by the more than 3 million Negro and white fellow Americans who happen to live within the geographical boundaries of that State.

It would be the poor Negroes and poor whites of Alabama who would bear the worst brunt of this proposed boycott.

Alabamans are not unlike other Americans in that they are a people proud of their State. Does Dr. King think that the effect of this boycott will be for the millions of whites in Alabama to cry "enough," denounce the Governor they have elected, and confess their sins to the Nation?

Rather we would think that every Alabaman, and other southerners, including those now employing their time and sweat to work out some peaceable solution to this racial crisis, would rally around Alabama and reject this implicit denunciation of an entire State—and a region.

Bringing Alabama to her knees is hardly the way to bring her to fuller acceptance of the new rules and laws of this land. Rather the opposite.

Dr. King has lost his perspective—and patience. He must remember that not until 1954 was it illegal to segregate public schools; not until 1964 was it unlawful for motels and major restaurants to keep out Negroes.

Because of the rulings and laws of this past decade, a century of tradition and an entire way of life must be discarded in the South. It is folly to think that such a radical change will not produce tension and, among the ignorant and reactionary, some violence.

As we are all Americans, it should be our objective to keep that violence to a minimum, to understand Alabama's agonizing problem while insuring that she moves into compliance with the law.

To clamp an economic boycott upon Alabama—which we lack the courage to clamp upon the Communist states of East Europe where all rights are denied indiscriminately—would be to declare the elected government of Alabama an enemy of the United States. That act would deal a crippling blow to the Union itself.

Using the example of the murdered Detroit woman and the murdered minister, Dr. King asked the boycott to end what he called the "reign of terror." Two murders by bigots, vicious and reprehensive as they were, do not make a reign of terror. Some of our larger cities, such as New York, can better come under such a definition.

In Alabama, as in every State, there are potential killers, both black and white, stupid, backward, brutal men, easily excitable, who would kill and have killed for little more provocation than the different color of a man's skin. Dr. King knows there are such men in Alabama.

As a man of nonviolence, he should keep his demonstrations strictly within legal bounds—and discourage the participation of unnecessary outsiders, recognizing full well that it is these outsiders who trigger the murderous instincts of the criminal white bigots.

As for the priests, nuns, ministers, and students—many of whom have the finest of motives in going to Selma or Montgomery—we suggest that the rights movement has now all the publicity it can handle.

We ask that they recognize the hard fact that their presence serves more to exacerbate the situation and incite violence than anything else, and that God will hear their prayers as clearly from St. Louis as He will from Route 80 in Alabama.

Abraham Lincoln: 15 April 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, today, a century after the death of Abraham Lincoln, our Nation is still struggling to realize the noble ideals for which our 16th President lived and died.

Our failure to realize these ideals is expressed eloquently in a poem by Dr. Paul V. Hale of the English Department at the State University College at Buffalo.

To bring Dr. Hale's poem, entitled "Abraham Lincoln: 15 April 1965," to the attention of my colleagues, I have permission to place it in the Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The poem follows:

ABRAHAM LINCOLN: 15 APRIL 1965
(By Paul V. Hale)

Five score years ago the ages claimed you,
Claimed you for their own;
Where moan echoed groan there is silence,
But there is no peace.

We were not there, but we, the unborn,
Bled through your wounds;
Today, through our own, you bleed,
For the evil of civil strife
Hydra-like springs from long-forgotten seed.
Washington, Springfield, Dallas,
Everywhere the spring comes late this year,
And the heavy fragrance of lilacs
Spreads slowly through the cold air.
This is a cruel time,
This is a cruel season,
For there is no peace.

Old leaves blown by the cold wind
Eddy and swirl through Gettysburg.
The branches, like dry bones, rattle
And the green leaves rustle
As they, like sentinels, stand guard
Over the many who have fallen.

Strange names echo in the wind
As we stand silent at Gettysburg with you:
San Juan Hill, Argonne, Corregidor, Iwo Jima,
Normandy, Bastogne, Casablanca, the Arno,
Inchon, Hungnam, Pleiku, to name but a few;
The sun never sets upon our dead.
We can not honor them as you honored these
In consecrating their final resting places
Because our dead were scattered,
Driven by the fury of some cosmic force
To countless, nameless spots
Where they met with destiny and paid our ransom.
Would they be amply repaid to know
Outer space is now only another
A more costly sea?
Would they pardon us for winning wars
And losing the peace?
Would they be proud of us because we have the power
To dissolve ourselves and their remains
Into primordial ooze?
And how would we answer them
If they were to ask:
Who today is free?

A gaunt, tired figure
Casts a shadow over the patient grass
That together with the withered leaves
Works to obscure the rows of granite
That long ago invaded their domain.

Centennial Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the Pittsburgh public schools sponsored centennial services recently marking the end

of the Civil War and paying tribute to members of the Allegheny County Bar Association who served in that conflict. These services paid particular honor to Medal of Honor winners from Allegheny County: Francis J. Herron, Thomas R. Kerr, Gottlieb Luty, John C. Mathews, Theodore Mitchell, Milton Mathews, Charles Oliver, Robert L. Orr, Alfred L. Pearson, Archibald H. Rowand, James M. Schoonmaker, and Michael Sowers.

A special tribute was paid to Pittsburgh high school students who are listed on a bronze honor roll plaque at the Fifth Avenue High School Uptown in Pittsburgh. The names of 63 young men, or 25 percent of the school's enrollment, are on this list.

Three Pittsburgh figures noted for their outstanding contributions and research on the American Civil War received albums of the Appomatox Centennial stamp from Pittsburgh Postmaster Edward G. Coll. They were presented to Dr. C. Stanton Belfour, president of the Historical Society of Western Pennsylvania, Edgar J. Roth, artist and authority on Civil War history, and Julia M. Cunningham, director of the Pennsylvania Reference Room, Carnegie Library, Pittsburgh.

I should like to extend my congratulations to Commander Joseph A. Borkowski, of the Allegheny County Council, VFW, and all the members of the VFW and to public school officials in Pittsburgh who made this program such a great success.

Joseph F. Manak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, the death of Joseph F. Manak in Cleveland this week brought sorrow to a great many homes in the area. Joe Manak was a man who won the admiration of those his life touched, and they were many. My condolences to the Manak family, who can be justifiably proud of the editorial tribute the Plain Dealer paid to him in its April 14 edition:

JOSEPH F. MANAK

Literally thousands of West Side Clevelanders knew the late Joseph F. Manak through one or more of his activities. Sandlot baseball players knew him from his participation and great interest in baseball. For a while he owned the old Norval Theater on Storer Avenue and this made him known to another group. Finally, his work for 50 years at Joseph & Feiss Co., prior to his retirement in 1960, brought him in contact with big and little clothing merchants here and around the country, as well as with the retail purchaser.

Those who knew Joe Manak always will remember him as a big, bustling, friendly man with a great concern for the poor, the weak, the underdog. His death at 82 concludes a long life spent in almost ceaseless effort on behalf of his employer, his friends, and family.

Tribute to Sir Winston Churchill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES McC. MATHIAS, JR.
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, people throughout the world were warned by President Eisenhower's tribute to his old comrade, Sir Winston Churchill. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include here this personal tribute delivered by President Eisenhower on January 30, 1965 at St. Paul's Cathedral in London:

A PERSONAL TRIBUTE TO SIR WINSTON CHURCHILL

(By General of the Army Dwight D. Eisenhower, delivered Jan. 30, 1965, at St. Paul's Paul's Cathedral, London)

Upon the mighty Thames, a great avenue of history, move at this moment to their final resting place the mortal remains of Sir Winston Churchill. He was a great maker of history, but his work done, the record closed, we can almost hear him, with the poet, say:

"Sunset and evening star,
And one clear call for me.

* * * * *

"Twilight and evening bell
And after that the dark.
And may there be no sadness of farewell,
When I embark."

As I, like all other free men, pause to pay a personal tribute to the giant who now passes from among us, I have no charter to speak for my countrymen—only for myself. But, if in memory, we journey back two decades to the time when America and Britain stood shoulder to shoulder in global conflict against tyranny, then I can presume—with propriety, I think—to act as spokesman for the millions of Americans who served with me and their British comrades during 3 years of war in this sector of the earth.

To those men Winston Churchill was Britain—he was the embodiment of British defiance to threat, her courage in adversity, her calmness in danger, her moderation in success. Among the Allies his name was spoken with respect, admiration, and affection. Although they loved to chuckle at his foibles, they knew he was a stanch friend. They felt his inspirational leadership. They counted him a fighter in their ranks.

The loyalty that the fighting forces of many nations here serving gave to him during that war was no less strong, no less freely given, than he had, in such full measure, from his own countrymen.

An American, I was one of those Allies. During those dramatic months, I was privileged to meet, to talk, to plan, and to work with him for common goals.

Out of that association an abiding—and to me precious—friendship was forged; it withstood the trials and frictions inescapable among men of strong convictions, living in the atmosphere of war.

The war ended, our friendship flowered in the later and more subtle tests imposed by international politics. Then, each of us, holding high official posts in his own nation, strove together so to concert the strength of our two peoples that liberty might be preserved among men and the security of the free world wholly sustained.

Through a career during which personal victories alternated with defeats, glittering praise with bitter criticism, intense public activity with periods of semiretirement, Winston Churchill lived out his 4 score and 10 years.

With no thought of the length of the time he might be permitted on earth, he was concerned only with the quality of the service he could render to his nation and to humanity. Though he had no fear of death, he coveted always the opportunity to continue that service.

At this moment, as our hearts stand at attention, we say our affectionate, though sad, goodby to the leader to whom the entire body of freemen owes so much.

In the coming years, many in countless words will strive to interpret the motives, describe the accomplishments, and extol the virtues of Winston Churchill—soldier, statesman, and citizen that two great countries were proud to claim as their own. Among all the things so written or spoken, there will ring out through all the centuries one incontestable refrain: Here was a champion of freedom.

May God grant that we—and the generations who will remember him—heed the lessons he taught us: in his deeds, in his words, in his life.

May we carry on his work until no nation lies in captivity; no man is denied opportunity for fulfilliment.

And now, to you, Sir Winston—my old friend—farewell.

Passover Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, of all the seasons of the year, Passover is perhaps fullest of religious depth, historical significance, and human warmth and gladness for those who share the precious heritage of the Jewish faith, Jewish history, and Jewish cultural traditions. For men and women of good will in all religious faiths, it is a time when the most sincere best wishes may be tendered to their Jewish friends.

The Passover is a reminder of one of the great events of history, the deliverance from Egyptian bondage of the children of Israel. That momentous deliverance is forcefully brought to mind by the four questions asked and answered at the seder and by the dietary rules that must be followed on this occasion.

The reliance upon divine providence that characterized the first Passover should be our reliance today. In the ceremony of the seder the knowledge and wisdom of Jewish fathers is tested by their replies to their sons' four questions, and the faith and courage of all who participate is stimulated and deepened. In this religious ceremony which is also a family meal, the members of the families are drawn together and renew their bonds of affection, as they resolve once again to live in the warmth of these precious human relationships and religious traditions.

In the singing and storytelling, in the ceremonial sharing of wine, in the beautiful words of the benediction concluding the Passover service, parents and

children and guests are brought together in affection for each other and for God, as blessings are called down upon the whole world in a prayer for redemption, peace, justice, and brotherhood.

The benediction is truly beautiful:

With songs of praise we have lifted up the cup, symbolizing the divine promises of salvation, and we have called upon the name of God. Let us again lift our soul to God in faith and hope. May He who broke Pharaoh's yoke, forever shatter all fetters of oppression and hasten the day when swords shall at last be broken and wars ended. Soon may He cause the glad tidings of redemption to be heard in all lands, so that mankind—freed from violence and from wrong and united in an eternal confidence of brotherhood—may celebrate the universal Passover in the name of our God of freedom.

The American Council for Judaism and Its Bedfellows

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on April 6 I placed in the RECORD a report by the New York Board of Rabbis on the notorious American Council for Judaism.

A new instance of this group's unsavory activities is described in the following article from the April 6, 1965, edition of the Near East Report:

BEDFELLOWS

The American Council for Judaism is coming in for severe censure by major American Jewish organizations because it furnished ammunition to the mounting neo-Nazi anti-Israel and anti-Jewish campaign in Germany last month.

The Deutsche National-Zeitung und Soldaten Zeitung—the central neo-Nazi organ in Germany today—featured an anti-Zionist article by Elmer Berger, the Council's executive vice president, on March 5, and another by Bill Gottlieb, the Council's publicity man on March 19.

In these articles, Council officers tried to discredit the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations, which had been urging the Bonn government to extend the statute of limitations on war crimes and also to restore arms deliveries to Israel.

Gottlieb's attack on the American Jewish leaders was based on his claim that the Conference of Presidents had "created the impression that the 5½ million American Jews have taken a position against West Germany's intention of discontinuing military aid to Israel."

These articles impunged the representative character and the independence of the Conference of Presidents. Thus, they served the purposes of the anti-Semitic German weekly which has been virulently attacking German parliamentarians who favored the extension of the statute and which has been denouncing an alleged "plot of international Jewry to poison German relations with the Arab world."

The newspaper was later castigated by indignant Bundestag members for its "dishonorable and anti-Semitic propaganda." And on March 25, the Munich public prosecutor launched formal action, charging that the publication was guilty of incitement to race hatred against the Jewish people.

This is not the first time that the American Council for Judaism, rejecting identification with the "Jewish people," has been identified with its enemies.

The American Council for Judaism lost its fight to prevent the restoration of Israel in 1948 but has never ceased to attack Israel and the many organizations which help her.

It is obsessed with its own humbug. It pretends that Zionists assume to speak for all Jews. (They don't.) And it pretends that Zionists claim there is some kind of legal relationship with Israel, involving rights and obligations which prejudice the position of American Jews. (There isn't.) It sets up these strawmen and then mows them down with a massive publicity scythe.

The campaign to weaken the ties between Israel and American Jews has encouraged Arabs to believe that someday Jews will abandon Israel. Thus, Arab propagandists have learned to parrot the Council's disingenuous sophistry: The Arabs really love Jews. It is the Zionists they cannot abide.

Sometimes, the Arabs forget the lines in the Council for Judaism script and confide what is really in their minds. In his angry anti-German speech last month, Nasser said: "If the Jews win this battle, then the Arabs' word is valueless."

Nasser's careless lapse wounded the council right down to the heart of its mimeograph machine. It rolled off a letter to Secretary of State Dean Rusk (and a publicity release) setting the record straight. It "deplored" Nasser's attack on "the Jews," especially since he had for some years made "careful distinction between Zionists" and "those who are solely Jewish religionists." How inconsiderate of Nasser.

The council will hold its annual conference in Washington late this month. It has invited attendance, greetings and blessing from Capitol Hill and the administration to feed its anti-Israel publicity barrage.

No one ever contends that all American Jews support Israel. Jews do cherish the independence of the individual to think, speak and assemble in freedom, and those who do not support Israel are completely free to express their views and to seek audiences and headlines. But dissenters, if they are moved by principle, must be discriminating and spurn alliances with those who are moved by hate.

And let no one be deceived by the council's pretensions about the size and the significance of its constituency. It is minuscule. And let no one be deluded into accepting the false premise upon which the council mounts its propaganda siege. It is fantasy.

Federal Bureaucracy Holds Back Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES D. MARTIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the best argument against giving more power to the Federal Government to bring prosperity to some areas of the Nation is provided by the bungling bureaucrats themselves. From their every action it would seem they are much more interested in building the power of the Federal Government and changing our private enterprise system to one of a planned economy than in really helping the poor or making it possible for private enterprise to do so.

The following editorial "Uncreative Federalism" from the Wall Street Journal for April 13, is a case in point. This is the kind of action which caused me to oppose the Appalachia bill:

UNCREATIVE FEDERALISM

When President Johnson signed the bill authorizing $1.1 billion for Federal programs in Appalachia, he hailed it as a true example of creative federalism. Yet that same federalism is impeding possibly more significant developments of private enterprise in the same area.

Specifically, a private electric power company in Appalachia is ready to spend $910 million of its own money on two power projects. So far it is being held back from spending a dime by Congress and a Federal agency.

For several years the Duke Power Co., serving customers in North and South Carolina, has been trying to get Congress to approve a proposed $210 million powerplant on the Savannah River. Federal law provides that Congress must sanction any powerplant built on a navigable river or stream. Some Congressmen are insisting that unless approval of a neighboring Federal power project is tied to any bill allowing the Duke project, they won't vote for the latter, though it is hard to see why each should not be considered on its own merits.

The second project, in upper South Carolina, requires only a license from the Federal Power Commission. It would represent an investment of $700 million in an area now qualifying for aid-to-Appalachia funds, but the project is opposed by federally financed rural electric cooperatives on the ground that someday a Federal plant might be built there (none now is planned) from which they could get preferential treatment. Meanwhile the FPC aimiably has granted a delay in further hearings on the project at the request of the Interior Department, which also wants to intervene.

Moreover, the Duke projects actually involve more than $910 million plant cost. An industry rule of thumb is that for every $1 spent to generate power in an area, another $3 is invested by industrial customers there, old and new. That new business is gained by adequate power is reflected in the company's claim that, serving 25 percent of the Carolinas' land area, it has helped to attract 50 percent of the States' new industries in the last 5 years.

So if creative federalism is active in Appalachia, it does not seem to be doing much for what could be, by the $3-for-$1 rule of thumb, a revenue-producing private investment of much larger scope. Surely it is a strange inconsistency when federalism—which can create nothing without first taxing the rewards of private initiative—whoops it up for a $1.1 billion handout while it lets creative business, with its own spending program potentially three times as big, go begging.

Triumph for Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD RUMSFELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the story of the successful launching of the "Early Bird" satellite, as told in the Chi-

cago Sun-Times editorial which follows, is another example of the superiority of the free enterprise system. The benefits that will be derived from this new communications system, which eventually will reach one-third of the globe, cannot be fully estimated at this time but surely it should bring greater understanding and unity among the people that will be served.

TRIUMPH FOR FREE ENTERPRISE

The successful launching of "Early Bird," the world's first commercial satellite, is a historic landmark for the free enterprise system.

The Communications Satellite Corp. or "Comsat," as it is commonly called, which launched Early Bird was created by an act of Congress in 1962. Its operating funds came from the sale of stock to the public and from 45 nations which are partners in the project. Comsat was and is, in every sense of the word, a "risk" venture.

When final tests are concluded it is expected that Early Bird will provide 240 high-quality, two-way voice telephone channels for telephone calls between the Western Hemisphere and Europe and transmit television programs as well. It will be able to service about one-third of the globe.

The prospects for profit seem to be good. About 5 million oversea telephone calls are made each year. That figure is expected to grow to 20 million by 1970. Comsat bought its satellite for $2,700,000 from a private U.S. firm. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration provided a rocket and launch facilities for which it charged Comsat $3,-300,000. No refund would have been made if the launch had failed. The cost of buying the satellite and putting it in orbit was far below that of installing undersea telephone cables.

Of more importance than profit is the fact that once again the United States has demonstrated that it makes its accomplishments in space techniques available for public use and benefit.

Membership in Comsat is not restricted. Anyone may buy stock, any nation may participate, including the Communist nations, if they wish. It will, however, cost those nations that are not members now a premium in the form of higher rates for the use of Comsat facilities. That is a hard lesson the capitalistic system teaches. Those who come in after the venture is a success must pay more.

The story of this unique concept of public ownership of communications, which Richard Lewis, the Sun-Times science editor, has called "the biggest advance in human communications since the smoke signal," should be told to the world. The Voice of America, the U.S. Information Service, and other Government agencies should broadcast that the free enterprise system has proved to be the best method ever developed for bringing the fruits of progress to everyone.

Speech by Walter Reuther

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TENO RONCALIO
OF WYOMING
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, last week it was my pleasure to be in attendance during the delivery of one of the best talks it has been my privilege to hear in many months.

Several years ago at Aspen, Colo., Institute, it was again my pleasure to hear Walter Reuther appearing on a panel at that time with leaders of industry and of business in discussions profoundly affecting the growth of the American business potential.

Fortunately, in America, there is a common bond between certain captains of industry and leaders of unions regarding challenges in a dynamic society. A challenge began in 1946 with the assurance of 60 million jobs after World War II. It has grown to present abundant years with 70 million employed, with an unprecedented gross national product possible only in this great Nation.

I believe this talk is a record of this challenge and contains a message of wisdom to those who would continue a nation in prosperity. I commend it to my colleagues who may not have been present during its delivery last week:

SPEECH BY WALTER P. REUTHER, INDUSTRIAL UNION DEPARTMENT CONGRESSIONAL DINNER, APRIL 6, 1965

My good friend, Jack Conway, Mr. Vice President, our many distinguished guests from both branches of the Government, the legislative and executive branches, my colleagues in the labor movement and friends:

First, on behalf of the Industrial Union Department, I should like to extend to each of you a very warm welcome. We appreciate the opportunity of breaking bread with you and visiting with you. And I say to our friends from both branches of Congress that we hoped that they enjoyed the meal because that is your fringe benefit at our expense and my speech to you (as we've told you on other occasions) is the fringe benefit that we enjoy at your expense.

But I should like to point out in all seriousness that our lawyers told us that unless a number of labor leaders availed themselves of the opportunity of addressing the Congressmen here, we might be charged with inappropriate trade-union expenditure under the Labor-Management Act. So we're covering our flanks.

Now, we have come together, as I think we can all agree, at a very critical period in the history of the world and a period of revolutionary change and challenge in our own country. This is perhaps the first time in the history of the human family that any society was subjected to the strains and sresses of two parallel revolutions. We are witnessing the revolution called the great civil rights social revolution and that revolution is being compounded by the fact that it takes place at the very time that we are going through another revolution, the "20th century technological revolution." And these two revolutions compound and complement each other. I believe as one American that the essential source of our difficulty is a crisis in conscience. As a nation, we profess to believe in the values that are built around the worth and the dignity of each human person, and I believe that we believe these things. But unfortunately, in too many areas of our national life we are long on professing these beliefs and we are short in putting them into practice in the areas of the greatest controversy.

It's easy to believe in something when everybody agrees with you, but the test is what do you do in the areas of challenge, in the areas of conflict? In the areas where these two revolutions bear upon these values, they are areas of great challenge and great controversy. The test of the commitment of America to these basic values is how effectively can we develop the economic and social mechanism within the framework of our free society so that we can meet the problems of these revolutions and bring to practical fulfillment their bright promises.

We in the labor movement believe that you cannot solve these complex and challenging problems by slick slogans or by pious platitudes. They will take practical dedication, courage, and a lot of hard work.

What we need to do—as we understand it in the labor movement—is to find a way to achieve in this country that deep sense of national purpose which is necessary to be able to harness the abundance of the 20th century technological revolution and relate that abundance to the basic unmet needs of the human community.

Now the Communists, as we have said many times, do not believe that we are capable of meeting this challenge. They believe that we are a nation composed of economic pressure groups and that we have a relationship that makes it impossible for us to rise above that pressure-group relationship and achieve the sense of common purpose in the absence of war. I believe that we need to demonstrate, not with words but with deeds, that a free society like ours can achieve unity in diversity, and that we can, when faced with the challenges of peace, achieve the same deep sense of national purpose, because we share common hopes and aspirations, as we are always capable of doing when faced with the challenge of war because we share common fears and common hatreds.

I believe this meeting tonight gives the lie to the Communists that we are incapable of achieving a sense of common national purpose, because we have invited to this dinner tonight and we shall be hearing from some of these people—people who represent the three major religious faiths: Catholic, Protestant, and the Jewish faith. We've invited a prominent civil rights leader and a farmer and we've invited George Meany, a labor leader.

In July of 1963 there was a meeting held in New York City. There were 120 odd organizations who gathered that day. They came from church groups and civil rights groups and labor groups and civic groups and fraternal groups and they joined together in forming what became known as "The National Coalition of Conscience."

In February this year in the city of Washington most of the people who participated in the formation and the work of the national coalition of conscience that was related to the civil rights struggle and the passage of the civil rights bill in 1964 came together with a lot of new allies that we did not have in the civil rights struggle. Together that broad coalition of American citizens formed what is called "The iCtizens Crusade Against Poverty." That group was formed to help support and implement the Government's antipoverty program, but to go beyond the Government's program and to have citizens at every level of our society develop and initiate and implement programs beyond the Government's program.

These two coalitions—the coalition of conscience around the civil rights issue, and the citizens crusade against poverty around that issue, represent the broadest coalition of concerned citizens who have ever joined forces in the history of America. I believe that they represent a new and decisive dimension in the social dynamics that are going to shape the forces of change in the years ahead.

President Johnson has called upon America to join together in building the Great Society. I think perhaps the most profound and fundamental thing that he said in that speech before the graduates of the University of Michigan was when he said that in the building of the Great Society, men must be more concerned about the quality of their goals than the quantity of their goods. This is a very real problem. Our society as it becomes more affluent in a material sense must be on eternal guard that we do not

permit the values of the market place to so corrupt the central-core values of a free society. If America gets into a contest of sheer materialism as the measurement of success, then the Soviet Union and the Communists will win that contest because they will be true to their values and we will be untrue to ours.

The quality of a society depends essentially on how a society allocates its resources, both human and material, and relates the allocation of those resources to its set of values. It depends upon what you put first in the relationship of one value to the other. We've said many times that you judge the quality of a society not by what it has but rather by what it does with what it has. We are the richest country in the world. We had a gross national product in 1964 approximating $625 billion. No other nation in the history of the world has had the economic capability of creating that measure of material wealth. And yet measured against that wealth we know that today more than 30 million Americans live in poverty. They are the "have not" Americans, they are the Americans who are denied and deprived and dispossessed. If your skin is black, you are also discriminated against. But the tragedy of poverty in America is not that it is just economic in character. Poverty in America is poverty of the spirit, because people who live in poverty are not only robbed of the economic necessities, they are robbed of that spiritual quality that you can have only as you have a sense of belonging and a sense of worth and a sense of participation. These people are outcasts, and therefore they are robbed both economically and spiritually.

The President should be commended for his program against poverty, and we salute the Congress for enacting that program. It's a good beginning, but we as Americans living in the face of the realities of the 20th century must say to ourselves that while it is a good beginning, it is only a beginning. What we need to do in America is to raise our sights. We need bolder action on the anti-poverty front and we need to be prepared to commit resources in the poverty fight equal to the dimensions of the problem we are working to solve.

There are other areas that need affirmative action. There is the broad area of education and there is the area of what do we do for our older people to give them a measure of security and dignity in the autumn of their lives when they're too old to work, but too young to die.

These two areas are really the test of the commitment and the value of any society. What do you do to provide your young people with the educational opportunities that will facilitate their maximum growth and development, limited only as God gave them the capability to grow? And what do you do for your older people after they've carried their share of the world's work? No American who looks at the facts can deny in good conscience the conclusion that we are failing both our children and our old people when you measure what we are doing up against our resources that we have.

In the field of medical care for older people, I challenge anyone to refute this simple statement: We in this great and wonderful land of ours, blessed like no other people has been blessed with material wealth, are doing less for our older citizens in terms of hospital and medical care needs in the autumn of their lives than does any industrialized nation of the world on either side of the Iron Curtain. That happens to be a tragic fact. It's because we let the marketplace decide what should have been a social decision of a society with a heart.

The problem in this area is not that we lack, or that the medical profession lacks, the professional competence to provide high-quality medical care (and I know it very well personally because they have made me whole on a number of occasions—and I've always been grateful for that). But the problem is not lack of medical know-how, the problem is not lack of technical competence, the problem is that our society has not provided a rational and responsible economic and social mechanism so that this high quality, comprehensive medical care can be available to the American people who need that care. That's where it breaks down. And when you get smug about this and when you get taken in by the propaganda of the medical society, just ask yourself how it comes that a country that leads in medical competence ranks 11th in the rate of infant mortality. We are 11th. Ten other nations with less skill and less resources do a better job seeing to it that when the Lord creates a new life that new life has a chance to grow and prosper than is done in this richest of all countries.

And so we say to our friends on both sides of the congressional structure and to our friends in the executive branch of the Government: The hour is late, we are encouraged by what has happened in this session of Congress, but we're going to keep pressing. We know our friends are going to keep working so that both the question of aid to education and medical care for the older people of this country will be taken care of in this session of Congress before you people go home for the summer holiday.

And then we have the civil rights question. We all rejoiced in 1964. We thanked President Johnson for his leadership, we thanked Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY for his leadership and we thanked people in both political parties because the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was not a partisan act. Civil rights is a moral issue that transcends party politics and both political parties deserve full credit, as does the President, for the enactment of that law.

But the record is clear. Back in 1964 we fought for the public accommodation section and we fought for the FEPC section * * * all in the record * * * we said, you're making a mistake if you don't build into that bill the Federal registrars, because all the legal obstructions will be used by the apostles of bigotry to block the achievement of first-class citizenship on the part of millions of American Negroes. And now a year later we're back doing what should have been done last year, and it is our urgent plea in the spirit of that tremendous address that the President made to the joint session of Congress which I believe was one of America's finest hours, we plead in the spirit of that address not to do a halfway job this time. Take the bill and strengthen it so you won't have to come back a second time before you remove all the barriers.

I know something about tyranny. I worked a year in the German underground fighting Hitlerism, and I lived almost 2 years under Joe Stalin. And I've looked ugly policemen with billy clubs in the eye, and I've been pushed around and beaten up and shot. I stood before the Berlin wall, a wall of shame which is the greatest monument to the bankruptcy of communism they've ever built. And I've stood at the wall of hate in Selma and as one American, as one human being, I say to our friends in Congress in this crisis: act in the knowledge that human freedom is indivisible. You cannot defend freedom in Berlin and deny it in Birmingham. And you cannot defend freedom in Saigon and deny it in Selma. It's that simple.

All of us want to get on with America's unfinished work and there is much unfinished work, but the key to all of these great social and economic problems is for America to realize the great unused potential that lies at our fingertips. You can't provide adequate education or security and dignity for older people or abolish poverty so long as we work within the framework in which from 12 to 18 percent of our economic potential goes to waste. Unemployment is still America's basic unresolved problem. In the last 11 years, 34 million man-years—not man-hours but man-years—have been wasted. They are gone forever. That's an irretrievable economic loss.

The year 1964, which we consider to be a relatively good year, was good only if you measure it by the past. Despite the fact that the economists say that was a relatively good year, we wasted $84 billion which was the unused economic potential—represented by idle workers, idle capacity, and the failure to achieve adequate economic growth in the economy. This is the margin of progress. It's the margin of doing those things in education and in housing and in medical care and in resource development and all the other things that are essential if we are to build the Great Society.

But you see the trouble is we always talk about where we've been and where we are in relation to where we've been. What we need to do is start measuring where we are—not from where we came from but where we ought to be going. Because that's the measurement of what we're doing.

We've made progress and the administration and the Congress are entitled to share in that. But that doesn't escape these tragic facts * * * that in 1964 there were still 13.3 percent of white teenagers walking the streets unemployed, and there were 25.9 percent of the Negro teenagers walking the street. That's the measurement of our crisis in this area.

I think the problem is that we have not as a nation in the development of national economic, and social policy, fully comprehended the dimension of the technological revolution. We have not understood that the acceleration of the technological revolution requires us to create 80,000 new jobs every week in the next 10 years.

In 1946, the Congress enacted the Full Employment Act which committed this Nation to policies to achieve maximum employment, maximum production, and maximum purchasing power, but we have never achieved those purposes. What the Congress needs to do is to take that concept and bring the Employment Act up to date so it can deal with realities of today and the realities of tomorrow and then enact enabling legislation to achieve the purposes of that Full Employment Act. Until we do, we shall not be dealing effectively with poverty. You can't wipe out poverty within the framework of continuing chronic unemployment. What good is a civil rights bill to a young Negro who can't get a job? And you can't wipe out poverty among older people until you raise the level of social security so the benefits will take them out of the poverty level.

And then there's the minimum wage law. We know that the Congress is going to consider it. We urge strongly that it be improved—not as a pressure group because relatively few organized workers will get the benefit of an increase in minimum wages—but the people who will get the benefits are millions of Americans who now are not covered. Here, again, Congress ought to look at the facts. There are hundreds and hundreds of thousands of workers in America today who are working 40 hours a week but they're getting welfare supplements because their wages are so miserably low. And we believe that you can't deal with this problem excepting as you deal both with the coverage of minimum wage and raise the level to a realistic level which we recommend as the level of $2 per hour for every American wage earner.

Congress should take a look at the wage and hour law. We in the labor movement say that it's economically unsound and morally indefensible to have a situation as is the case now where hundreds of thousands of workers work excessive overtime week after week and month after month—and their

neighbors walk the street unemployed. Something has to be done about that.

This Nation has accepted collective bargaining as the rational and reasonable way for management and labor to work out their problems. If we believe in that, then we believe that 14–B ought to be wiped off the statute books so that collective bargaining won't be interferred with.

But fundamentally the problem is this:

We had the great depression—nothing mysterious about how it happened. We had a maldistribution of income and that is still our basic problem. If we are to deal with the problems and to realize the promise of the 20th century technological revolution, we have to achieve a more rational, a more responsible, and a more equable distribution of the national income. This is not only a matter of economic justice, it's a matter of economic necessity, if we are to achieve our full economic potential.

Our problem today is that by and large we are still wedded to obsolete economic concepts that grew out of a period of economic scarcity. What we need to do as a free people is to create new forms of economic cooperation between labor and management and industry—and out of that cooperation learn to do a better job in harnessing the abundance that automation makes possible and then gear that abundance to the unmet needs of the people of our society. This will require new ideas and new concepts. One of the things that we need to learn to do is to judge new ideas not by their source but by their substance. And we ought to accept them or reject them on their merits. I think that the real challenge is: Is it possible in our free society?

There is no argument in America about whether we believe in a free enterprise economy. This is the only major free labor movement in the world in which that is not a problem. The real problem is: How do we go about it within the framework of a free economy? Believing in the values of freedom and of human worth and dignity, how do we work out an arrangement in which we make compatible private planning for profit and public planning for the people? Because this is the area where we break down.

As one American I have unlimited faith in the capability of free men and free institutions. As one American I am confident that under the leadership of President Johnson we can build the Great Society, we can harness the rising star of science and technology and we can gear this abundance to the needs of the human family so that human progress and human fulfillment can be the proud blessings of all the people who share in the family of our great Nation.

National Prayer Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine, Miss Barbara J. Mercer, has proposed a National Prayer Day observance in honor of the President of the United States each year. Miss Mercer has tenaciously developed her idea concerning this prayer day. I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a speech which this good lady gave to the San Leandro Marina Kiwanis Club breakfast on April 6, 1965; and, also, I am enclosing an editorial from the California Southern Baptist magazine for April 1, which favorably comments on this program:

ADDRESS BY MISS BARBARA MERCER

Good morning, gentlemen. Thank you for inviting me to breakfast with you and giving me the opportunity to tell you personally a little about my project. In almost a year I have contacted almost every Governor in the land—and many heads of church and state. It has been my privilege to correspond with some of them to the extent that I believe I have made real and lasting friendships.

This project of mine was an idea born right after the heartbreaking assassination of our late President Kennedy. I believe we have delayed this national offering to our President almost too long.

I wrote to President Johnson after his taking the oath of office and told him I would remember him in prayer and that I hoped God would see him safely along the way. I also mentioned I had read his presidential breakfast speech and was much impressed by his statement—and I quote: "No man could live in the house where I live, and work at the desk where I work, without needing and seeking the support of earnest and frequent prayer."

I received an answer to my letter and the President urged me to continue to remember him in my prayers. My reaction to his plea was almost instant. I knew I had to do more than just offer my prayers—why not ask the Nation to stand together in his hours of need. I feel the best thing I can do for my country is to pray for the man who leads it.

Mayor Maltester proclaimed June 12 of 1964 as San Leandro Presidential Prayer Day. Much effort went into the idea and although not too many churches participated because they weren't notified, inadvertently, we did have it established and it was observed in a very quiet manner.

The time for being quiet is over—all year I have worked constantly to enlist the support of the Governors throughout our land, various church dignitaries, fraternal organizations, any and all who would listen.

The book I have shown your president and which is being passed among you this morning is filled with the support letters—all invaluable—but now the demand must be made directly to the Governor.

On June 18, 1964, my very first support letter came from the Salvation Army. On June 24 came Governor Brown's letter supporting the idea and hoping I would succeed in getting religious and civic organizations interested. The letters came in abundance then—among them Pastor Jinks of the First Baptist Church, San Leandro, and one from your chairman of support of churches committee, Kenneth Bailey. Mr. Bailey sent me a copy of his letter to Kiwanis International President Charles Swain. I have never received an answer from him.

But I am asking Kiwanis Club of San Leandro Marina to again enlist the national support of Kiwanis membership, and in doing so, to send a letter requesting Governor Brown to proclaim a statewide observance.

A very fine editorial has just made the California Southern Baptist paper and they have sent a marked copy along with an excellent letter to Governor Brown. Dr. J. Terry Young, editor of the paper, made the first big step toward statewide observance and more requests are needed to flood the Governor's office. I hope I can count on your interest.

We feel that 1 day would be a bit unfair so mayors and heads of church have agreed that a 3-day observance would indeed be proper. So we hope to have proclaimed the last weekend in June—Friday, Saturday, and Sunday—so that all faiths may participate.

I am leaving a copy of the Baptist editorial and its accompanying letter to Governor Brown, along with a copy of his support letter and the mayor's proclamation of 1964. Perhaps the editorial will assist you in formulating your request to Governor Brown.

If there is any question in your mind at all, such as: "Should there really be a presidential 3-day prayer observance," I can only answer this way:

The man who leads our Nation has his aids, his advisers, his assistants. It is human to err and many, many times they do. All their advice must be weighed and studied and only the President can decide what to do. I have seen pictures of our Presidents in the past and President Johnson, seated in the small hours of the morning at their desks—heavily burdened—trying to decide, which aid or adviser was right. Only then does he realize—and I again quote President Johnson: "Prayer helps me to bear the burdens of the first office, which are too great to be borne by anyone alone."

Our beloved Nation was built on the solid foundation of God's word. Thomas Jefferson "swore upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man." Today the termites of terrorism, violence, hate, destruction are nibbling at our Nation's foundation—but our Nation will stand firm only if we, her people, stand together with God as our shield. We have too long put God aside—we must return to the "firm reliance on the protection of divine providence"—a most precious last sentence in our Constitution.

Please help, gentlemen, to help our Nation stand secure by standing with me in this call to proclaim a national presidential 3-day prayer observance for the President of the United States.

[From the California Southern Baptist magazine, Apr. 1, 1965]

PRAYERS FOR NATION'S PRESIDENT

A one-woman crusade to establish an annual day of prayer for the President of the United States deserves wholehearted support. Miss Barbara Mercer, of San Leandro, last year proposed such an annual observance. The mayor of the city of San Leandro proclaimed the third Sunday in June as a day of prayer for President Johnson. The idea sparked considerable interest from religious and political leaders in other sections of the country. Miss Mercer suggests that the special period of prayer for the President become a national observance.

Gov. Edmund G. Brown would render the Nation and its Chief Executive a favor by proclaiming the third weekend in June a statewide season of prayer in behalf of the President of the United States. Governor Brown declared last year's limited prayer observance "A splendid idea." A California Congressman is ready to introduce legislation in Congress to create a national observance of prayer for the President if Governor Brown will proclaim a statewide season of prayer. Governor Brown has the unique opportunity to lead our State's citizens in praying for the Nation's No. 1 citizen and of providing a necessary stepping stone toward the creation of a national season of prayer for our Chief Executive. We think Governor Brown should exercise this opportunity and proclaim the third weekend of June as a three-day season of prayer for the Nation's President.

No man in the Nation needs the power of prayer support more than the resident of the White House. The responsibilities and burdens that are upon his shoulders are almost beyond our understanding. The Bible says that we are to pray for those in Governmental posts. An annual season of prayer for our President is most appropriate. Miss Mercer has suggested that the third week of each June—Friday, Saturday, and Sunday—be the date for an annual prayer observance. She suggests a 3-day period so as to encompass

the day of worship for most of the Nation's religious groups. We support her idea and hope that Governor Brown will make California the first State to observe this meaningful season of prayer for the President.

National Society Children of the American Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention to the fact that on April 23, 24, and 25 the National Society of the Children of the American Revolution will hold its 70th annual national convention here in the Nation's Capital.

A thousand young people between the ages of birth and 22 years who are descended from a Revolutionary patriot will attend.

This is the oldest patriotic youth organization in the United States, having been founded April 5, 1895, by Mrs. Harriet M. Lothrop who served as its president for 6 years.

From the time Mrs. Lothrop retired until the 1930's wives of Members of Congress served as the national president, visiting the State societies en route to and from Washington. Senior leaders were from the ranks of membership of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution; National Society, Sons of the American Revolution; and National Society, Sons of the Revolution. Now these leaders still serve in an advisory capacity but there are member officers who carry on much of the work of the organization. Mrs. Nile Faust, of New Hampshire, is the senior national president.

Van Rensselaer Hoffman Sternbergh, of Washington, D.C., is the current national president and will preside at all sessions of the convention. Van is a junior in the College of Business Administration, George Washington University. He is chaplain of the Sigma Nu Fraternity and serves as assistant leader of the Boy Scout Explorer post they sponsor—the only Scout post sponsored by a social fraternity. He was delegate to the Inter-Fraternity Council; he served as editor of its news sheet and received their Top Conductor's Award presented at the council sing. He is currently editor of the news sheet for the Society for the Advancement of Management. Van was one of the top five shots in the District and has shot in many national rifle matches. He has been an Episcopal choir boy, and patrol leader, and is a member of the Order of DeMolay, General Society of the War of 1812, and the Military Order of World Wars, of which his late father was national commander in chief.

Van's background is typical of the children in this society which has as its purpose "the training of the members in true patriotism and love of country, in order that they may be better fitted for American citizenship."

The objects of the society are, first, to acquire knowledge of American history; second, to preserve and restore places of historical interest; third, to ascertain the deeds and honor the memories of the men, women, and children who rendered service to the cause of the American Revolution; fourth, to promote the celebration of patriotic anniversaries; fifth, to honor and cherish the flag of the United States above every other flag; sixth, to love, uphold, and extend the principles of American liberty and patriotism.

Work of the society includes an active conservation program; the donation of scholarships, books, clothing, and money to mountain schools and St. Mary's School for Indian Girls and Bacone College.

They present many flags, flag poles and flag instructions to other youth groups, hospitals, and settlement houses.

They have programs on and encourage the study of American music, literature and the other arts.

They maintain a small museum, open to the public, of Revolutionary articles and some items as recent as 1820. They also maintain one room in Gadsby's Tavern, and the Tomb of the Unknown Revolutionary Soldier in Alexandria, Va. They have assisted with the building of the Bell Tower at Valley Forge and Moore House—surrender house—at Yorktown, Va.

During war times they have loaned their headquarters for use of the Red Cross prisoner of war files, sponsored LST ships, and conducted war bond drives. They furnish prayer books for the children's chapel at the Washington National Cathedral and do many other civic services.

For the sixth consecutive year, Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge will honor the society at their convention with the George Washington Honor Medal Award for their outstanding work in promoting patriotic education among young people.

To encourage others in their youth work, the CAR presents a President's Award each year. This year Standard Oil Co. of California will receive the award for its "Standard School Broadcast," the oldest program of fine music sponsored, without commerical reference, and widely used for classroom instruction.

I feel that at this time when we hear so much adverse criticism of our young people, that it is well to be reminded that there are many dedicated, patriotic young people among us on whom we can depend to uphold the American way of life.

The Humanities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the culture of America is the outward manifestation of our ideals, our aspirations, and our way of life—the reflection of our civilization itself.

This culture of ours is neither exclusive nor of recent development. While in many respects it mirrors our national aims and characteristics, our love of the fine arts, and science, our manners and customs, our inner motivations and impulses, our most profound goals, our loftiest concepts, it is essentially a composite of the past, a clear reflection of the present, and to some extent, probably a forecast of the future.

Our American culture reveals the things that are in our hearts, the preoccupations of our minds, and the deep-hidden stirring of our souls.

From other nations and people principally Western Europe but also many other parts of the world from the time of antiquity to the present, we have derived most of the basic patterns and ingredients that make up our culture.

In the broad sense, our culture embraces our freedoms and the governmental institutions we have developed to protect them, and it includes our dedication to the higher things of the spirit and the strong spiritual promptings which are, and until recently eroded substantially by materialism and other mechanistic philosophies always have been, a primary, fundamental basis of the American dream.

While culture embraces our manners, our social graces where we have them, our humane and compassionate reactions and the niceties and courtesies we display in our relations with others, it goes much deeper into our very system of government, our educational processes and our posture as a nation and a people in a world torn by strife, sorrow, fear, and uncertainty.

Culture is transmitted from one generation to another in the family circle, in the community, in the church, in the school, in the marts of trade and industry, and for the individual it does not necessarily require formal education, although that may be very helpful, and is becoming more increasingly necessary and desirable for the individual, since knowledge is, in the best sense, not only the progenitor, but the preserver and the disseminator, the creator and encourager of culture without which it will languish and wither.

To that end, we must as Americans be concerned more vitally and urgently than ever, though we seem not to be, with the development and spread of learning and the building of its facilities for generating the increase and dissemination of knowledge, because knowledge is the indispensable bloodstream and mainstream of our life and our civilization and the very bulwark of our freedom and the best promise of our future well-being, prosperity, happiness, and peace.

For this reason, and in order to promote the national good, we must constantly strive these days with intensified vigar and militant spirit of devotion and dedication to build and enrich this great heritage of American culture which is so much a part of our country and the differentiating characteristics of our people.

It is with these thoughts in mind that we note the recent progress report of the

Commission on Humanities recommending a National Foundation for the Humanities.

My able, distinguished colleague and valued friend, Congressman WILLIAM MOORHEAD, of Pennsylvania, introduced in the House the bill embodying the recommendation of the Commission urging that "the United States must not limit its efforts to science and technology, but must give full value and support to artistic activity."

Those words were extremely well and appropriately spoken by my colleague, and I want to associate myself with them in approval and agreement.

I think the important thing now in this field is for the Congress to get a start in promoting this great work which is so closely related to the national interests, and the growth, the development of the Nation, and the well-being, advancement, and happiness of the American people, and in turn the many peoples of the world who have an orientation toward us and may be influenced by the example we set, good or bad. Of course, we intend always that it shall be good and wholesome, constructive and fruitful, for personal liberal, moral, and spiritual integrity and the betterment of mankind.

The role of the specialist in our current day society is vital and must be given closest attention, and we must by all means recognize that the role of the generalist is of preeminent importance, since it is from the pool of individuals trained in the humanities that the bulk of the great, essential, inspirational leadership of the Nation comes.

It is important that both specialists and generalists should work hand in hand, and that individuals of promise, ability, and aspiration be given fullest possible opportunity to secure the very best training and education to which he aspires. The doors to higher education should be open to all who aspire, and special encouragement and assistance must be given to highly qualified individuals who seek either specialized or generalized education.

There must be no invidious distinctions drawn between scientists and generalists—all should have the chance to get the best education of which they are capable. In this process, all should be treated equally and one group or one person should not be preferred over others unless on their merits they are entitled to special consideration. The fit must prevail, but those who earnestly aspire must not be turned aside. One of them may be a Newton, an Einstein, or a Michelangelo.

Five Towns Conference on Religion and Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT TENZER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. TENZER, Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, March 28, 1965, I was privileged to participate as an honorary sponsor of the five towns Conference on Religion and Race held at Lawrence High School in Cedarhurst, N.Y.

Residents of our community gathered in great numbers in a meeting publicized as "An appeal to conscience"—in a spirit of reconciliation and constructive concern for the welfare of all men. The purpose of the conference was "to mobilize the religious forces of our community to work for fuller brotherhood and higher attainment of racial justice and to stir the conscience of the people so that they will seek those paths which will make our community more truly reflect God's love in all relationships."

Sponsoring organizations were the Roman Catholic Diocese of Rockville Centre; the Religious Council of the Five Towns and Rockaways; and the Group Relations Committee of the Five Towns Community Council.

Distinguished members of the clergy presided at the different sessions of the conference, which included workshops on education, housing and employment. Community leaders of all faiths participated as panelists and addressed those attending the afternoon and evening sessions.

On many occasions throughout the Fifth Congressional District, I have praised the clergy of all faiths for the leadership which they have exercised in order to achieve a better understanding among all the residents of our community.

They stood in the forefront of the struggle for human rights. This was illustrated at the Five Towns Conference on Religion and Race—a study in community awareness, community interest and community action. I have never been more proud of my community, my constituents, or of our American heritage than I was on that Sunday.

The remarks of Mr. Albert Vorspan, director of the Commission of Social Action of the Union of American Hebrew Congregations were so stirring that I commend the following excerpts from his address to my colleagues:

THE RACIAL REVOLUTION—ACID TEST FOR RELIGION

"Behold how good and how pleasant for brothers to dwell together."

We stand today at the vortex of a racial revolution which will determine, for all the generations yet to come, whether this blessed land will rise to its destiny as a land of the free. I thank God for the racial revolution. I believe that the Negro has become "God's suffering servant," his instrument for human redemption in our sick time. The Negro has become, like the Jew and the Catholic and other minorities at other times, the barometer of our moral health—and national sickness. The Negro revolution has held up a mirror and has compelled us to see ourselves. The Negro has reminded us of the gap between America's promise and fulfillment. The Negro has recalled an affluent and complacent American to a sense of national purpose, to be a sacred cause. The Negro has broken through the tinsel of self-righteous affluence and egocentric complacency. He has taken us by the throat and shaken us awake. He has restored a vision of a good society, a just society, a Godly society—a vision which can put a fire in men's belly and grandeur in our national life. Along with much pain and conflict and difficulty and challenge—the price of social revolution—the Negro has thrust before us the gleaming promise of a new tomorrow.

History will show that, in this decade, religion in America disenthralled itself. The church and the synagogue today are in the march toward racial justice and no power on earth can turn us around again. And we are marching together for the first time in American history, Roman Catholic priests and nuns, Protestant clergy, rabbis, laymen of all faiths. This new partnership is a vast power. It is the power of Judaism and Christianity in action, put to work in the life of our society. This partnership first emerged in Chicago in 1963 at the National Conference on Religion and Race, where the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the National Council of Churches and the Synagogue Council of America pledged to work together in a non-violent and unceasing war against racial segregation. That partnership lifted the march on Washington from a great Negro protest to a sublime expression of the conscience of a total society.

That religious partnership made possible the passage of the Civil Right Act, because the combined strength of religious groups elevated the issue above the dark arena of partisan politics to the high ground of moral and spiritual commitment. Our churches and synagogues now see race not as just a problem; but as challenge, as opportunity for renewal, and as the acid test of whether or not religion will be alive and relevant to a changing world.

And that same partnership now bears personal witness in Selma, Ala., where clergymen of all faiths have streamed in from all sections of the United States in answer to the irresistable summons of outraged conscience. Let us make no mistake. Selma will be recorded in American history as a triumphant breakthrough in America's struggle against racial tyranny. The martyrdom of Reverend Reeb, together with the living testimony of religious leaders of all faiths, has blasted through the shell of apathy and penetrated to the heart and conscience of the American people. It has inspired the President of the United States to embrace, with the words "We Shall Overcome" on his lips, the Negro revolution itself. It will inspire the U.S. Congress to put teeth into the right to vote. And it inspires us here and now with a new sense of the urgency of our own task.

And now we must lift the civil rights struggle from a negative and narrow fight against discrimination to a far grander and nobler goal: the remaking of America itself. We must convert the civil rights struggle into a genuine social revolution. The Negro, among his many other contributions to America, has made poverty visible. In the bright glare of the Negro challenge, we now see that 38 million Americans have been submerged in another America we did not know existed. We have come to know that the racial revolution cannot be fulfilled unless and until we solve the grinding problem of poverty in this wealthy land. Banish all discrimination tomorrow—as we surely will—the problem of the Negro will not vanish. In some ways, the plight of the Negro will be sharpened. What good is a man's right to go into a hotel if he has neither the money, nor the job, nor the self-esteem to contemplate it? What good is a child's right to integrated education if his spirit has been blasted by the hell of a slum before he even enters school? Our racial problems are connected to deep-seated social problems. Automation wipes out 40,000 jobs every week, and the unskilled Negro is the chief victim. Negro unemployment is twice that of whites.

Some 220,000 examinees for the military draft are rejected each year because of defects of health and education. In New York City alone, 25,000 youngsters drop out of school each year, most of them drifting into the cycle of hopelessness, despair and unemployment which is handed down from generation to generation. Poverty, like wealth,

is inherited in America. In 1950, according to the Great Cities School Improvement Studies, one child out of ten in America's largest cities was "culturally deprived," growing up ill equipped to deal with an urban world of papers and books and conversations and desks and machines.

I was fortunate to have been a part of the historic Selma to Montgomery march and to have engaged in the exhilirating experience of personal witness there and in other storm-tossed southern communities. I can appreciate the wisdom of the words of President Johnson: "Let each of us look within our hearts and our own communities and let each of us put our shoulder to the wheel to root out injustice wherever it exists." We cannot all go to Selma; and the most important contribution each of us can make to racial justice is what we do right here in our own community. This conference today is only the first step in a long journey—but as the late President Kennedy often reminded us, the first step is the crucial one.

But what about the Five Towns? Isn't it fantastic to connect Selma or St. Augustine or Montgomery with the Five Towns? We are all one. Nation and racial injustice is a national, not a regional, problem. In our own community we do not have the ghoulish spectacle of tear gas and police dogs and Nazi-like sheriffs. But let us not pretend that the Messiah has arrived on the 5:52. We are not yet an open community. We are stratified along lines of race, economics, and even religion. Most of our neighborhoods are homogenized all white. If we think this is purely accidental, we should accompany one of our Negro neighbors from Inwood as he traverses the obstacle course of hypocrisy, lies, evasions, and humiliation in seeking the simple opportunity of renting an apartment or purchasing a home in the manicured and racially pure sections of Hewlett, Woodmere, Cedarhurst, and Lawrence. We do not resort to violence in keeping the stranger from our gate, but the violence we do to the mind and spirit of the nonwhite often hurts more than clubs—and the violence we do to ourselves and our children, by creating a false sense of racial superiority, is no different morally from the racist gospel taken straight.

We have not held out our hand as a community. We have not held out our hand as employers, welcoming nonwhites not just as menial workers but in jobs where a man can stretch to the limits of his potential of growth. We have not sought out nonwhite teachers to give our children the experience of respect for differences. We have not as a community done much more than cluck our tongues about the profound social and economic problems which place Inwood at the bottom of the poverty ladder in the entire county. Race has been a Berlin wall and few of us whites even know our Negro neighbors as human beings. We have papered over our problems with ameliorative social work and with pious sermons and with Lady Bountiful projects, but we have not—until now—attacked the basic roots of poverty which, when linked with racial discrimination, impoverish and stifle the spirit and the personality.

And let us admit also, these failures to build the city of hope—the community of fellowship, a genuine neighborhood of love and mutual cooperation—these failures are due in some measure, at least, to the fact that many of our religious institutions have been spectators and not participants in the building of a community. We have offered the sermon, but not the deed. We have shrunk from the hard, daily, undramatic work of knitting the fabric of community life. This conference is historic because Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish religious institutions are working in unison for the first time. Perhaps now, in the crucial days ahead, joined in a spirit of reconciliation and constructive concern, the united forces of religion can move the Five Towns closer to that humane and just kingdom of God which is the vision and goal of our respective faiths.

We have work to do right here. In some matters we have already begun to move. Leaders of the community, mobilized by our Five Towns Community Council, are spearheading now a realistic approach to poverty in our community. Prekindergarten nurseries, tutorial projects and "each one teach one" are offering opportunities for personal growth and community development. The Group Relations Committee is working hard to guarantee equality of opportunity in housing, employment, and education. Our community house is a beacon of hope in strengthening the human resources of the community. But our problems, too long neglected, cry out of the depths of the combined intelligence and good will of the total community. The Great Society, like charity, must begin at home. Hearts aching and tormented by events in Alabama can be healed best by the work of our hands here in our own community. For each of us, and our lives, do count. Together we can move mountains. Together, Protestant, Catholic and Jew, Negro and white, we can make this community a model of decency, compassion and justice.

Martin Luther King electrified the march on Washington when he proclaimed his dream for America. Well, with apologies to Reverend King, I have a dream for our Five Towns community. I have a dream of an open community where people will be judged solely on their merits as human beings and not by their color or religion. I have a dream of a community where brotherhood will be a fact of life and not an annual event in February, where each will be enriched by knowing and cherishing his neighbor of another color and another faith and another part of town. I have a dream of a community which will be as aroused by poverty in its midst as by noisy planes overhead, where my neighbor's suffering will be a humiliation to me. I have a dream of a community which not merely obeys the laws of civil rights, but which reaches out its hand to encourage those who need encouragement—who need a fair chance at a good job, a good house, a good life. I have a dream of a community where our schools will not be timid but will seize the opportunity to teach human relations and the great meaning of the civil rights drama of our day. I have a dream of a community where the churches and the synagogues will not be isolated spectators but become houses of prayer for all people, through visits and exchanges across denominational lines, through cooperation in building a better community. I have a dream of a community in which a young man of ideals will not have to go to Mississippi to work for human rights but will be challenged and encouraged to make his contribution here in our community. I have a dream of a community which will be known near and far not for its exclusiveness or its lavish homes or its beach clubs, but for the graciousness of its spirit, the friendliness which binds neighbor to neighbor and goals which animate it. I have a dream of a community in which it will no longer be regarded as a civil rights victory if a man of dark skin moves into our neighborhood. I have a dream of a Five Towns which will glady play its part in building that larger American dream.

In the words of an ancient rabbi: "The matter is urgent. The hour is late. The task is difficult. It is not incumbent upon us to complete the task—but neither are we free to desist from it."

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey

Aiken, George D., *Vt*
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.* — 6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*
Bayh, Birch E., *Ind*
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*
Bible, Alan, *Nev*
Boggs, J. Caleb, *Del*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md* — 1327 33d St.
Burdick, Quentin N., *N. Dak.*
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va* — The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*
Carlson, Frank, *Kans* — Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N.J*
Church, Frank, *Idaho*
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*
Cotton, Norris, *N.H*
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*
Dominick, Peter H., *Colo*
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*
Eastland, James O., *Miss* — 5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*
Ervin, Sam J., Jr., *N.C*
Fannin, Paul J., *Ariz*
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii* — 5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Fulbright, J. W., *Ark*
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*
Harris, Fred R., *Okla*
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.* — 5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla* — Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*
Javits, Jacob K., *N.Y*
Johnston, Olin D., *S.C*
Jordan, B. Everett, *N.C*
Jordan, Len B., *Idaho*
Kennedy, Edward M., *Mass*
Kennedy, Robert F., *N.Y*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*
Long, Edward V., *Mo*
Long, Russell B., *La*
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.* — 5916 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*
McGovern, George, *S. Dak*
McIntyre, Thomas J., *N.H*
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.* — The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont* — 453 First St. SE.
Miller, Jack R., *Iowa* — 5417 Kirkwood Dr., Bethesda, Md.
Mondale, Walter F., *Minn*
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg* — 4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak* — 122 Schotts Court NE.
Murphy, George, *Calif*
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*
Nelson, Gaylord, *Wis*
Neuberger, Maurine B., *Oreg.*
Pastore, John O., *R.I*
Pearson, James B., *Kans*
Pell, Claiborne, *R.I* — 3425 Prospect St.
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*
Proxmire, William, *Wis*
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va* — 4608 Reservoir Rd.
Ribicoff, Abraham A., *Conn*
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass* — 2320 Tracy Pl.
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*
Simpson, Milward L., *Wyo*
Smathers, George A., *Fla*
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John, *Ala* — 4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*
Thurmond, Strom, *S.C*
Tower, John G., *Tex*
Tydings, Joseph D., *Md*
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N.J.*
Williams, John J., *Del*
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex*
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak* — Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Secretary for the Majority—Francis R. Valeo.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Anderson (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Holland, Mondale, Tydings, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Hickenlooper, Curtis, Jordan of Idaho, and Aiken.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Johnston, Holland, Eastland, Talmadge, Jordan of North Carolina, McCarthy, McGovern, Bass, Montoya, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Cooper, Boggs, and Miller.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Pastore, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, McGee, Mansfield, Bartlett, Proxmire, Yarborough, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Kuchel, Hruska, Allott, Cotton, and Case.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Stennis, Byrd of Virginia, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Cannon, Byrd of West Virginia, Young of Ohio, Inouye, McIntyre, Brewster, Saltonstall, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Thurmond, Miller, and Tower.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Sparkman, Douglas, Proxmire, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Long of Missouri, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. McIntyre, Mondale, Bennett, Tower, Thurmond, and Hickenlooper.

Committee on Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Lausche, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Hart, Cannon, Brewster, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. Bass, Cotton, Morton, Scott, Prouty, Pearson, and Dominick.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, McIntyre, Kennedy of New York, Tydings, Prouty, and Dominick.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Long of Louisiana, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Fulbright, Ribicoff, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Curtis, Morton, and Dirksen.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Sparkman, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Gore, Lausche, Church, Symington, Dodd, Smathers, Clark, Pell, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Carlson, Williams of Delaware, Mundt, and Case.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Gruening, Muskie, Ribicoff, Harris, Kennedy of New York, Metcalf, Montoya, Mundt, Curtis, Javits, and Simpson.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Jackson (chairman), Anderson, Bible, Church, Gruening, Moss, Burdick, Hayden, McGovern, Nelson, Metcalf, Kuchel, Allott, Jordan of Idaho, Simpson, and Fannin.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), Johnston, McClellan, Ervin, Dodd, Hart, Long of Missouri, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Bayh, Burdick, Tydings, Dirksen, Hruska, Fong, Scott, and Javits.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Pell, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Nelson, Kennedy of New York, Javits, Prouty, Dominick, Murphy, and Fannin.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Johnston (chairman), Monroney, Yarborough, Randolph, McGee, Brewster, Hartke, Burdick, Carlson, Fong, Boggs, and Simpson.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. McNamara (chairman), Randolph, Young of Ohio, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Metcalf, Jordan of North Carolina, Inouye, Bayh, Montoya, Harris, Cooper, Fong, Boggs, Pearson, and Murphy.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Jordan of North Carolina (chairman), Hayden, Cannon, Pell, Clark, Byrd of West Virginia, Curtis, Cooper, and Scott.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D.C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 5136 Palisade Lane.
Mr. Justice White, of Colorado, 2209 Hampshire Rd., McLean, Va.
Mr. Justice Goldberg, of Illinois, 2811 Albemarle St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John F. Davis, 4704 River Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Henry Putzel, Jr., 3703 33d St.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Goldberg. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Hon. R. G. Le Tourneau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD some articles about one of the great and outstanding men of our Nation, Mr. R. G. Le Tourneau. Through the years he has contributed much through his creative genius to the welfare of this country. He is still contributing much. Mr. Le Tourneau is a great Christian leader who lives and practices his Christianity. I commend Mr. Le Tourneau on his attainments.

I include the article from the Longview Daily News at this point:

WALL STREET JOURNAL PROFILES MR. R. G.

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—A front page article bore the headline "Hang-the-Cost Effort on Inventions Lands Le Tourneau in Black" in Thursday morning's edition of the Wall Street Journal. The article follows).

(By Frank Morgan)

LONGVIEW, TEX.—The company's president sketches machine parts in chalk on the factory floor. His executives ignore cost analysis, efficiency studies and other management tools. "If we can drive it out the door and it does what it's supposed to do, that's it," says one official.

That's the way R. G. Le Tourneau, Inc., does business. In spite of this unconventional approach—and in some ways because of it—this maker of big earthmoving equipment has bounced from near-bankruptcy to comparative affluence within the past 2 years, illustrating in the process some of the advantages and drawbacks of one-man control.

The man is R. G. Le Tourneau, 76-year-old founder, president, chairman, chief designer and, in effect, absolute ruler of the concern headquartered here. "No one argues with R. G.," one executive says. Disdaining lengthy conferences and committee meetings, Mr. Le Tourneau spends much of his 14-hour day whizzing around his plant in an electric cart or bending over a drawing board, designing new equipment.

The company's turnabout is due chiefly to Mr. Le Tourneau's inventive genius—and particularly the success of an enormous gamble he took in developing one of his inventions, the electric wheel. This effort took 10 years and cost $25 million, a staggering sum for a company Le Tourneau's size. No stockholders were screaming for management's scalp, however; Mr. Le Tourneau controls 90 percent of the company's shares, which are owned by a foundation he heads.

The gamble paid off and now the electric wheel is used on all Le Tourneau's road scrapers, dirt loaders, and transports, which sell for up to $212,000 each. Aided by the new wheel, the company is regaining some of the market it once dominated. "In 5 years we'll have one-third of the total industry scraper sales," predicts William B. Barry, eastern division sales manager. The company expects to sell 120 pieces of earthmoving equipment this year, double the 1964 total.

In machines using the electric wheel, a single diesel engine produces electric current, which is fed to a powerful direct current motor and gear box mounted within the rim of each wheel. The power applied to the wheels is controlled from the operator's cab. Mr. Le Tourneau claims that "the steepest grade and the thickest mud can't hold it back." The device makes the most efficient use of available horsepower, he notes, because no energy is wasted on a transmission, clutch, or driveshaft.

Development of the idea began in 1953, when Mr. Le Tourneau sold his patents and three of his five plants to Westinghouse Air Brake Co. for $31 million, with the additional stipulation that Le Tourneau could produce no more earthmovers for 5 years. Le Tourneau then branched out into other areas, building huge "slicing" machines to clear jungles, cranes to remove crashed planes from airport runways, and aircraft carrier decks, log carriers, and offshore drilling platforms. Only the latter, however, showed promise of big sales and profits. In the meantime, Mr. Le Tourneau kept pouring cash into development of the electric wheel.

He was almost too late. By 1958, when the company was permitted to sell earthmovers again, the wheel still wasn't ready. In the next few years, Mr. Le Tourneau sold a few machines with the new device, but it was riddled with bugs. The company lost $1.7 million in 1962, and teetered at the edge of bankruptcy. Weakened by heavy spending to develop the new wheel and other gear, facing creditor lawsuits, and unable to pay a $100,000 electric bill, Le Tourneau appeared sure to collapse.

But Mr. Le Tourneau sacked the attorney who recommended bankruptcy, stalled his creditors, and finally licked the technical problems that were crippling sales. Le Tourneau moved into the black. Its recovery was helped along by another of Mr. Le Tourneau's brainstorms—an offshore oil and gas drilling platform with slanted legs which rest on the ocean floor. Weighing 4,500 tons and selling for $5.5 million, the platforms are more stable than conventional ones with straight legs, customers say. The development has helped Le Tourneau get contracts for 9 of the 18 offshore platforms currently under construction in the United States.

The scripture quoting Mr. Le Tourneau is philosophical about his company's recovery. "The Lord chooses the weak to confound the mighty," he says. Rivals suggest that the company's costly trial-and-error product development measures are risky business indeed, and indicate Mr. Le Tourneau was lucky—this time. "We all have high regard for his genius and inventiveness, from which we've all benefited," says an executive of one competing company, "but mechanical genius and business ability are two different things."

For the present, at least, Mr. Le Tourneau can afford to smile at such observations all the way to the bank. Last year the company posted net income of $4.6 million on sales of $29.7 million.

I include the Wall Street Journal article.

HANG-THE-COST EFFORT ON INVENTIONS LANDS LE TOURNEAU IN BLACK—HUGE GAMBLE ON ELECTRIC WHEEL, UNUSUAL METHODS PAY OFF FOR EARTHMOVING EQUIPMENT FIRM

(By Frank Morgan)

LONGVIEW, TEX.—The company's president sketches machine parts in chalk on the factory floor. His executives ignore cost analysis, efficiency studies and other management tools. "If we can drive it out the door and it does what it's supposed to do, that's it," says one official.

That's the way R. G. Le Tourneau, Inc., does business. In spite of this unconventional approach—and in some ways because of it—this maker of big earthmoving equipment has bounced from near-brankruptcy to comparative affluence within the past 2 years, illustrating in the process some of the advantages and drawbacks of one-man control.

The man is R. G. Le Tourneau, 76-year-old founder, president, chairman, chief designer and, in effect, absolute ruler of the concern headquartered here. "No one argues with R. G." one executive says. Disdaining lengthy conferences and committee meetings, Mr. Le Tourneau spends much of his 14-hour day whizzing around his plant in an electric cart or bending over a drawing board, designing new equipment.

The company's turnabout is due chiefly to Mr. Le Tourneau's inventive genius—and particularly the success of an enormous gamble he took in developing one of his inventions, the electric wheel. This effort took 10 years and cost $25 million, a staggering sum for a company Le Tourneau's size. No stockholders were screaming for management's scalp, however; Mr. Le Tourneau controls 90 percent of the company's shares, which are owned by a foundation he heads.

NEW WHEEL SPURS SALES

The gamble paid off, and now the electric wheel is used on all Le Tourneau's road scrapers, dirt loaders and transports, which sell for up to $212,000 each. Aided by the new wheel, the company is regaining some of the market it once dominated. "In 5 years we'll have one-third of the total industry scraper sales," predicts William B. Barry, eastern division sales manager. The company expects to sell 120 pieces of earthmoving equipment this year, double the 1964 total.

In machines using the electric wheel, a single diesel engine produces electric current, which is fed to a powerful direct current motor and gear box mounted within the rim of each wheel. The power applied to the wheels is controlled from the operator's cab. Mr. Le Tourneau claims that "the steepest grade and the thickest mud can't hold it back." The device makes the most efficient use of available horsepower, he notes, because no energy is wasted on a transmission, clutch, or driveshaft.

Development of the idea began in 1953, when Mr. Le Tourneau sold his patents and three of his five plants to Westinghouse Air Brake Co. for $31 million, with the additional stipulation that Le Tourneau could produce no more earth movers for 5 years. Le Tourneau then branched out into other areas, building huge "slicing" machines to clear jungles, cranes to remove crashed planes from airport runways and aircraft carrier decks, log carriers, and offshore drilling platforms. Only the latter, however, showed promise of big sales and profits. In the

meantime, Mr. Le Tourneau kept pouring cash into development of the electric wheel.

ON BANKRUPTCY'S BRINK

He was almost too late. By 1958, when the company was permitted to sell earthmovers again, the wheel still wasn't ready. In the next few years, Mr. Le Tourneau sold a few machines with the new device, but it was riddled with bugs. The company lost $1.7 million in 1962, and teetered at the edge of bankruptcy. Weakened by heavy spending to develop the new wheel and other gear, facing creditor lawsuits, and unable to pay a $100,000 electric bill, Le Tourneau appeared sure to collapse.

But Mr. Le Tourneau sacked the attorney who recommended bankruptcy, stalled his creditors, and finally licked the technical problems that were crippling sales. Le Tourneau moved into the black. Its recovery was helped along by another of Mr. Le Tourneau's brainstorms—an offshore oil and gas drilling platform with slanted legs which rest on the ocean floor. Weighing 4,500 tons and selling for $5.5 million, the platforms are more stable than conventional ones with straight legs, customers say. The development has helped Le Tourneau get contracts for 9 of the 18 offshore platforms currently under construction in the United States.

The Scripture-quoting Mr. Le Tourneau is philosophical about his company's recovery. "The Lord chooses the weak to confound the mighty," he says. Rivals suggest that the company's costly trial-and-error product development measures are risky business indeed, and indicate Mr. Le Tourneau was luckly—this time. "We all have high regard for his genius and inventiveness, from which we've all benefited," says an executive of one competing company, "but mechanical genius and business ability are two different things."

For the present, at least, Mr. Le Tourneau can afford to smile at such observations all the way to the bank. Last year the company posted net income of $4.6 million on sales of $29.7 million; this year sales are expected to top $48 million, and pretax earnings are expected to be about $9 million (the company will be taxed at standard rates this year after paying only $67,500 in income taxes for 1964 because of loss carryforwards). Order backlog currently stands at $40 million against "almost nothing" 2 years ago, and the work force has risen to 3,000 from only 800 then.

Though competitors can charge Mr. Le Tourneau with taking an occasional risky plunge on a new machine, none can accuse him of lavishness in other areas. His car is a reconditioned Volkswagen, his home a modest ranch-style brick house 200 yards from the plant. Executive offices, which lead out into the plant, are noisy and devoid of all but necessary work furniture. The executive washroom is the same one all employees use, located across from a welding machine on the factory floor.

Intensely religious, Mr. Le Tourneau gives a healthy chunk of his $36,000 salary to his church, Pinewood Alliance Church in Longview, a unit of the Christian and Missionary Alliance Society, and to the Le Tourneau Foundation, to which he also donated the company stock. The foundation operates Le Tourneau College, a 4-year liberal arts institution whose students can work in the plant to help pay their tuition, and finances self-help projects overseas. On weekends Mr. Le Tourneau flies to different parts of the country to tell religious and business groups about his work and his faith, which are intertwined. "Sometimes I have a hard time proving to God I love Him more than these machines," he says.

This article appeared in the Tyler Morning Telegraph:

LE TOURNEAU BOUNCES BACK

(The following editorial is reproduced from the April 5 issue of the Tyler Morning Telegraph, one of the two daily newspapers owned by the T. B. Butler Publishing Co. Calvin Clyde, Jr., general manager, is recognized as one of the most outstanding newspapermen and business executives in the Southwest.)

East Texans should rejoice that business is again booming for one of this region's major industries, that of R. G. Le Tourneau, Inc., in Gregg County. It is an industry that contributes much to the economic well-being of this region.

According to a Wall Street Journal writer who visited the plant recently, it was the persistence and inventive genius of 76-year-old R. G. Le Tourneau who brought the company back on the highroad of sales after a slump in the latter 1950's and early 1960's.

That downturn came after Le Tourneau, manufacturer of heavy earth moving equipment, had sold all his patents and five of his plants to Westinghouse, and had agreed not to produce any more earthmovers for 5 years. But in that period, R. G. Le Tourneau dared to go ahead with a new and revolutionary idea of inventing and developing an electric wheel. Despite the heavy and paralyzing costs and delays in getting the new invention perfected and in production, that goal has been achieved and it is described as a mighty factor in Le Tourneau's regaining prominence in the markets.

"In 5 years we'll have one-third of the total industry road scraper sales," predicts William B. Barry, eastern division sales manager, quoted in the Wall Street Journal.

The company expects to sell 120 pieces of earth moving equipment this year, double the 1964 output. These "pieces" include earth moving units that sell for up to $212,000 each and offshore oil and gas drilling platforms that sell for around $5.5 million each. These platforms are another brainchild of Le Tourneau that has quickened the industry's recovery. The development of this huge drilling facility has helped Le Tourneau get contracts for 9 of the 18 offshore platforms currently under construction in the United States.

A few details on that electric wheel belong here: According to the Wall Street Journal, "In machines using the electric wheel, a single diesel engine produces electric current, which is fed to a powerful direct-current motor and gearbox mounted within the rim of each wheel. The power applied to the wheels is controlled from the operator's cab. Mr. Le Tourneau claims that 'the steepest grade and the thickest mud can't hold it back.' The device makes the most efficient use of available horsepower, he notes, because no energy is wasted on a transmission, clutch, or driveshaft."

The Le Tourneau recovery is a success story with few equals and it is of particular interest, and pride, here in east Texas where the qualities of inventiveness and persistence against adversity are mighty factors in business and industrial success. R. G. Le Tourneau has proved this to be true, and he deserves plenty of applause.

New York's World Trade Center: Vision or Delusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following detailed appraisal of the proposal to build a world trade center in lower Manhattan.

It seems to me that the least that can be said is that no project of this magnitude should be undertaken without a great deal more intensive study.

The views of the Citizens' Inquiry on the World Trade Center, Inc., follow:

THE PROPOSED WORLD TRADE CENTER: VISION OR DELUSION?—AN APPRAISAL

(Citizens' Inquiry on the World Trade Center, Inc., New York, N.Y.)

WHAT IS THE PORT OF NEW YORK AUTHORITY?

The Port of New York Authority is a bi-state agency created in 1921 by a compact between the States of New York and New Jersey with the consent of the Congress of the United States. It is run by a 12-member board, 6 of whose members are selected by the Governor of New York and 6 by the Governor of New Jersey. The port authority was created to operate the transportation facilities between the two States. Until the 1962 law providing for the World Trade Center, its activities were essentially confined to the ownership and operation of these physical transit facilities.

THE HISTORY OF THE WORLD TRADE CENTER

The history behind the plans of the port authority for the proposed World Trade Center is important to an understanding of them. The concept of a World Trade Center in New York City first received public recognition in 1946, when the New York State Legislature created the World Trade Corp. to study and take action in the matter. This specially created public body, which was headed by Winthrop Aldrich, reported that the concept of a World Trade Center in New York City was unnecessary and unfeasible. It further concluded that the principal need and most urgent and suitable project was the modernization and rehabilitation of the piers.[1]

The concept was kept alive by the Downtown Lower Manhattan Association and its chairman, David Rockefeller, who, in 1958, commissioned the port authority to study the idea. In 1961 the authority issued a report suggesting that a World Trade Center be built on the East River at about Wall Street. Tentative plans revealed at that time showed a project area dominated by one 76-story building. This site was chosen because of its proximity to the Stock Exchange (which was to be the "cornerstone" of the project in 1961) and because, according to the port authority's own investigation, this was found to be the "most appropriate" site for such a center, for "no other single site was considered to be appropriate when all requirements were evaluated."[2]

In 1961 the New York State Legislature passed a law which authorized the port authority to build a World Trade Center on the lower east side of Manhattan. However, this 1961 statute never really went into effect because the New Jersey Legislature refused to pass such a law. (Since the port authority is a bistate agency, legislation of this nature requires the consent of both New York and New Jersey.)

There now began a battle of special interests. New York State had for some time been under pressure from her sister State to have the port authority take over the Hudson tubes from the near bankrupt Hudson & Manhattan Railroad Corp. As far as the World Trade Center was concerned, New York's Governor Rockefeller was very much in favor of it, and further, he insisted that the creation of the World Trade Center be linked together with the acquisition of the Hudson tubes.[3] On the other hand, the

Footnotes at end of speech.

New Jersey Legislature and both former Governor Meyner and present Governor Hughes, though strongly in favor of having the port authority acquire and modernize the Hudson tubes, were not interested in the creation of a World Trade Center in New York City, particularly on the east side of the city. Moreover, they were vehemently opposed to Governor Rockefeller's suggestion that the two projects be linked together.[4]

An agreement was finally reached, largely due to the influence of Governor Rockefeller. New Jersey accepted the idea of the port authority creating a World Trade Center on the Hudson, rather than the East River, in return for which New York agreed to allow the port authority to take over the Hudson tubes.

In 1962 each State passed virtually identical statutes making the two projects inseparable parts of one unified project. The statutes expressly provide that if, for any reason, one project cannot be consummated the other may not be pursued.

LEGAL CHALLENGES

The constitutionality of the New York statute was immediately challenged in a lawsuit by the small businessmen who operate stores in the area proposed for the World Trade Center, a 16-acre site on the west side of downtown Manhattan, bounded generally by Liberty, Church, Barclay, and West Streets. The businessmen claimed that any condemnation of property in the area would be a deprivation of property without due process of law, in that it would be a taking of private property for other than a public use or purpose.

Although the appellate division of the New York Supreme Court, first department, decided in favor of the businessmen, the New York Court of Appeals reversed this decision, and the U.S. Supreme Court dismissed an appeal for want of a "substantial Federal question."

This first lawsuit ended in late December 1963. Within a month thereafter, the port authority revealed its current plans for the World Trade Center. Unlike the earlier plans in 1961, these plans showed two buildings, each 110 stories in height, in a complex of buildings which would make available an aggregate of 10 million square feet of new business and commercial space in New York City.

The constitutionality of these plans is now under attack in a second lawsuit begun in September 1964, by leading builders, owners, and operators of office buildings in New York City. The realtors claim that, even if the statutes under which the port authority purports to act are constitutional, the action proposed to be taken thereunder is not. They say that the plans of the port authority show clearly that the proposed World Trade Center is merely a real estate venture of giant proportions by which the port authority, under its tax-exempt status, will increase its revenues at the expense of private enterprise. In addition, the Downtown West Businessmen's Association, Inc., has announced that it will challenge the constitutionality of the project in new lawsuits.

This paper, however, is not written to set forth propositions of law, but questions of public policy. We, the people, must decide the public policy questions—we must decide whether the port authority's plans are sound, and wise, and consistent with the traditions of our system of free enterprise and representative government.

WHY THE PORT AUTHORITY NEEDS A WORLD TRADE CENTER

Above, it was indicated that the history behind the plans for the World Trade Center is important. It is more than that: it is critical. It shows that the plans cannot be discussed apart from the facts relating to the takeover of the Hudson tubes.

Footnotes at end of speech.

This takeover will cost the port authority about $15 million per annum. The operation of the tube system cost the Hudson & Manhattan Railroad Corp. about $10 million per year. That cost will now be increased by the expense of the program of rehabilitation in which the port authority is necessarily engaged.

The port authority is faced with the prospect of financing a unified project of which the acquisition of the Hudson tubes is an inseparable part. It must finance this project by floating a bond issue. It cannot hope to sell bonds, however, unless the project is sufficiently profitable to insure investors of both the security of their investment and the prospect of a reasonable return. The only solution to this predicament is to make certain that the other part of the project, the World Trade Center, is sufficiently profitable to overcome the anticipated annual deficit of the tube system and to produce an overall annual profit large enough to attract investors.

In short, the only way out of this dilemma is to make the World Trade Center into a gigantic real estate development which will have all the tax advantages available to a tax-exempt Government authority. This solution, however, will create a situation worse than the problem it is intended to resolve.

WHY WE BELIEVE THE WORLD TRADE CENTER IS UNNECESSARY AND UNFEASIBLE

To begin with, a gigantic real estate development in one relatively small area in New York City will not help to promote world trade in the port of New York. It will not do so, because it will not affect the economic factors responsible for reducing this port's share of world trade. It will not reduce the high cost of carrying on world trade in New York City, which results from high labor rates, high storage and trucking charges, and, generally, the high cost of distributing the merchandise brought into the city.

The legislation providing for the creation of the World Trade Center states that its purpose is to furnish "the centralized accommodation" for all the backup services essential to world trade in the port of New York. It has never been shown, however, just how centralization could or would solve the problems of the port.

The chairman and executive director of the port authority have had occasion to take inventory of the principal causes of the relative decline of the port of New York. They have attributed its comparative decline to factors other than the lack of "centralization."[5] Some of the factors to which Austin Tobin, the executive director, has ascribed port decline are rail rate differentials, higher costs of trucking services to and from the port, and the broad growth and economic development of the South and Southwest whose cargoes are naturally "captive" to the gulf and southern ports.[6] Another reason which has often been cited is the deplorable state of New York's old and outmoded piers. This last factor is particularly disturbing in view of the fact that the port of New York has some of the best natural piers and waterways in the world.

Given these reasons for the decline, the port authority never answers specifically just how a World Trade Center—i.e., office buildings—will solve the problems of the port. The one thing it never does is to outline the cause and effect. As far as we can see, therefore, the World Trade Center provides no answer to the very real and concrete problems facing the port of New York.

The answer of the port authority to these facts of economic life is that the proposed World Trade Center will reduce the high cost of carrying on world trade in New York City by centralizing all of the backup services essential to world trade. As the World Trade Corp. pointed out as early as 1948, however, centralization is both unnecessary and unfeasible.

No one can deny that all of New York City is a world trade center. How can there be centralization when practically every business conducted in New York City is in some way connected with world trade? This 13-square block area could never truly combine the thousands of services in the New York area which make the city a world trade center in capital letters. Therefore, it is obviously strange that a major portion of the port authority's World Trade Center complex is planned to hold a shopping center, hotel, extensive parking areas, restaurants, and unrelated businesses that immediately dispel the concept of a tight-functioning machine devoted solely to world trade.

There has never been any spontaneous demand or demonstrated desire for centralization by the prospective occupants—that is, businesses engaged primarily in world trade—of a world trade center. Proof of this was brought out as recently as the week of December 6, 1964, when WCBS television news and the public press reported that after 3 years of intensive soliciting by the port authority, less than 300,000 of the more than 10 million available square feet has actually been leased—and this on a conditional basis. This figure represents less than 3 percent of the total available space. It is also interesting to note that the major portion of this 3 percent figure is being leased by five banks. No less important is the fact that despite their prolonged selling campaign, to date, the port authority has proved unable to interest any new businesses involved in foreign trade in moving their business operation to New York City and locating in a world trade center.

Another aspect of the question of tenants has been the matter of the State offices. Governor Rockefeller suddenly announced this past January 1964, that the State offices in New York City would be moved into the World Trade Center. This proposal has provoked strong reactions from the State legislature as well as from the public information media. A valid question has been raised as to what possilbe connection the State offices have with world trade. Current plans call for these State offices to occupy approximately 2,500,000 square feet of space in the World Trade Center. This means that the State offices would occupy a major portion of one building. In fact, it has been stated that this building would be known as the New York State Office Building. However, WCBS television news has reported on December 8, 1964, that our new Democratic-controlled legislature has indicated that it will strongly oppose any such move.

In view of this obvious disinterest on the part of perspective tenants engaged in world trade, it is clear to us that a world trade center is unfeasible as well as unnecessary. WCBS radio in an editorial examining the question of feasibility had this to say:

"The port authority maintains it will rent all of the trade center space to firms and agencies in the export-import field * * * it was on the basis of what is called a public purpose that the Legislatures of New York and New Jersey empowered the port authority to condemn private land for the trade center. If, however, the complex of export-import industries cannot be attracted to the project, then no trade center is possible, and plainly no public purpose is involved. The taking of private property in that case would amount to willful government destruction * * *."[7]

A FEW OF THE SERIOUS CONSEQUENCES OF THE PROPOSED "WORLD TRADE CENTER"

1. This World Trade Center carries with it a threat to the protections and limitations surrounding the use of eminent domain. It raises serious questions of public policy if flourishing private enterprise is destroyed to be replaced primarily by other private enter-

prise. The following quotation demonstrates this point:

"Government has of course the right to appropriate private land for a legitimate public use, with just compensation. Historically, public use has referred to highways, schools, military installations and the like. To appropriate a man's home or business for a public purpose obviously is something not undertaken frivolously. Certainly to take one man's property to make way for another man's property is something not undertaken at all. This, we submit, is what is being proposed by the port authority for the World Trade Center." [8]

This question becomes even more disturbing in the light of the enabling legislation which allows the port authority to condemn not only the 16-acre site specifically designated for the World Trade Center. The law states:

"If the port authority shall find it necessary, convenient, or desirable to acquire * * * from time to time any real property or any property other htan real property * * * for any of the purposes of this act whether for immediate or future use * * * the port authority may find and determine that such property * * * is required for a public use, and upon such determination the said property shall be and shall be deemed to be required for such public use until otherwise determined by the port authority, and such determination shall not be affected by the fact that such property has theretofore been taken for and is then devoted to a public use; but the public use in the hands of or under the control of the port authority shall be deemed superior to the public use in the hands of any other person, association or corporation." [9]

The above excerpt surely raises a public policy question concerning the application of eminent domain, for the statute clearly enables the port authority in future acquisitions to itself determine what constitutes a public purpose and makes a port authority public use superior.

2. Placing the quasi-governmental port authority in the real estate business represents unwarranted interference with our free enterprise system. Actually, the proposed World Trade Center will hurt business in New York City. It will, leading realtors are convinced, turn the office building boom into a bust by dumping on the market 10 million square feet of new business and commercial space at a time when millions of square feet of such space are already vacant. Since it will have serious effects on the private real estate industry, and will also involve a considerable loss in taxes from the doomed area itself, this project will thus hurt the city's tax base available for public services.

3. The proposed World Trade Center will harm all private enterprise. It will establish a precedent for financing public projects (in this case, a bistate commuter railroad) by having Government agencies enter into competition with private firms in what is, traditionally, the private sector of the economy (in this case, a real estate development). There can be little question as to the ultimate victor in any such competition.

4. Perhaps most important, the proposed World Trade Center will also do great damage to our traditional concept of representative government. This World Trade Center project cannot be considered apart from the agency empowered to create it. Therefore, a brief examination of the nature of the port authority is in order. The port authority is a tax-free body which consists of a 12-member board, all of whom are appointed, not elected by nor directly responsible to the people. Their plans and policies are not directly subject to public scrutiny or consent.

"The New York Port Authority, set up to handle a bistate problem, and like many another authority, ostensibly nonpolitical, has developed a politics of its own, a politics of specialists who may or may not be responsive to the public interest." [10]

The prime concern of a public agency should be the public welfare. But the port authority itself freely admits that the deciding factor in all its undertakings is the element of profit and the protection of the interests of its bondholders.

"A brilliant political invention, the port authority has worked splendidly for 30 years. The only trouble is that it's now doing the wrong job and stubbornly refuses to take on the urgent task it ought to be handling * * *." [11] The port authority, while matching the high level of private business management talent, must also be informed with a superior sense of responsibility to the public it serves. * * *

"However, it turns out that this lofty ideal is secondary to something else; namely, an almost transcendental sense of obligation to the port authority's bondholders. Accordingly, only such enterprises can be undertaken as will enrich it. * * * Beyond all else, this is the number one guiding principle of every port authority action." [12]

An agency of the nature of the port authority may be fine for the physical facilities of the port of New York, such as the bridges, tunnels, and airports which cross State boundaries. It was not intended, however, to act as the government of little enclaves within New York City or to make decisions which will affect the entire economic life of the city. These are powers which should either be confined to the government of the city or delegated to administrative agencies which will depend for their appointment upon the government of the city rather than the government of the State and for their finances upon tax revenues rather than bond money. In this way they would be more sensitive to the desires of the citizens of the city rather than to the wishes of bondholders and other special interests.

Our concern for the preservation of our representative government increases as we note that at no time in the proposal or planning stages of this massive undertaking were the people of this city and their duly elected representatives allowed to examine and evaluate the necessity, desirability, or location of this project. To date, there has still never been a public hearing.

CITY PLANNING: BY WHOM?—FOR WHOM?

This project raises important questions for the future planning of our city:

1. Who is to plan for our city—our city government or independent agencies acting apart from city consultation, approval, and control?

2. For whom is our city to be planned—the ordinary people who live and work here or certain special groups and vested interests?

3. Can the city adopt an effective and long-range plan in view of the actions of an independent agency like the port authority, which, as in the case of this World Trade Center, seems able to change the face of the city at will?

The current plans for the proposed World Trade Center are a case in point. Certainly a law which allows the port authority virtual immunity from city building codes, safety requirements, zoning regulations, etc. is a mockery of city planning. The 1962 law expressly provides that "so long as any facility constituting a portion of the port development project [Hudson tubes and World Trade Center] shall be owned, controlled, or operated by the port authority * * *, no agency, commission, or municipality of either or both of the two States shall have jurisdiction over such facility nor shall any such agency, commission, or municipality have any jurisdiction over the terms or method of effectuation of all or any portion thereof by the port authority * * * including but not limited to the transfer of all or any portion thereof to or by the port authority. * * * [13]

The World Trade Center plans will create new traffic and transportation problems for the city about which Commissioner Henry Barnes has already complained publicly. They will, however, do even more: they will change the face of the city.

We say that this is a change which should be made only by the government of the city as part of an overall plan. We submit that there is something all wrong in having the face of the city changed at the whim of the 12-man board of the port authority, whether it is for better or for worse. Today, for the first time, the concept of such an overall plan is being given serious consideration and is receiving substantial support. The ensuing excerpt clearly states the problem:

The mayor is hemmed in. As he strives to exercise policy leadership, his power is challenged on all sides * * * there are the public authorities. * * * Some, like the Port of New York Authority, handle a whole range of functions. They are eminently useful institutions, but however efficient they may be, they are virtually laws unto themselves and they have severely limited the mayor's ability to rule in his own house and, more important, his ability to plan for long-range development. [14]

THE CURRENT STATE OF THE OPPOSITION

As indicated, considerable opposition does exist. The realtors who are presently challenging the constitutionality of the plans represent the owners of office buildings assessed at more than one-half the total assessment of all such buildings in New York City.

CBS radio in four editorials, Forbes magazine, and the New York Daily News have also spoken out strongly against the port authority's World Trade Center. In addition, architects, city planners, civil leaders, legislators, and union officials have indicated their serious reservations and downright disapproval.

WILL WE HAVE A VOICE IN THE FUTURE OF OUR CITY?

The situation is still in flux. The pending litigation will probably cause postponement of any action on the plans of the port authority for a considerable period of time. In the interim, the New York and New Jersey State Legislatures can be persuaded to repeal or amend the statutes joining the creation of a World Trade Center in New York City with the takeover of the Hudson and Manhattan tube system, so that these two logically independent matters can be considered separately and intelligently.

Last year, in the closing hours of the session of the New York State Legislature, such an amendment was filed too late to be reported out of the committee to which it was referred. It was never killed, however, and met with a most encouraging response. Many legislators, upstate as well as city, expressed amazement at the plans of the port authority and insisted that when the statute authorizing the creation of a world trade center was passed, they had no idea they were authorizing any such action to be taken.

As of now, sponsorship has been obtained for a new bill to repeal the proposed World Trade Center project. This bill will be resubmitted in the 1965 legislative session.

Before the legislators will enact corrective legislation, however, they will have to be persuaded that there is a substantial public demand for such legislation, and before

Footnotes at end of speech.

there is such a demand, the public must be awakened to the seriousness of the threat presented by the current plans of the port authority. It is for this important educational task that we ask your support.

The responsibility belongs to all of us.

---

[1] Directors of the World Trade Corp., under ch. 928, New York Laws, 1946; 1st report, Dec. 31, 1946; 2d report, Feb. 27, 1948; 3d report, Dec. 31, 1948.

[2] Port authority, "A World Trade Center in the Port of New York," Mar. 10, 1961, p. 25.

[3] The New York Times, Mar. 21, 1961, p. 1: 2.

Ibid., Apr. 3, 1961, p. 13: 4.

Ibid., Nov. 2, 1961, p. 41: 4.

[4] The New York Times, Mar. 24, 1961, p. 25: 1.

Ibid., Mar. 28, 1961, p. 1: 1.

Ibid., Oct. 20, 1961, p. 20: 5.

Ibid., Nov. 2, 1961, p. 41: 4.

[5] S. Sloan Colt, in a statement reported in the New York Herald Tribune, May 25, 1962, under the headline, "The Declining Port of New York"; Austin J. Tobin, in a speech before the Fordham University School of Business and Alumni Association, Dec. 24, 1962, reported in the Christian Science Monitor under the headline, "New York Port Takes Inventory."

[6] Ibid.

[7] Ralph W. Goshen, WCBS radio editorial No. 310, "WCBS Questions Feasibility of World Trade Center Proposed for Lower Manhattan," Apr. 15, 1964.

[8] Sam J. Slate, WCBS radio editorial No. 182, Oct. 4, 1962.

[9] Ch. 209, New York Laws, 1962, pp. 31, 32.

[10] The editors of Fortune, "The Exploding Metropolis," Doubleday Anchor, 1958, p. 82.

[11] Edward T. Chase, "How To Rescue New York From Its Port Authority," Harper's, June 1960, p. 67.

[12] Edward T. Chase, "How To Rescue New York From Its Port Authority," Harper's, June 1960, p. 69.

[13] Ch. 209, New York Laws, 1962, p. 28.

[14] The editors of Fortune, "The Exploding Metropolis," Doubleday Anchor, 1958, p. 64.

Dams—Not Dollars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD generally two excellent articles that appeared recently in the New York Herald Tribune, commenting on President Johnson's great speech at Johns Hopkins University.

The first, an editorial, very properly rejects the charge that the President was trying to "buy peace" with his advocacy of a vast development plan in southeast Asia. The second article, by David Lawrence, is the more remarkable because it comes from a writer who has, to put it mildly, not always been in agreement with Democratic Presidents.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the validity of the points made in these articles will be established by history, and that the President's address at Johns Hopkins University will go down as one of the most statesmanlike of our era.

The articles follow:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 11, 1965]

DAMS—NOT DOLLARS

The assertion by some Americans, in and out of Congress, that President Johnson was trying to buy peace with his advocacy of a vast development plan in southeast Asia is very wide of the mark. Yet it is the familiar charge leveled at the foreign aid program. Because the programs are generally stated, for simplicity, in dollars, Congressmen and the public both tend to forget that what foreign aid means to the recipient is not dollars but dams—and roads, factories, harbor works and irrigation projects.

As President Johnson said: "The vast Mekong River can provide food and water and power on a scale to dwarf even our own TVA." Studies and preparatory work for the plan have been underway for years, under the auspices of the U.N. To complete so grandiose of scheme will, of course, require dollars—and, one may hope, pounds, francs, marks and even rubles. It will also require peace, and a degree of political stability in an area running from Burma to the South China Sea. But above all, it will require cooperation, among the nations of southeast Asia and among the industrialized countries that can give reality to the plan.

It is this complex of needs, rather than any simple purchase of peace with dollars, that gives real meaning to the Mekong River project. For by bringing many nations together for the purpose of raising the living standards of millions of underprivileged human beings the plan could accomplish much for the region and for the world. It would help the Burmese, the Thais, the Laotians, Cambodians and Vietnamese in very practical ways. And by setting up an example of genuine international collaboration, it would reduce tensions and hold up common goals for them and for those who would supply the aid. It is a great concept, difficult of achievement, certainly, but offering hopes far beyond any mere diplomatic horse trade.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 9, 1965]

THE PRESIDENT'S VIET SPEECH

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—President Johnson's latest speech on the Vietnam situation is one of the best exposition of American foreign policy that has been presented since the "cold war" began. The advisers who helped to compose it also deserve credit because they acurately assembled the facts that make up the consensus of American thinking today.

The President avoided the mistake made by the United Nations in Korea when consent was given to participate in a cease-fire which never was followed by the signing of a peace treaty.

This time there is no self-imposed restriction upon the United States to withhold military action while peace talks are proceeding. The Communists cannot with impunity, therefore, string out peace discussions year after year while at the same time conducting clandestine violations of a cease-fire agreement.

So when Mr. Johnson declared that he would enter peace talks unconditionally, it means that the United States retains its freedom of action and can punish the enemy and retaliate whenever there are aggressive acts.

The key words in the President's speech are these: "We will not be defeated. We will not grow tired. We will not withdraw, either openly or under the cloak of a meaningless agreement."

Having said this, however, the President made a constructive suggestion along an entirely different line when he called for an international program for development of southeast Asia, starting with a cooperative effort by the countries of that area. He urged Secretary General Thant of the United Nations to use his prestige to initiate such a plan and invited "all other industrialized countries, including the Soviet Union," to become participants. He added: "For our part, I will ask the Congress to join in a billion-dollar American investment in this effort as soon as it is underway."

This move has been wrongly interpreted by some as merely a kind of sop to those who have been criticizing the continuing of the war. Its significance is deeper. This is the first time that the United States in recent years has publicly declared a policy that goes beyond governments and into the hearts and minds of the peoples themselves.

Whether because of timidity or indifference, the United States has not carried on a campaign directly to the peoples of the Communist-dominated countries. It has not endeavored to show them how much better off they would be if they had a free government.

The President's speech doesn't necessarily imply that there is any intention to drive a wedge between the peoples and their totalitarian governments. But the United States, in its information programs overseas and in its policy speeches broadcast abroad, has too long neglected the importance of telling the peoples of the Communist and "neutralist" countries of the willingness of the American people to help them seek a life of individual opportunity and improved economic conditions.

In countries where the hand of the oppressor is stern there is no way to attain the kind of living conditions which prevail in the free countries except by the concerted will of a determined populace.

Too often the idea of revolution is scoffed at in the belief that armies are controlled by the dictators. But, as was evidenced in 1917 in the revolution against the czar, even the army participates in the revolt when public opinion definitely desires it.

President Johnson rightly discussed the need in southeast Asia for homes for millions of impoverished people. He said:

"Each day these people rise at dawn and struggle through until the night to wrestle existence from the soil. They are often wracked by diseases, plagued by hunger, and death comes at the early age of 40.

"Stability and peace do not come easily in such a land. Neither independence nor human dignity will be ever won, though, by arms alone. It also requires the works of peace.

"The American people have helped generously in times past in these works, and now there must be a much more massive effort to improve the life of man in that conflict-torn corner of our world."

This is a welcome note in the outline of American foreign policy. It needs to be followed up by radio and every other form of communication. For history has proved that, if ideas are conveyed to a few, they spread to many by word of mouth, which indeed is the most effective form of communication in existence today. The Communist governments will, of course, reject the proposal for economic aid, but the seed will have been planted among the people.

The President wisely did not discuss details. But he made it clear that the United States wants peace—not war. He also pledged American cooperation to achieve a better life not merely for the free peoples but for those whose rights have been so elegantly abused by their rulers.

The speech was remarkable because of its forthrightness and its scope. Sooner or later

peace talks will begin, and it looks now as if the advantage then will be on the side of the United States.

A Gratifying Example of Dedication by Another Peace Corps Member

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to insert in our RECORD the inspiring story of another ambassador of good will in shirtsleeves. The news item is from the Paterson Evening News of April 13, 1965, and deals with a constituent of whom I am proud, Roy H. Elsenbroek, a member of the Peace Corps.

The closing paragraphs of the article so ably written by Bert Nawyn were particularly pertinent in the week before Good Friday and Easter, as they indicate the fact that religious principles can be translated into meaningful actions.

The article follows:

(By Bert Nawyn)

HAWTHORNE.—If anybody can change the American image abroad it will be Peace Corps members such as Roy H. Elsenbroek, who returned home last week from east Pakistan.

Elsenbroek, a handsome young man of 20 years, tells of his experiences in east Pakistan with enthusiasm changing into a somber mood as he reflects on the privations of the population in that country.

GRADUATE OF EASTERN CHRISTIAN SCHOOL ASSOCIATION

Young Elsenbroek is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Henry Elsenbroek, 122 Westervelt Avenue, and a graduate of the Eastern Christian School Association. He entered the Peace Corps on February 28, 1963, and ended his service 2 years later.

Renewing acquaintances, he plans to become either a missionary to bring spiritual, moral, and physical assistance to deprived people or to enter the U.S. Foreign Service.

Although they have the same government, East Pakistan is separated from West Pakistan by over 1,000 miles. In between them is India.

PRIMITIVE CONDITIONS

A comparatively small area, east Pakistan is about the size of the State of Minnesota. But there the similarity ends. While Minnesota has a population of 3.5 million persons, there are 57 million people crowded into east Pakistan, most of whom have no modern conveniences, no telephones, no television or radio, no sanitary conditions, people who live in villages and hunt leopards with bow and arrow when they prowl too close to the thatched huts.

East Pakistan is on the Bay of Bengal. About 90 percent of the population are Moslems. West Pakistan, where the Government seat is located, is a modern area compared to east Pakistan, where in the larger cities the major products are burlap, jute, fertilizers, and tea crops.

Young Elsenbroek had nothing but praise for the Peace Corps and what it is attempting to accomplish. He said "We came into the country, were welcomed by statesmen and high officials, and then took our place with the lowest class of people, to help them and show them how they could live a better life."

Elsenbroek emphasized, "There are 7,000 Peace Corps members from 18 years to grandparents. I met one man who was 76 years old, doing a good job.

"The Peace Corps in such countries as east Pakistan is changing the American image abroad. We used to send tractors and equipment to people who are illiterate. Many times they were told that this equipment was the gift of a Communist country. Now, these same people find Americans willing to give of themselves to plan a better life. This impresses these people."

Elsenbroek was accepted in the Peace Corps shortly after graduating from Eastern Christian High School, North Haledon. After a 4-day stay in New York City for orientation, lectures, and instructions, he left with 102 other volunteers for Camp Radley, Arecibo, P.R. Camp Radley was named after the first Peace Corps member who died abroad.

SURVIVAL STUDY

At Camp Radley, a month was spent in a rigid survival course which included rock climbing and instruction in survival methods. The main objective of the course was to strengthen physical, mental, and emotional resources upon which the Peace Corps member can draw to achieve the tasks which lie ahead.

From Puerto Rico, Elsenbroek left with 48 other volunteers for Brattleboro, Vt., where a course in "Experment in International Living" was given.

It was here that Elsenbroek learned to speak Bengali, the east Pakistan language. The program for that country was divided into nine parts, consisting of the language program, area studies, international affairs, communism, American studies, technical skills, training, the psychology of effective functioning overseas, and Peace Corps orientation.

At Brattleboro, 20 Peace Corps volunteers dropped out. Disqualification of volunteers went on during the entire training course, which lasted 240 hours.

Elsenbroek left June 11, 1963, for a new life of service to others and adventure, arriving at Dacca, in east Pakistan, on June 14.

"It was like coming into a different world which could not be compared with anything in this country. On a corner intersection was a man selling meat. He had just slaughtered a cow in an open market and was slicing the meat as the people came up to to purchase a piece. Millions of flies swarmed about. The temperature was over 100° and the stench was sickening."

SHORT LIFESPAN

Elsenbroek said that because of the high mortality rate of infants the average life is from 28 to 35 years. He remarked, "These people live on a daily menu of curry and rice. Vegetables are extremely hard to grow because of flooded conditions and the extreme heat, which almost every day climbs up to 120°."

At Chittagong, where he spent most of his time, Elsenbroek worked with engineer Grant Wells, of Michigan. While at Chittagong he received a citation from the Pakistan Government for devising and erecting a cyclone shelter.

East Pakistan each year is devastated by cyclones, with thousands losing their lives. The two Peace Corps members built a 150 person cyclone shelter which was approved by the government. More are now being built.

Peace Corps members in east Pakistan helped the natives build roads, schoolhouses, and other types of buildings. All these were constructed without modern machinery.

For extracurricular activities, Elsenbroek started ball clubs with the children, with whom he soon became a favorite. While in Jamalpur, he started a basketball team for the natives.

What struck Elsenbroek as most impressive is that natives of east Pakistan are concerned with nothing but eating, sleeping and having children.

NO TAXES

He remarked, "People in the villages are not concerned over taxes because they don't pay any, they have no social life, no PTA's, no television, no religious organizations. They lead a very simple life, one of the simplest in the world. They don't complain, because they know of nothing better. Children have wooden carved toys. This truly is primitive life."

Peace Corps members are volunteers who are not paid for their tour of duty. According to Elsenbroek, some are disappointed when they arrive at their destination. He said, "A few of those coming to east Pakistan took the next plane back to the States."

Peace Corps members do not sign up for any specific length of time. Neither does a stint in the Peace Corps exempt anyone for service in the Armed Forces.

Elsenbroek said Saturday that he felt his Christian parental, church and school training was largely responsible in his decision to devote 2 year of his life in the service of others.

He concluded "Throughout the world, the American is pictured as being interested in materialism and what he can get for himself. The Peace Corps shows the world that the American is willing to give himself so that persons in underdeveloped nations might have a better chance in life.

When a Christian enters into this phase of activity, he has before him the sacrifice of one who gave His life on the cross of Calvary. This is why I want to continue in a life of service to others."

Johnson Proposal for Peace in Southeast Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, on the editorial page of the Baltimore Sun this week, there was an interesting and illuminating editorial regarding Communist reaction to President Johnson's proposals for peace in southeast Asia. The text of the editorial follows:

REJECTIONS

The initial rejection by North Vietnam, Communist China, and the Soviet Union of President Johnson's proposals for peace in southeast Asia were about should have been expected. They should not be allowed to rule out the possibility of peace discussions—but approached in a more roundabout way than a public acceptance of the President's proposition—nor should they be allowed to obscure the point that the President was moving in the right direction.

Communist doctrine, in the capitals of the oddly matched triumvirate of North Vietnam, Red China and the Soviet Union, requires the government officials to pretend that there is no North Vietnamese aggression against South Vietnam, and to claim that aggression is being committed by the United States in its effort to help South Vietnam to maintain its independence. There is reason to believe that the real policy of each of these countries—policy that is affected by old na-

tionalist concerns as well as by the present split between the Chinese and Russian Communists over the leadership of the Communist Parties around the world—may impel each of them to a different approach to the possibility of ending the war in Vietnam. It is possible that these differences will figure in the diplomatic explorations which will continue.

It must be kept in mind, too, that the Communist side will not give up its effort to overrun South Vietnam as long as there is a prospect that it will succeed and will not cost too much. To suggest, as some have, that Mr. Johnson was trying to buy peace by his suggestion for a great economic development scheme, including the Mekong River program, is to turn the facts upside down. The President was suggesting that an investment in peace is better than an investment in war, and that if peace is established all of southeast Asia, including North Vietnam, will benefit. At the same time he was insisting that, while the door is open to peace discussions without preconditions, the United States intends to press its present military effort. Nothing decisive is likely to happen soon. Patience and firmness are essential.

Pan American Day

SPEECH
OF
HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution which designates this day, April 14, 1965, as "Pan American Day."

Today marks the 75th anniversary of the first Conference of American States which was held here in Washington and from which has developed the bulwark of democracy and freedom in our own hemisphere—the Organization of American States.

Throughout the long life of this organization, which is the oldest of its kind in the field of international relations, we have seen the wisdom of its founders and the need for its stated purposes. Among the essential purposes proclaimed by the charter of the Organization of American States are two which are most familiar to us. These are, first that the Organization is to strengthen the peace and security of the continent, and, second, that it is to prevent possible causes of difficulties and to insure the pacific settlement of disputes that may arise among the member states.

In the effective accomplishment of these purposes, this Organization of 21 American Republics has in recent times presented a solid front against the enroachment of any subversive political philosophy, particularly communism, which has threatened and continues to threaten its member states.

Threats to our continental security and solidarity have taken other forms. The Cuban missile crisis and the situation at Panama, of course, were epic examples.

As we rededicate ourselves on this Pan American Day to the principles which affirm the necessity for peaceful, cooperative action through the Organization of American States, let us resolve to bring to the attention of each of its member states the need for legislation such as that which was recently considered within these very Halls. I refer to legislation which provides aid to education of children born to poverty and which promotes the health and economic welfare of older persons. It seems to me that this would advance in a meaningful way one of the least known purposes of the Organization of American States, and that is, the member states shall "promote, by cooperative action, their economic, social, and cultural development."

It is within the Pan American framework of peace, security and an enlightened and healthy citizenry that the member states, individually and collectively, can continue to observe Pan American Day with ever-increasing significance.

A Call to National Conscience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MORRIS K. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, on January 25 and 26 of this year the city of Tucson, Ariz., was the scene of a National Conference on Poverty in the Southwest. Here, for the first time, we saw some of the extent of the poverty suffered by Mexican-Americans, Indians and other minority groups in the States comprising the Southwest.

A number of participants in the conference have prepared a report entitled "A Call to National Conscience." Because of its great importance and relevance to our country's current antipoverty program I want to call this report to the attention of my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, without objection I shall insert the report in the Appendix at this point:

A CALL TO NATIONAL CONSCIENCE

The undersigned were invited to sit as a "jury" while spokesmen for the poor and representatives of both private and public agencies aired their views on the causes of and cures for poverty in the vast area of the American Southwest. The speakers had assembled at the recent National Conference on Poverty in the Southwest—and their testimony dramatically underscored the delinquency of leadership in and for this area.

THE NATURE OF SOUTHWESTERN POVERTY

We were convinced by the testimony presented there that poverty in the Southwest has characteristics that are unique in the national American scene. The great distances in the Southwest and the economic expansion attendant on two decades of postwar prosperity and population explosion mask poverty in the rural areas, in the cities, in the mountains, and in the desert. The economic expansion of these decades has given few benefits to the poor. In New Mexico an Indian lives on a reservation on less than $400 a year, speaking little English, growing up in a culture that never developed concepts of competition, baffled by the white man's world of aggression and materialism. In Texas a Mexican-American family of 12 subsists on a diet consisting principally of beans and corn, trying to maintain a marginal existence on the fringe of an affluent but hostile society.

We were told of the poverty of hope for the white "Anglo" migrant farmworker who, systematically and deliberately exploited by the big agricultural growers, ekes out a family existence on $1,100 a year. He tries vainly to understand why a nation permits—in fact, invites—foreign laborers to compete under deliberately favored conditions. California growers were described as consistently preferring Mexican bracero labor.

We heard of the poverty of education and opportunity haunting the Arizona Negro who assumed he was escaping discrimination and inadequate schooling in the Southeast, only to encounter them again under more hypocritical circumstances in an area which exhorts its citizens to "stand on their own two feet."

Poverty in the Southwest is represented by some of the Nation's most abysmal housing, and it is perpetuated by an educational system that makes no provision for the special needs of its different ethnic populations. For in the Southwest, as elsewhere in the country, the most acutely impoverished are the ethnic minorities. They include 3.5 million Spanish-surnamed people whose backgrounds may be a blend of Indian, Spanish, Mexican, and Latin-American origins; seeking identity among the recently arrived "Anglos," these people find themselves regarded as aliens. Of the area's 2.2 million Negroes, only those in California have found anything of the better life they sought when leaving the "old South," and even there this "better life" consists largely of better ghettoes and slowly improving education for equal job opportunities. The Southwest includes some 200,000 Indians of varied tribes, nations, and reservations who are shuttled back and forth from rural to urban life by a confusing series of Federal policies.

Several Southwestern cities have trebled in size in the historic population explosion of the past two decades. But Southwestern civic and community leaders have ignored the fact that this population growth would necessitate preventive action against the multiplying economic and social problems confronting the region. And so the same civic leaders have neglected the aggressive social improvisations which the development of a modern, urbanized society makes imperative.

With the spread of technology and the growth of business and industry, the original occupant of the Southwest, still rooted in his native and different culture, has been completely left behind. Educationally unprepared for the technical complexity of modern America, barred by racial, social, and economic discrimination from participation in the very society to which they belong, the poor of the Southwest remain overlooked, unwanted, and ignored—by the Southwest and by the Nation.

THE ATTITUDES

The testifiers at the conference in Tucson revealed conflicts, distrust, and intense competition between the relatively prepared "Anglos" on the one hand and the severally disadvantaged Indian, Negro, and Spanish-surnamed citizens on the other. This situation, aggravated by the widespread apathy of the responsible members of the power structure toward the problem of poverty, seems to us to portend serious social disorders in the future unless extensive social reforms occur. Here, in a five-State population of 30 million, are over 8 million living on annual family incomes of less than $3,000. Possibly only the ethnic insularities and mu-

tual distrusts of the minority groups have so far prevented the coalescence of thought and action necessary to force social reform.

Apparently a Southwestern power elite of mining, oil, cattle, real estate, and agricultural interests tends to sweep social problems under the rug. Testimony indicates that the weight of this elite is arrayed against the economic and political weakness of minority groups and of the poor generally. The press, with certain exceptions, reflects the views of the elite and reinforces its dominance. The press also exhibits a persistent suspicion of social causes and the people involved in them, thus promoting a regional antagonism to coordinated family assistance, suspicion of private philanthropy for social causes, and resistance to public planning. It proclaims that social planning properly resides in the private sector, but it supports only minor endeavors by private agencies. These factors may account for the apparent indifference of private agency directors toward much-needed private and public social reforms. They may also account for the fact that welfare administrators seem to thwart the will of the Congress and of the Nation through welfare policies that, even charitably, can only be described as inhuman.

REGIONAL INFLUENCES

Poverty in the Southwest differs from poverty in other parts of the Nation because the Southwest itself is different. A major factor of this difference is the existence of a 1,500-mile border shared with a nation whose economic standards are 30 years behind ours—a border far more open than most Americans realize. As many as 3,000 immigrants per month enter to become permanent residents. More than 30,000 commuters swarm across the border on a regular basis to work at wages which, while substandard for the United States, make them comparatively well paid residents of Mexico. Many employers, particularly agricultural growers, profit handsomely from this cheap source of labor. This foreign labor force, willing to work at 60 to 90 cents an hour, depresses the southwestern economy which is already suffering from growing automation and excess job applicants.

The relative openness of the border has created another problem—that of "semi-citizens," Mexicans who have lived in the Southwestern States, particularly Texas, for decades. For various reasons they have not become citizens. Many of them have now lost track of the personal papers or witnesses who could establish the vital statistics prerequisite for citizenship applications. Many are old and incredibly poor. Lacking citizenship, they are ineligible for most public welfare or any kind of assistance except charity. They have no homes to return to in Mexico; in this country their lot is a form of aged peonage.

We come then to some suggestions, both general and specific, for attacking poverty in the Southwest. National attention to this region is obviously overdue.

SUGGESTIONS

First, the openness of our international border must be reviewed. Steps must be taken to regulate and reduce the flow of "border commuters." Congress must enact appropriate legislation and the State Department must effect international wage agreements with Mexico. The Labor Department needs its administrative hand strengthened so that it can halt commuters when there is a demonstrably adverse affect on the U.S. labor force. State—and, where necessary, Federal—legislation is needed to apply fair labor standards to the international worker as well as our own citizen. For poverty in the Southwest cannot be separated from poverty in Mexico while the international border remains no more than an inconvenience to commuters. The problem is international in scope and should be approached internationally, even to the extent of contemplating some kind of specific joint Mexico-United States aid to northern Mexico and establishing a minimum wage to the Mexican citizens' service here. It is not enough to treat the symptoms. We must endeavor also to cure or at least ameliorate the sickness, which, in this case, is the perpetual depression that exists in the north of Mexico and spreads into our vulnerable Southwest.

We urge that public welfare agencies, instead of wasting dollars trying to ferret out chiselers, apply that energy and more to rehabilitating the poor and reducing their dependency. The Federal Government must insure that the will of Congress is honored, particularly in Texas and Arizona.

We call upon the Southwestern agricultural States, notably California, Arizona, and Texas, to bring farmworkers under the protective canopy of State labor laws. These should include minimum wage laws; laws securing workers in their rights to organize; laws against discrimination and the like.

We urge grower participation in conquering the age-old problems of seasonal crops and wages while laborers have year-round family needs. We advocate total abandonment of the bracero immigrant labor concept. We request an interstate study of education for those to whom English may be the foreign or second language.

We appeal to the States of the Southwest to reduce the varying harsh residence requirements for old-age assistance eligibility and to achieve some uniformity in their welfare and other assistance programs.

Perhaps most important of all, we plead for a new regional attitude toward social programing not only for, but subject to the ideas of the less fortunate. Perhaps a privately funded regional entity should be created to give voice to the impoverished. The various social agencies of the Southwest both public and private—agencies concerned with health, family planning, education, preparation for employment, and housing—must abandon their aloofness and yield a major portion of their planning and decisionmaking process to the disadvantaged themselves. United funds, community councils, and other similar organizations should concentrate most of their time, funds and attention on the problems of the poor and, as they do so, involve these same poor at the highest levels of policymaking. We believe that a show of patience with the neophyte social planner from depressed areas will produce unheard-of dividends. It is not now being done.

Finally, there should be national respect for the cultural differences of the great Southwest. As one of the participants at the Tucson poverty conference so eloquently stated: "We have given too little awareness to the history of this land which has made us so affluent. In our haste we tend to equate material poverty with spiritual and cultural poverty * * *. The 'Anglo' must realize that many who are poor in the Southwest have rich and priceless traditions—a cultural kind of affluence which we need badly to share. As we undertake to rid the Southwest of poverty * * * we'll be working in a land of great beauty among peoples of great beauty. We must be sure that our efforts in no way erode the great gifts of diversity which we enjoy here—diversity of language, art, dance, ceremony, religion. And the 'Anglo' perhaps must learn better to place himself properly in the history of this region—the last to arrive here—in a sense, the newcomer. We owe to ourselves the obligation not to try to overcome differences but to preserve and honor diversity. For the 'Anglo' affluence itself badly needs the cultural enrichment of the ancient peoples of the Southwest."

Respectfully submitted.

Leonard Duhl, M.D.; Mr. David Danzig; Mrs. Grace Montanez Davis; Mr. D'Arcy McNickle; Dr. Laurence Gould; Mr. Henry Saltzman; Paul O'Rourke, M.D.; Mr. Steve Allen; Mr. Henry Talbert; Dr. Julian Samora; Mr. Bernard Valdez.

MARCH 1965.

One of the Most Charming Institutions of the Great Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, one of the most charming institutions of the Great Society is the incomparable Liz Carpenter. The wife of newspaper correspondent Les Carpenter, and a former president of the Women's National Press Club, Liz Carpenter is a delightful and effective press expert for Mrs. Lyndon Johnson and for the White House in general.

Few women in America have the genuine charm and spark which Liz possesses, and an article which appears in the New York Times, April 11, 1965, and is printed below is an indication of the recognition this lady so justly deserves:

FIRST LADY'S LADY BOSWELL

(By Nan Robertson)

(NOTE.—Nan Robertson is a member of the Times Washington bureau who regularly reports White House News.)

WASHINGTON.—It was November 22, 1963, in Dallas. Elizabeth Carpenter, executive assistant to Lyndon Baines Johnson, was riding in a black limousine from Parkland Memorial Hospital to Love Field. Emerging from a daze of horror and shock, she recalls: "I was aware suddenly I was riding along with the Vice President. I started scribbling what he might have to say when we got to Washington. I gave it to him."

President John Fitzgerald Kennedy was dead. Mr. Johnson was about to take the oath of office as 36th President of the United States in a hushed, desperately hurried ceremony inside a jet plane parked on a dirty runway.

When the plane reached Washington, President Johnson read the brief speech Mrs. Carpenter had drafted (This is a sad time for all people * * *. I ask for your help—and God's"), then turned to her, "Liz, go with Lady Bird and be of any help to her you can," he said. He left for the White House.

In the car on the way home to the Elms, the mansion the Johnsons had bought from Perle Mesta, the shaken First Lady asked her companion what to expect. "There will be reporters there. They'll want to know your reaction," Mrs. Carpenter said.

"The way I feel about it? It has all been a dreadful nightmare, but somehow we must find the strength to go on," Mrs. Johnson blurted out.

"That is your statement," Mrs. Carpenter said.

Liz Carpenter, since that night, has served as the First Lady's press secretary and staff director (the title became official 2 weeks later)—and as Mrs. Johnson's Boswell.

She sees her role not as watchdog, fending off intruders (the invariable attitude of former press secretaries and aids to President's wives), but as a person hired to accommodate the representatives of public curiosity. She has made the First Lady's deeds and thoughts more accessible than at any time since Eleanor Roosevelt was in the White House.

Mrs. Carpenter is also often funny, a trait that endears her to both Mrs. Johnson and reporters. At the start of the First Lady's whistlestop campaign tour of the South last October, Mrs. Carpenter, who had spent the previous 3 weeks working out the details, tacked a note to the train bulletin board that gave some idea of the hectic time ahead. It read:

"A whistle will blow 2 minutes before the train starts moving. We hope we won't be scattering you over the countryside, but the train does not wait.

"In case you do get left, look for the advance man [the person who makes arrangements in advance at a campaign stop]. He can be easily identified as the happiest man at the depot because all of his problems have just left. See if he can work out your transportation to a nearby town. If he can't, just take out residence, register and vote."

Mrs. Carpenter is also thoughtful of reporters, a rare trait in press secretaries. By the third day of the whistlestop trip, the press car was a rolling slum. Mashed cigarettes, spilled coffee containers, and bread crusts littered the place. None of the 150 sweating typers aboard it had had a bath since leaving Washington because the wash basins in the compartments were eyecup size. As the train rocketed toward Tallahassee, Mrs. Carpenter pinned another note to the board. It said: "On the theory that the press that bathes together stays together, we have reserved three rooms, baths, showers, and 150 towels at the Du Val Hotel in Tallahassee tonight." The gratitude of the train's grimy prisoners was intense.

Mrs. Carpenter's relationship with the Johnson family is unique. She is the White House idea man and stage manager. She is an intimate of the woman she serves, helps write most of her speeches, and plans her schedules. "Liz means something very special to me," the First Lady said recently. She went on, through adjectives like "imaginative," "elastic," and "indispensable," and concluded: "In all her relations with people she is kind—and I like that." The two women are so closely attuned that when Mrs. Johnson, herself gifted with words, is speaking, it is impossible to detect which phrases and thoughts are her own and which Mrs. Carpenter's.

Mrs. Carpenter is devoted to the President and shows it, but she is also one of the few employees, perhaps the only one, who talks back to him. Once, when he bellowed at her over the intercom, "Why don't you use your head?" she snapped, "Because I'm too busy using yours." When piqued, Mr. Johnson has referred to her as "that smart-alecky girl," but he does not stay angry long.

An incident last election day illustrates Mrs. Carpenter's style. The President and his wife had just cast their votes and were leading a horde of reporters on a tour of the little house in Johnson City, Tex., in which he had grown up.

Mrs. Johnson sat on the front porch swing with the President beside her while the two recalled details of their courtship. A battery of photographers pressed close.

Suddenly a short, square woman with a disheveled mop of fluffy gray hair bustled to the front. She held up her hand. "That's enough," Mrs. Carpenter said firmly but kindly, and the photographers stopped.

"Now, Mr. President, would you and Mrs. Johnson come down over here so the photographers can take a shot of you by the rail fence?" she said in her Texas twang, and did not wait for an answer. The President of the United States and his wife rose obediently and followed Mrs. Carpenter. "Not here," she said, "over by the gate." They moved to the gate, trailed by the photographers.

Mrs. Carpenter is bored by what she calls "old brocade" questions about White House fashions and furnishings and other trivia, but manages to keep her good humor. A Chicago reporter, whose style of questioning can be described only as gently implacable, discovered at one of Mrs. Carpenter's briefings that Blanco, the White House collie, had been given to the Presidential family by an Illinois child. She pounced on a possible local angle for a story.

Was it an upstate or a downstate dog? Where did it live? (Mrs. Carpenter giggled at this point and muttered: "Local bitch makes good." She had overlooked one vital detail; Blanco is a male.) The questioning went on. Was it happy at the White House? How did Liz know it was happy at the White House?

"I know because I'm in the doghouse with it most of the time," Mrs. Carpenter said, referring to a recent run-in with the President.

The laughter and easy give-and-take in the east wing of the White House where answers sought and given can be on the light side, but usually full and frank, are in marked contrast to the mood in the west wing, where President Press Secretary George Reedy holds forth. There, in an atmosphere that is often angry and frustrating, reporters rush into Mr. Reedy's office twice a day for 10-minute briefings that offer up a grab bag of scattered items ranging from uninformative monologs to brusque no comments. West wing reporters, accustomed to this, evince astonishment and envy when they first cover one of Liz Carpenter's briefings.

These are much less frequent than Presidential press briefings because they are obviously less important. They take place at the time announced, often last more than an hour and frequently are held in the White House library—accompanied by tea or coffee served from a silver set, a spread of what Mrs. Carpenter calls "something to chew on" and, if it is cool, a fire in the grate. Other briefings are in Mrs. Carpenter's roomy office in the east wing, without refreshments or fire but equally prompt, long, and relaxed.

It is difficult to find a White House correspondent with a complaint about Mrs. Carpenter. One, however, is an expert woman reporter who covers the White House sporadically. "I feel uncomfortable in Liz' office," she says. "I feel I'm being snowed."

If Mrs. Carpenter controls her end of White House news—which, of course, any press secretary does to some extent—she generally manages to do so painlessly. She also has one enormous advantage over any press secretary to Lyndon Johnson, a tempestuous man who insists on bossing everything—her employer is Mrs. Johnson.

The First Lady, a friendly woman who is unfailingly kind even in her tensest moments, has an instinctive sense of public relations polished during nearly 28 years in public life. She was graduated from the University of Texas in 1934 with a bachelor's degree in journalism, and although she had no time to practice it before Mr. Johnson married her, she is sympathetic to reporters' problems and needs. Typically, she chose as her press secretary the first working newswoman ever to hold the post, which carries a salary of something more than $18,000.

Mrs. Carpenter is 44 years old, 8 years younger than her boss, 5 feet 2 inches tall, and hefty. She seems to churn along rather than walk, arms and legs pumping as she bustles through the White House. "She's all rough, tumble and Texas," says one reporter friend.

She was born Mary Elizabeth Sutherland in Salado, Tex., in a big, white columned mansion built by her great-grandfather before the Civil War. "Twenty-four rooms and no bath," she observes. She met her husband at Austin High School, where she was the editor and he was the business manager of the school paper. Both went on to journalism studies at the University of Texas in Austin. She was graduated in June 1942, after becoming the first woman vice president of the student body on a campus that breeds future politicians, and took off without delay for Washington.

Her brother was working there "and it seemed an exciting place to be," she says. "And one of the first things you did was call on your Congressman." She called on hers, Lyndon Johnson, but his wife was manning the office while Representative Johnson was off at war.

Elizabeth Sutherland married Leslie Carpenter in 1944 and the Johnsons were at the wedding. The Carpenters now have a son, Scott, aged 18, and a daughter, Christy, 15.

Among the newspapers Mrs. Carpenter represented in Washington was the Austin American-Statesman, the main paper in Representative Johnson's 10th District: "He was proud of me as a local girl, but we weren't close until the 1960 campaign," she says.

That year, Mrs. Carpenter took leave from the Carpenter News Bureau, which her husband still runs, to assist Mrs. Johnson. The wife of the vice-presidential candidate had begged her to take part "in the great adventure of our lives."

"I thought long and hard about it," Mrs. Carpenter said. "I didn't want to do it—leave Les and the children. And I am petrified of flying. But then I thought it was foolish to let silly fear rob me of this experience." In the next 71 days of barnstorming she covered 35,000 miles, mostly by air.

After the election, she stayed on as press aid and social secretary to Mrs. Johnson; and in addition, in 1961, became the Vice President's executive assistant—a combination which made her feel, she said, "like a two-way stretch." She proved her ability to stage-manage colorful stories with the visit of Bashir Ahmed, the Pakistani camel driver whom Mr. Johnson invited to the United States. Mrs. Carpenter drained the last possible anecdote and catchy quote out of the lively little man.

Since moving into the White House, Mrs. Carpenter has carried her instinct for an angle onto a larger stage: the unprecedented upstairs tours of the mansion; the alfresco press conference on the south lawn; the barbecues on the banks of the Pedernales.

Mrs. Carpenter, unlike the woman she serves, worries constantly about what she calls the reviews of Mrs. Johnson's performances at the White House and on the road. If they have been glowing since that tragic November day nearly 17 months ago, the credit goes both to the remarkable Mrs. Johnson and to her faithful female Boswell.

Medicare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent to proceed for

1 minute, revise and extend my remarks to answer a charge by South Dakota Democratic State Chairman Clem Noonan that I would have to answer to the voters of South Dakota in the 1966 election for my vote against the President's medicare plan.

Mr. Speaker, I have already answered. As in former years I sent out a questionnaire to every boxholder in my present congressional district and 83 percent of the people living west of the Missouri River voted against the President's medicare plan in the questionnaire returns that I have just tabulated. By the same token, 84 percent voted for eldercare.

I sent a questionnaire containing the same questions to the 20 new counties being attached to my old congressional district, lying between the Missouri River and the James River, and while the tabulation is not yet complete on the returns from this area sent to everyone in the telephone directory, the vote is almost as overwhelming, with 75 percent opposing medicare and 76 favoring eldercare.

Mr. Speaker, the results of elections can be misconstrued. This is the reason I annually send out a questionnaire because the majority of those interested in good government take the time to give me the benefit of their thinking and their advice, and these results determine my vote.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the people of South Dakota have already spoken, and have spoken very decisively in answering my questionnaire.

Excerpts From Capt. W. N. Ginn's Address Before the 41st Spring Meeting, American Machine Tool Distributors' Association, March 25, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, an address given by Capt. W. N. Ginn at the recent meeting of the American Machine Tool Distributors' Association has been commended to me as containing the kind of knowledge which all Americans need, as a clear explanation of the effort being made by the Navy to modernize its facilities.

The excerpts from Captain Ginn's address, which follow, were condensed by an admirer of his and constituent of mine, Mr. George E. Viereck, and are felt to relate the hard facts involved in the problems with which the U.S. Navy shipyards were faced in trying to carry on in our competitive economy.

Captain Ginn's address, as edited by Mr. Viereck, follows:

The Bureau of Ships' naval shipyard complex is big business. We do approximately $1 billion worth of business each year. We have a capital investment of $1.2 billion. This represents the original procurement value of our land, buildings, and equipment excluding New York and Portsmouth. Of the $128 million invested in industrial productive equipment, $118 million is represented by our major metalworking equipment such as boring mills, drills, gear machines, grinders, lathes, milling machines, presses, punches, shears, etc. This equipment amounts to 11,903 individual pieces. An interesting fact about this equipment, that should get your attention, is that 52.5 percent of this equipment was bought prior to 1944. Only 3 percent of the above machine tool inventory has been procured since 1960. The average age for each of the above pieces of equipment is 21.4 years.

I wish to contrast this figure with the figures contained in an article that I found in the magazine Management Services, January–February 1965 issue. The article was written by the Machinery and Allied Products Institute and is entitled "The Need for Modernization of Aging Industrial Plant."

Despite heavy business capital spending on both expansion and modernization in recent years, the average age of industrial plants today is substantially higher than it was before the depression of the 1930's, and that of equipment is about the same as it was then.

These are the findings of a study recently completed by the Machinery and Allied Products Institute. MAPI computed the average ages of business structures and of equipment separately * * * and found significant differences in their patterns.

The average age of plant rose steadily from about 20 years in 1930 to more than 27 years at the end of World War II. With the postwar construction boom, it declined until 1957 and since then has remained fairly stable at about 24 years.

The average for equipment rose from around 9.5 years in 1930 to a peak of 11.3 years in the midthirties, then dropped after the war to a low of about 8.5 years. In the early 1950's, however, it began to rise again. Since 1962 it has been virtually unchanged at about 9.6 years.

Using the MAPI figure of 9.6 years as the average age for industrial productive equipment in private industry, it becomes painfully clear that our industrial productive equipment, with an average age of 21.4 years, has long since passed the point where it normally would have been replaced if in private industry. In this era of cost effectiveness we can no longer afford to maintain and operate obsolete and antiquated equipment. During the past 5 years, fiscal years 1960–64, the Bureau of Ships has received a total of $5.2 million for procurement and replacement of metalworking machinery in its navy yards.

Based on a 50-percent escalation of the original purchase price of our metalworking machinery to represent replacement costs and the Department of Defense criteria of a 2- to 5-percent annual replacement, the Bureau of Ships requires an average of $3.5 million each year, at the 2-percent rate, to just replace worn out equipment. To keep our shipyards modern requires another estimated $2 million each year to be able to keep up with the changes in the state of the art. More money is required each year for metalworking machinery than the Bureau of Ships has received over the entire last 5 years. This, gentlemen, is the problem. On the horns of this dilemma, the Bureau of Ships has uncomfortably ridden.

A World War II destroyer of 376 feet in length has now grown to 533 feet with a commensurate increase in displacement, draft and complexity. The complexity of communications, navigation and fire control equipment has expanded at a rate undreamed of 20 years ago. The degree of accuracy that was demanded from our productive equipment and production workers during World War II is no longer satisfactory nor acceptable—but bear in mind that over 50 percent of our metalworking equipment being used on a day-to-day basis in our navy yards was procured prior to 1944. We are trying to accomplish today's technical requirements and precision on 21.4-year-old machines. The point that I am trying to make is that the Navy of 1965 can no more be compared with the Navy of 1945 than you can compare a 1965 automobile with a prewar model * * * and as you gentlemen know, the automobile industry is not producing the 1965 automobile on the same machinery or even the same type of machinery that was used to produce their prewar model. The equipment must give us the same advantage that the new equipment has given to the automobile industry.

It is not the Bureau of Ships' desire to increase our navy yards' productive capacity. It is our desire through a true modernization program to reduce the number of machine tools in our inventory, reduce our cost of operations and at the same time improve our ability to produce the quality and quantity of work required by our modern fleet. Everything we do today in the field of fire control, communications and nuclear power must meet quality assurance standards that were unknown to us 10 years ago.

Inconsistencies of Federal Regulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURT L. TALCOTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, whenever a centralized, federalized remote governmental Bureau or Department arbitrarily intercedes and establishes regulations, many shock waves will occur and many inequities will result. No matter how benevolent the motive, one man cannot be right when he attempts, from Washington, to set rules for far away areas.

A prime example is the horrendous chaos and unbelievable injustices being promoted by the Department of Labor in relation to California fruit and vegetable farming.

A letter from Stephen D'Arrigo, Jr., of Salinas, Calif., points this up succinctly. I urge each Member to give thought to these questions. The text of the letter follows:

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TALCOTT: The Secretary of Labor has announced in effect that his Department is going to get the wages of farmworkers up above the poverty level. It is apparent that the aim of the administration is to make agriculture compete with other industries for its workers. Notwithstanding the fact that agriculture cannot pass the increased cost on to the consumer as the Secretary of Labor has indicated could be done, California agriculture will nonetheless agree with the Secretary of Labor that it is most desirable to raise the level of all agricultural workers throughout the Nation. California agriculture further agrees to the principle of a national minimum wage for agriculture. Once competitors of all the other producing States in the Nation, mainly Florida and Texas, are brought up to our standard, California agriculture can hold its own as long as this minimum applies throughout the Nation. The only one dan-

ger lies in the imports of foreign produce mainly from South America and Mexico.

So having agreed to this principle, that it is most desirable to raise the wages of all Americans to a decent level, California agriculture suggests that the U.S. Government look into its sordid record in the pay of its servicemen. It pays an ensign at sea less than a baby sitter. A Navy lieutenant makes less in 60 hours a week than a New York City policeman or fireman makes in 40 hours. A Navy petty officer on a Polaris submarine earns less per month than a man on the public unemployment rolls in New York State. A recruit in the Army earns $78.00 per month which figures out to the princely sum of 44½ cents per hour for a 44-hour week.

Five thousand families of Air Force personnel are forced to accept relief checks, and 55,000 more are technically eligible for relief but are too proud to accept it. One hundred sixty-nine thousand Air Force personnel receive basic pay below the poverty standard set by President Johnson. An underprivileged school dropout will receive $105 a month in a Job Corps camp, but a skilled seaman with 2 years naval service receives only $99.

Having accepted this principle of decent wages for all, how can our Government remain silent on the question of better pay for our servicemen? Or is it that taxes would have to be increased, and increased taxes is not politically popular? As mentioned above, agriculture can find no quarrel with the principle of decent wages for all.

The Secretary of Labor has also told agriculture that if it paid decent wages, they would not have the turnover problem and that workers would be more willing to stay. For the Secretary's information, the military has been complaining about this very same problem, and I would suggest that he contact the military and advise them of his solution to the problem.

California agriculture cannot pay $1.40 per hour when Texas and Florida are at 90 cents or less. We would be most happy to pay industrial wages as long as our competing States pay the same. It is they with whom we must compete.

With respect to service pay, with whom does Uncle Sam compete that it can't pay our boys a decent wage?

Sincerely yours,

STEPHEN D'ARRIGO, Jr.

How Niles, Ill., Earned Its New Title of All America City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD RUMSFELD
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, every year the National Municipal League and Look magazine honor 11 communities whose citizens have put forth extraordinary effort to solve their problems, designating each as an All America City. It is a distinct pleasure to me and, I am sure, to all residents of the State of Illinois, to learn that the village of Niles, located in the 13th Congressional District which I have the honor of representing in the Congress of the United States, has been selected as one of the 11 outstanding communities in the Nation in 1964. I extend my congratulations to the citizens of Niles and to their civic and business leaders on their public spirit and interest which has brought them this well-deserved recognition.

The towns selected for this coveted honor may win because their citizens survived a natural disaster, ousted a corrupt government, improved economic conditions, or undertook to solve other problems that beset American communities at some time during their history. The outstanding effort of the citizens of Niles, Ill., in meeting their problem of rapid growth during the period from 1950 to 1964 and in replacing their local government officials who did little or nothing to provide the necessary community services to keep pace with this growth brought the distinguished award of All America City.

How the village of Niles earned this distinction is described in the following article by Richard Hoffman, writing in the Chicago's American:

HOW NILES, ILL., EARNED ITS NEW TITLE OF ALL AMERICA CITY

(By Richard Hoffmann)

How does a community become an All America City?

First, you throw the rascals out, especially if they're part of a political machine in power for 20 years.

Then you inject helpings of spirit, pride, youth, dedication, integrity, and efficiency, all of which mobilize the community in the pursuit of higher accomplishments.

This, at least, is the formula for success described by officials in the northwest suburb of Niles, one of 11 communities just honored by Look magazine and the National Municipal League as an All America City.

Mayor Nicholas Blase, 36, whose New Era party swept to victory in the 1961 elections, feels the crackdown on gambling which had flourished on an unincorporated strip of Milwaukee avenue between Niles and Chicago gave the people confidence in his administration.

"Everything seemed to spring from that," he said, "and other new projects that followed enjoyed public support."

Blase and Police Chief Clarence "Whitey" Emrikson were both subjected to telephone threats for their campaign against the strip, whose gaudy establishments were finally shuttered when Chicago annexed the area.

Emrikson, also 36, said through 1961 and 1962 he was harassed by anonymous callers who would utter such threats as, "Leave the pinballs alone or your kids will never reach school tomorrow."

"This will be a constant problem," Emrikson says. "There are still people who want the pinballs and the jar games back." Emrikson is the type of police chief who turns down annual gifts of liquor with a polite but firm "no," associates say.

Although to the passerby there is nothing to distinguish Niles from any of the other towns which border commercial strips like Milwaukee Avenue, the community is really in full throttle now.

Citizens for Better Parks pushed through a $705,000 bond issue in 1962 which resulted in two park sites and a new community center and swimming pool.

A $575,000 library will open soon because of the efforts of the Women's Club of Niles, which started a part-time, volunteer book lending program.

A new $198,000 village hall will be dedicated Sunday; a second $375,000 fire station opened in 1962; an $825,000 reservoir opened 2 years ago to increase water capacity by 3 million gallons.

A $3,840,000 "leaning tower" YMCA is under construction next to a replica of the famed tower in Pisa, Italy.

The Tower was originally constructed in 1932 by Robert A. Ilg, inventor and electrical manufacturer, to store water for his private park and swimming pools, which he later donated to the YMCA.

Niles also has changed because of the dedication of men like Trustee Robert Wente. He jumped into the swollen waters of the Chicago River to pull out old bikes and bed springs to speed the river's flow when basements began flooding.

Mrs. Margaret B. Lieske, village clerk, said when she took office she had to sort out 20 years of records filed in cartons.

While Niles has been able to build, it has also cut taxes from 0.370 cents per $100 assessed valuation to 0.362.

Village Manager James F. Pryde says one of the reasons is top personnel.

Blase says the big problem now will be to live up to the All America image.

With village elections coming up April 20, Blase's party has also changed its image. It's now called the Forward Era Party.

The 75th Anniversary of the Inter-American System

SPEECH
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, April 14, 1965, marked the 75th anniversary of formal regional cooperation in the Americas, but the interest of the United States in creating an inter-American system dates far earlier than 1890. In fact, from the very beginnings of our Republic, leading political figures urged hemispheric cooperation to preserve the independence of the New World from European domination and to resolve peacefully tensions among the American nations.

The desire among North Americans and Latin Americans alike for hemispheric cooperation finally came to fruition at the end of the 19th century. In 1889 and 1890 the First International Conference of American States met in Washington. From this conference emerged the first hemispheric machinery for peaceful arbitration of disputes and the first permanent inter-American agency, the Commercial Bureau of the American Republics, later renamed the Pan American Union.

Cooperative efforts in the Americas slowly and gradually grew until the Second World War tested hemispheric solidarity: all the American nations joined forces against the Axis powers. The basis had been laid; solidarity had been tested and proven. In a sense the war was a watershed in inter-American relations, for it sparked intensified efforts at cooperation.

Thus, in the years since World War II inter-American cooperation has been consolidated and inter-American institutions have proliferated into our present-day inter-American system. The

Rio Treaty of 1947 formalized our hemispheric defense structure. The Bogotá Charter of 1948 creating the Organization of American States organized the hemisphere into an actively functioning regional political system.

In the years since World War II the inter-American system has developed into a dynamic instrument of hemisphere solidarity, successfully preserving the collective security of the hemisphere against the No. 1 danger today: Communist aggression. Recently the American nations have turned more and more to a set of problems virtually neglected in the early years of inter-American cooperation: the pressing economic and social problems of the hemisphere. The Inter-American Development Bank and the Punta del Este Charter are cornerstones of a vast cooperative effort to improve living conditions throughout the hemisphere.

The first 75 years of the inter-American system have witnessed a remarkable growth in solidarity, particularly during the last 20. The focus of cooperation has changed with the times: from collective defense against European domination to collective defense against Communist aggression. Political cooperation has expanded into economic and social cooperation. But the goals have not changed: a better life in freedom for everyone throughout the hemisphere. May the next 75 years bear witness to even greater progress through hemisphere cooperation.

Only Man Who Can Arrest a President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MORRIS K. UDALL
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, those of us who represent the State of Arizona are proud that one of our citizens has risen to the position of Sergeant at Arms of the U.S. Senate. Of course, I am speaking of Joseph C. Duke, of Miami, Ariz., who has served the Senate in his present capacity for the past 16 years.

Recently the Buckeye Valley Journal Post, of Buckeye, Ariz., published an article by Columnist Ralph Watkins reviewing Mr. Duke's career and praising him for his accomplishments. In the article Mr. Watkins pointed out that the position of Sergeant at Arms is the only office in the world given power to arrest the President of the United States—that is, on instructions of the U.S. Senate. I might say that I do not expect my fellow Arizonan to exercise this power, at least during the present administration.

Mr. Speaker, without objection, I insert the article referred to at this point in the Appendix:

[From the Buckeye Valley Journal Post, Apr. 1, 1965]

POLITICAL SCENE

(By Ralph Watkins)

In politics, there are a few public servants who are known as can do people. There is no task too large or too small for them to tackle and follow through to a successful conclusion.

The U.S. Senate is blessed with one of these rare individuals in the person of their Sergeant at Arms, Joseph C. Duke, of Arizona. Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY calls him the Houdini of Washington because he can produce the almost impossible on short notice.

He is affectionately called "Joe" by all of the U.S. Senators, his friends, and six Presidents dating from Herbert Hoover through President Lyndon B. Johnson. He proudly wears a wrist watch engraved L.B.J., which the President took off his own wrist and presented to Joe in appreciation of their long and pleasant friendship.

Joe's career started in Phoenix where he attended PUHS and was active in the Young Democrats of Arizona. He was extremely bright and was offered a job as teller with the Gila Valley Bank in Globe, this bank was the grandpa of the present Valley National Bank of Arizona). He accepted the job and was doing quite well when he had a better offer from Tom O'Brien of the mine. He accepted this offer and did well.

At this time, in 1930, the depression had hit and everyone was trying to cut expenses, even Joe. A good friend asked him if he would join the volunteer fire department in Miami where he could get his room free by sleeping upstairs over the firehouse. He made his application to join and was accepted. He moved in but spent most of his spare time at the police station next door just visiting and learning the ropes.

One night one of the officers was killed. This left an opening which was offered to Joe. The police job paid $188 per month and he could still live in the fire house.

It was considerably more than he could make at the mine so he accepted the new challenge. He might still be an officer or possibly chief of the Miami Police Department if he hadn't tried to keep peace and order among a bunch of drunk Mexicans. In trying to do his duty, he was shot through the stomach. Dr. Nelson Brayton arrived just in time, and Joe gives the doctor full credit for saving his life.

While convalescing, he wrote his good friend, Senator Henry Ashurst in Washington, making an application for a more peaceful job on the Senator's staff. The Senator had just lost one of his most valued assistants by death and this left the perfect opening for Joe. He arrived in Washington in 1931 and worked as clerk and administrative assistant to Ashurst as long as he was in office.

He then moved over to Senator CARL HAYDEN's office, and later to become the Senate's bill clerk, a job so important that the Republican Senators requested that he stay on the job even through the 80th Congress which was Republican controlled.

Joe decided that he would like to be Sergeant at Arms of the U.S. Senate when the Democrats gained control with Harry Truman in 1949. He started lining up his votes among the Senators, but it was necessary that he be nominated by his own Senators, CARL HAYDEN and Ernest McFarland. CARL didn't want to lose Joe, consented if McFarland would nominate him.

Mac made a slip of the tongue and nominated Joe Doaks. He was elected January 3, 1949, and served until the Republicans took over under Eisenhower. He was out 2 years, but was reelected January 5, 1955, and is still there.

His job gives him control of 14 departments and 900 people. He is the only man in the world who has the power to arrest a President, and this must be done on instructions from the U.S. Senate.

Watch your TV screen, the next time you see the President going in or coming out of a joint session of Congress, the dapper, youngish-looking man with horn-rimmed glasses immediately in front of the President is our Joe who has done so much for Arizona and the country as a whole.

President Johnson Looks Beyond the War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD M. FRASER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's speech on Vietnam last week clearly pointed out the divergent aims of the United States and Communist China in regard to southeast Asia.

President Johnson forcefully stated this country's commitment to peaceful change and economic progress. On the other hand, Communist China has given no indication that it is willing to abandon its policy of aggression in southeast Asia. The President's offer of extensive development aid for Asia stands in marked contrast to China's continuing role of encouraging and supporting insurgency wars in southeast Asia.

A column by Max Freedman, in the Chicago Daily News of April 10, eloquently emphasizes this long-range commitment of the United States. I have unanimous consent to place Mr. Freedman's article in the RECORD:

JOHNSON LOOKS BEYOND THE WAR

(By Max Freedman)

WASHINGTON.—President Johnson, in his address at Johns Hopkins University, has done much more than open up a new and constructive phase to American policy in Vietnam. He also has proclaimed an American commitment to resist Chinese expansion anywhere in southeast Asia.

Until now, for what has appeared to be weighty and sufficient reasons, the administration, from Dwight D. Eisenhower to Mr. Johnson, has steadily identified North Vietnam as the aggressor, as she certainly is and as this administration would never deny. China's appetite for aggression, however, has been given far less emphasis.

This technique died at Johns Hopkins. After weighing all the risks, the President decided to look beyond the war in Vietnam and to concentrate attention on China's threat to southeast Asia.

In this wider context he gave a pledge, an unlimited and unconditional pledge, to resist Chinese military aggression, alone if necessary, and as long as may be necessary.

Any country in southeast Asia attacked by China's power, either directly or through puppets and guerrillas, and willing to fight for its freedom and independence, can be assured that American help will be offered in response to an appeal for assistance.

That is the stark and far-reaching implication of the principles asserted in the President's address. Washington is ranged directly against Peiping in a more blunt and deliberate manner than many of us would have believed possible before Johns Hopkins.

This firm stand has been taken by the administration, after long and careful deliberation, because it has decided that China can be deterred from a continued career of aggression only if she realizes that she must overcome prompt and massive resistance by the United States.

Perhaps this warning will fail. In a situation overflowing with uncertainties, it is

quite possible that China will ignore the warning or will be provoked by it.

But China now stands on less solid ground. Her rulers know that the United States will forbid easy military conquests, and the threatened nations of Asia, no longer defenseless and alone, can have new confidence in resisting the encroachments of communism.

These must be considered two securities for peace, even though they will be brushed aside and will count for nothing if Peking is blind to reason and is covetous of conquest and aggression. Then a time of sorrow and upheaval will truly face mankind.

Meanwhile, beginning with Vietnam, the President has given fresh hope and opportunity to all of southeast Asia.

The rulers of North Vietnam have a clear choice. They can wreck their country in a suicidal contest with American power; and China and Russia will then find it much easier to degrade North Vietnam into a pathetic puppet than to respect its status as an independent country.

That is one choice—ruin, devastation, the loss of effective independence. It is the fate that awaits North Vietnam while she follows the present course.

But President Johnson gave North Vietnam another choice. It is a choice sanctioned by reason, by justice, and by generosity.

North Vietnam cannot only join with other nations in conditions of equality to obtain a fair and honorable and guaranteed settlement, she can also benefit from the economic and social aid that can quicken southeast Asia with progress in many fields now beyond its reach.

The President wants the United States to make an initial contribution of $1 billion to that international program in which the United Nations will exercise an important influence.

While China threatens aggression, this country offers massive help. The contrast will be visibly clear to every government and people in Asia.

Let us note that the President invited Russia, and other industrialized nations, to unite in making the international program a great success.

He was silent about China. That too will be remembered and appreciated by Asia's rulers. For China will be welcomed in this international project when she renounces aggression and abides by the commitments of a good neighbor. Once again that is a choice for Peiping to make.

The President at Johns Hopkins held out before the independent nations of southeast Asia the chance, with international aid, to root out the grievances and injustice that give Communist guerrillas their sinister opportunity.

He also should take the lead now in building a stronger system or regional security to replace the discredited SEATO alliance.

Choosing his time well and his words with wisdom, President Johnson has given North Vietnam a chance to end the war and southeast Asia a chance to enter a new age of hope. It will be a supreme tragedy if the promise of Johns Hopkins is not amply fulfilled.

Verrazano Day 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, on or about April 17, 1524, 441 years ago, an adventurous Florentine navigator sailed his ship into New York Harbor and sent a small boat through the Narrows to explore what we call today Upper New York Bay. The name of the navigator was Giovanni Verrazano.

Long before the voyages of Raleigh, Hudson, and the Pilgrims, Verrazano and his intrepid companions came to the shores of North America, explored these shores, and reported their findings to Europe. For centuries, Americans remained ignorant of this exploit. The name they gave to their continent evoked the voyages of Amerigo Vespucci. They set aside a day to commemorate the discoveries of Christopher Columbus. But neither of these great explorers—who contributed so largely to the renown of Italian navigation—came to the shores of what today is the northeastern coast of the United States. It is to Verrazano that credit belongs for first exploring this coast.

Belatedly, Americans have come to recognize the achievements of Verrazano. In 1909, a statue of Verrazano was unveiled in Battery Park in New York City. In 1964, a suspension bridge across the Narrows of New York Harbor was completed, bearing appropriately the name of Verrazano. It is my hope that one day all our citizens will be acquainted with the exploits of Verrazano, and that his name will be set alongside those of Columbus and Vespucci when the glorious history of Italian navigation is evoked.

With Courage and Reason

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer on Friday morning, April 9, 1965.

The editorial follows:

WITH COURAGE AND REASON

President Johnson's address at Johns Hopkins University—directed to America and the world, to our friends and our enemies—was a masterful presentation of U.S. policy in southeast Asia.

It is a policy that calls for continuing courage in the defense of a far-off land against the aggression of a brutal invader. It is a policy that summons the forces of reason in quest of peace even though the foe is notoriously unreasonable and seemingly committed to the path of war.

The President balanced a strong pledge to defend freedom in South Vietnam with an equally strong promise to seek a fair peace through "unconditional discussions." He capped it all with a billion-dollar offer of economic development aid to southeast Asia that ought to serve as a persuasive inducement to end the war and reap the harvest of peaceful progress.

While there were overtones of idealism in his speech the President also faced the hard truths and the harsh realities—something that many of his critics have been too timid to do.

"We must deal with the world as it is, Mr. Johnson said. "The first reality is that North Vietnam has attacked the independent nation of South Vietnam. Its object is total conquest • • • To abandon this small and brave nation to its enemy—and to the terror that must follow—would be an unforgivable wrong."

It was on this note that Lyndon Johnson rose to the pinnacle. His policy is based on what is right rather than on what is expedient. His firm voice of compassion for the victims of Communist terror in South Vietnam comes as a refreshing breath of hope in a world where many people and many countries are all too willing to pass by on the other side and leave the oppressed and the tormented to their horrible fate.

President Johnson emphasized that "we will not withdraw, either openly or under the cloak of a meaningless agreement."

This was a well-deserved rebuke of those who clamor for negotiations on any terms. What they really are seeking is a way to surrender.

If Hanoi is ready to talk peace, it has an open invitation. America's terms, as stipulated by Mr. Johnson are eminently fair and clear: "An independent South Vietnam, securely guaranteed and able to shape its own relationships to all others."

Whether the Communists will consider these terms acceptable is another matter. It takes two to negotiate.

Senator Dodd's Leadership

SPEECH
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 10, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2) to protect the public health and safety by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to establish special controls for depressant and stimulant drugs, and for other purposes.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I am a strong supporter of the pending drug bill, H.R. 2, and am very anxious to compliment and congratulate the distinguished committee for its fine work in bringing this very desirable, constructive legislation to the floor of the House for appropriate action.

I am also very anxious to compliment and congratulate the very distinguished Senator from Connecticut, our former great and esteemed colleague, the Honorable THOMAS J. DODD, for his tremendous contributions in so ably developing and pressing for this necessary, vital legislation.

Many of us here know of the long-sustained interest and effective work of Senator DODD in this field, and those of us who know him well and served with him here in this great body well understand his very high purpose and the dynamic impact of his great ability, patriotism, and spirit of dedication upon many of the great issues confronting the Congress.

The country and his great State, and its wonderful people, are fortunate indeed to have such a wise, inspired, sagacious leader representing them in the other body, and I believe that this drug bill, which is to a great extent the product

of TOM DODD's deep concern, will do much to alleviate some of the shocking conditions currently extant in the Nation, raising speculation and doubt regarding the future health, strength, stability, and soundness of some of our youth and our people.

I am very proud that I serve in this great Congress with a brilliant, far-sighted, courageous leader like Senator TOM DODD, and that I can call him my dear, admired friend.

School Bill Big Great Society Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, now that the education bill has become the working law of the land, it is gratifying to know how greatly our Nation will be altered in the years to come because of its enactment.

Those of us who worked for final passage of the bill can take particular pride in having preserved its main strength—direct aid to students.

The future of America is limited only by the economic and mental future of her citizens. Tomorrow's problems will not be solved by reliance on old formulas, old theories, old conceptions of poverty, deprivation and limited abilities. Americans today must do more than take their place among the people of the world who have learned the rudiments of reading and writing.

President Johnson sees 190 million Americans as individuals, with individual capacities for growth. He has stressed the need for far-reaching programs to help those individuals who, through lack of education and training, cannot help themselves. The President's devotion to this concept of the worth of every individual reinforces our ability to see that each of us participates directly in the wealth and progress of our country.

The enormous wealth of achievement which will be realized as a direct result of this historic education bill can be felt in classrooms and communities all over America.

The President has called on us to lend our skills to insuring the freedom of opportunity to every man, woman and child in the 50 States. Now, in fact and in our lifetime, we can provide direct assistance to those millions less fortunate to develop their abilities for the enrichment of all. The wonder is why we waited so long to turn our attention to this great cause.

Following is an article written by Mr. James McCartney, which appeared in the Chicago Daily News recently about the education bill and the hope it has stirred in communities across the length and breadth of the land. I bring it to the attention of my colleagues today so that they may share its reaction of approval and applause for a job well done.

Mr. Speaker, the article follows:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Daily News, Apr. 10, 1965]

SCHOOL BILL BIG GREAT SOCIETY VICTORY

(By James McCartney)

WASHINGTON.—We're off on the road to that Great Society.

Suddenly, in two smashing and unprecedented victories, President Johnson has taken giant strides toward achievement of his major legislative goals.

Friday night his education bill—after nearly 20 years of frustrating and often angry debate on similar measures—went rocketing through the Senate. The vote was 72 to 18.

It was only Thursday that the President's health-care-for-the-aged bill passed over its steepest hurdle, in the House, by the eye-popping vote of 313 to 115.

That, too, was an impressive achievement.

The education bill now requires only a Presidential signature to become a reality.

The health care bill, which is just about as revolutionary, is not expected to encounter serious trouble in the Senate.

The President was so confident concerning the prospects for the education bill that he left town before the final vote.

He did not think it was necessary to stay handy to the telephone to apply his velvety technique at persuasion in case it should be close.

The President has done more than simply show that he can accomplish legislative feats that previously have seemed impossible.

He goes one better than that.

He makes it look easy.

Republicans aren't quite sure how to react.

They seem, at times, simply stunned.

It can't be said that the President is totally responsible for the success of the education bill.

Surely, it is his bill, but there is no evidence that it was Lyndon Johnson who came up with the brilliant concept—at least from the legislative point of view—that made it possible to pass the bill in Congress.

This is the concept, essentially, that the major part of the money in the bill—$1 billion—should go to help children of the poor, regardless of whether they attend public or private schools.

In terms of historic perspective, the passage of the bill is simply a marvel.

The first serious effort to pass a general education bill after World War II was made in 1948. By 1950 the discussion degenerated into a bitter and acrimonious fight over church-state relationships.

Over the years bills foundered in every imaginable way. They were tied up in committees, boxed in by powerful congressional committee chairmen, sometimes passed in one House of Congress and stopped in the other.

But once the magic concept came from the White House this year, on January 12, the atmosphere was different.

A successful solution had been found to the church-state controversy. Groups which had bitterly opposed one another in previous hearings were suddenly nodding and smiling.

Even Republicans who are famous for their conservatism found themselves unable to stand in the way of the bill's passage. Some finally helped boost it along its way. Others voted for its passage.

The story behind the passage of the health care bill is nearly as dramatic, although it tends to be more the story of a single man.

That man is Representative WILBUR MILLS, Democrat, of Arkansas, chairman of the powerful House Ways and Means Committee.

For years he stood as an opponent of health care for the aged under social security.

Whether it was President Johnson's seemingly limitless powers of persuasion, or a slow process of educational conversation that changed his views this year, the public at present does not know.

He modified his views to the extent that he became willing to accept a social security-style system of prepayment. Then he hurried hearings through his committee.

A final touch in the legislation was to add a package of voluntary provisions which the aged may sign up for if they wish.

The final package includes, essentially, a hospital care plan under a social security style system of prepayment, plus a voluntary health insurance system to cover doctor bills.

Report to Kansas on H.R. 6675

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE SKUBITZ
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD my report to the people of Kansas on H.R. 6675:

REPORT TO KANSAS

The House of Representatives, on April 8, passed the administration's hospital and medical services bill. Although President Johnson has recommended that Congress enact a limited hospital care program—the Ways and Means Committee, apparently with the President's blessing came forth with one of the most far-reaching medicare programs ever to reach the floor of the House.

Let's not kid ourselves. When this bill becomes law, the soundness of the social security pension program will be in real jeopardy.

It has always been my feeling that we have a responsibility to provide hospital and medical care for all our people, young, and old, who are in need of such assistance. We have a responsibility to assist our senior citizens who are able to care for their ordinary expenses of living, but who live in constant fear of a major illness, which might wipe out their savings, and force them to become public charges—and such assistance should be given without embarrassment or humiliation to those who need help.

Hence, the real issue before the Congress during the debate on H.R. 6675, insofar as I was concerned, was not whether we should provide assistance but how we should provide assistance.

The administration bill was brought to the floor under a closed rule which permitted 10 hours of discussion but denied to House Members the right to offer amendments, to remove objectional provisos, clarify ambiguities or improve it. Hence, a Member was required to vote "yes" or "no" on the whole package. With a single exception, the minority was permitted to offer one amendment in the form of a motion to recommit. Under these circumstances, the minority offered the Byrnes bill as an alternative proposal.

The administration program and the Byrnes alternative both included the provisions of H.R. 11865 which passed the House last year (and I supported it) providing for (a) an increase in social security benefits, (b) lowered the retirement age to 60 years for widows, (c) provided social security benefits for those over 72 years of age, and (d) continued benefits to dependent children up to 22 years of age if in school. Both bills provided for a voluntary insurance program for medical (physicians) care. Both bills provided for hospital care. In fact, the Byrnes

proposal was far more liberal since it provided for catastrophic illnesses and medicinals—these were not included in the administration's bill H.R. 6675.

The major difference in the two programs, was not so much in the benefits provided, but in the method of financing. The administration bill provided that hospital care for those over 65 should be paid through an additional payroll tax attached to social security by those who now pay social security but who would not be entitled to any benefits until they reach 65. The Byrnes proposal which I supported provided that those over 65 should pay one-third of the hospital and medical care insurance premium (average $6.50 per month) and the Government would pay two-thirds of the cost out of the general fund of the Treasury. It was the same program provided by the Government today for Members of Congress and Federal employees.

It was agreed by some that if we could give aid to the nations all over the world, if we could pay benefits to labor, industry, and agriculture, if we could assist Federal employees, then we could subsidize the medical needs of the aged to meet their medical costs. The question has also been raised why should a worker with two dependents and earning $3,600 per year be required to pay an income tax of $214 and also hospitalization costs for a person on retirement who has an income of $3,600, pays no income tax and contributes nothing toward the hospital care program.

I supported the Byrnes proposal. I could not in good conscience support the administration proposal which in my opinion undermines the whole social security structure and places unnecessary additional burden on those who now pay social security.

WHAT'S WRONG WITH HOSPITAL CARE UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY?

Most of us have always considered social security as a program under which we would receive a pension at age 65—which combined with our life savings—would make it possible for us to maintain a decent standard of living during our years of retirement. When the program was first enacted in 1937, it held out much promise. But since then what has happened to social security?

Through the years we have so expanded and enlarged upon the original intent that, like Government bonds, it is rapidly losing its attractiveness. We now have on the books commitments to pay out approximately $625 billion to those on retirement or covered by social security. We have in assets around $305 billion. If all payments into the fund were to stop—we would be $300 billion short to meet present commitments.

Instead of building up reserves, as private pension programs do, we have actually been paying out approximately as much as we have been taking in. We have continued not only to increase the social security rate, but also the earnings base upon which the tax is paid. In 1954, when disability payments were added, we were told OASI trust funds would climb to $28.5 billion by 1965—actually the fund is now estimated at around $19 billion, $7.5 billion short. And now we are enlarging the program by adding hospital care, increasing cash benefits and reducing the age requirements for widows.

Have pension payments kept pace with the increased social security payments made by the worker? The answer is "No." In 1939, an employee who earned $550 per month paid $30 per year into the Social Security fund. He could look forward to receiving $58 per month on retirement. Today an employee earning the same amount pays $174 into the social security fund and his maximum social security benefit is $127 per month. By 1973, an employee earning $550 per month will pay $353 annually into the social security fund, and he will receive a maximum pension check of $168. In other words while the cost has gone up 480 percent—the workers retirement check has increased only 119 percent.

What is there about social security that is attractive to the young man who is about to enter the labor force for the first time? One must remember that these are the workers upon whom we must depend to pay into the fund so that those over 65 may secure these benefits. A young man, 21 years of age, entering the labor force next year and paying the full amount of social security until 65, could have deposited the same amount in a building and loan at 4½ percent, and he would accumulate by retirement time an estimate of $42,000. If we add the employer's share, it would be $84,000. His retirement checks under social security would total $2,004 per anum. If he invested $42,000 at 5 percent, he would earn $2,100 annually and still leave an estate of $42,000 at his death.

Can we keep expanding the social security program by adding hospital care, medical care, increasing benefits to those over 65, and charge it to social security? Yes, if those who pay into the fund are willing to stand for an increase in the payroll tax and the earning base upon which the tax is paid. It should be remembered, however, that the social security tax by 1971 will be as burdensome as the income tax. For example, take a man earning $5,000 per year with a wife and two dependents—in 1971 his income tax will be approximately $290 and his social security tax will be $260. These, of course, will be increased when demands are made that Congress grant further increases in social security benefits to meet living costs, and as hospital and medical services increase in cost.

A hospital care program for those over 65 financed by a payroll tax attached to social security not only does serious damage to the social security pension program, but it also inflicts the most unfair tax in our whole taxing system. The president of the corporation pays on the same basis as the plant janitor.

In closing may I repeat what I said in the beginning—I believe in providing hospital care and medical care for those who are in need. I want to help those who can care for themselves, but live in constant dread that one serious illness will place them on relief. But I want to do it without wrecking the social security pension system for those who are between the age of 21 and 65 and are required to foot the bill. I do not want to kill the goose that lays the golden egg. That is why I favored the financing provided by the Byrnes alternative and opposed the administration bill.

Pan American Day

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN BUCHANAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with other Members in expressing appreciation for the fine leadership of my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SELDEN], as chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs of the Foreign Affairs Committee. His fine work has been a credit to our State and to our country. Americans of every political persuasion owe him a debt of gratitude for his outstanding contribution in this area of foreign affairs.

James A. Farley: Truly a Pro's Pro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank Conniff which appeared in the New York Journal-American on April 5, 1965:

JAMES A. FARLEY: TRULY A PRO'S PRO
(By Frank Conniff)

One of the nicer tints brightening the political spectrum during recent years is the universal admiration and affection exhibited toward James A. Farley, a pro's pro who has been to the wars without losing his integrity or his self-respect.

Although he scrupulously shuns donning the toga of an elder statesman, audiences, especially those of a Democratic Party tinge, seem intent on communicating their vast esteem for him at every opportunity. He is still much too vigorous to hold still for the wise man role, but people seem dedicated to placing him in a niche removed from the less seemly facets of public life.

Largely by coincidence, this writer has many times this winter been at affairs where the introduction of Jim Farley brought a heartfelt and spontaneous response. The standing ovation bit is the most overdone feature of the banquet circuit these nights—a claque of about three stands up and the rest of the room is ashamed not to follow suit—but in the case of Big Jim the roaring tribute strikes one as emanating from a deep desire to convey the audience's high regard for the man.

There is something heartening about all this: a feeling of events coming full circle to honor the man for his many contributions devoid of the sniping that marred the unhappy years. Deep down, we suspect Jim Farley believes he has never been given proper credit for the role he played in helping enact President Roosevelt's New Deal into law.

Not too many years ago, critics dismissed him as a "conservative." This was in the days when one's attitude toward Soviet communism determined your classification as a "liberal" or a "conservative."

Those who viewed communism tolerantly and believed the United States could accommodate itself to all things Russian automatically were designated as "liberals." Others who, like Jim Farley, looked at Soviet Russia with suspicion, were branded "conservatives," although their support of liberal welfare measures had been a long standing commitment.

But that's raking over a long-gone ideological dispute which Josef Stalin settled by his unabashed aggressions following World War II. We would do well to bear the old feud in mind, however, in the current Vietnam controversy. Those who believe the United States has committed its honor to the defense of South Vietnam are not necessarily trigger-happy reactionaries; nor are those who call for instant negotiations automatically appeasers of aggressive communism.

We are not trying to adjust a halo on Big Jim's shiny pate, because he operated according to the rules of political warfare, which can be pretty rugged at times. What he has proven is that you can survive in this rough game and still abide by the canons of decency, respect for opponents and trust. He managed to do it, and it's a shame not

enough of the new breed have pondered his example.

Now he has come into the years of full recognition and his story reads very pleasantly over the long haul. Prestige-wise, we would say he is ranked only by President Johnson and Harry S. Truman in the Democratic Party. Vice President HUMPHREY, Senator BOB KENNEDY, and Franklin D. Roosevelt, Jr., to mention of a few of the later generation, have years to go before the accumulate the record of public service, adherence to ideals and party loyalty built up by Jim for more than 40 years.

As we say, it's one of the nicer things we've seen recently, the spontaneous salute of admiration and affection showered on James A. Farley whenever people get the chance to demonstrate how they feel about him.

Conference at Soviet Embassy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. I. E. "Pappy" Schechter, publisher and editor of the Park Forest Reporter, Park Forest, Ill., attended the National Editors Association Conference held in Washington. As part of the program, he and his fellow newsmen had an opportunity for a press conference at the Soviet Embassy.

It isn't very often that Communist diplomats expose themselves to proper scrutiny by the U.S. press. Mr. Schechter's report of the interview is so fascinating that I felt it deserved widespread review.

I place it in the RECORD at this point:

"Nyet" may be the most popular Russian word in the American lexicon, yet in all candor we must admit that during our 1-hour news conference at the Soviet Embassy in Washington recently, Red diplomats were affirmative, skillful at responses, suave in their mannerisms. One couldn't help coming away with a feeling that the confidence they exuded regarding political and economic matters was based on their true feelings, not on a false sense of security.

The event was a first in Russo-American relations. The 130 newsmen who attended the 4th annual National Editorial Association Government Relations Workshop were the first news group of this size to be invited to the Soviet Embassy to query their diplomats.

In the absence of Ambassador Dobrynin, his chief aide, Consul Alexander Zimchuk, undertook to answer all queries. His comments were firm and even though we sensed the uselessness of pursuing inquiry, he could hardly be classed as equivocal. Obviously, he must have answered similar queries before.

Here are some random questions and answers:

Question. Why is your government insisting that the United States get out of South Vietnam?

Answer. You are violating the treaty of 1955, when Indochina was partitioned. At that time a free election was promised in the nation. Only a dictatorship has existed since then. The United States has no right to arm South Vietnam and send its troops.

Question. Didn't you do the same thing in Cuba?

Answer. No. There was no civil war in Cuba. We sent missiles to Cuba at the request of Chairman Castro. We also removed them and our men when it looked like they could cause an all-out war. We are basically a peaceful nation.

Question. There are signs that Russia is going capitalist. Can you explain your latest efforts to increase production by employing standards long used in this (capitalist) nation?

Answer. The Soviet Union will never go capitalist. We have embarked on an incentive program. This is not a profit motive, just a means to increase our production. It may interest you to know that our gross national product has increased 8 to 10 percent while the United States can boast of only 4 or 5 percent.

Question. Can you explain the split between your country and Red China?

Answer. Our differences with the Republic of China are purely ideological. (He never used the word "Red" in describing a Communist nation; acting bullish, perhaps?) We are not nearly as estranged as you are led to believe. Furthermore, it's obvious that your government and some of its western partners don't see eye to eye on many matters either.

Question from this correspondent. What about the controlled press in your country? Is there anything like the type of newspapers we represent—suburban weeklies, semiweeklies and small town dailies, who reflect the attitudes of America's grass roots? We can and frequently do criticize our governments and officials and show our editorial independence to a remarkable degree.

Answer (Comrade Zimchuk bristled a little. A slight tic on the left side of his face began a more rapid action). Our press is not controlled. Yes, we have papers like yours in our communities. But they carry mostly social news—something like a company house organ. Our major papers are national ones. Remember, we do not have private ownership of the press.

Question. Can your community papers criticize?

Answer. Yes, if there's a grievance toward a factory superintendent, for example, a letter to the editor will be accepted to be printed.

Question. What was behind the ouster of Khrushchev.

Answer. Chairman Khrushchev sent his resignation to the Presidium, the same body which elected him to his high office. (Before this response could draw a followup query, the Counsul recognized another outstretched hand.)

Question. Do you expect that Russo-U.S. tensions will ever cease?

Answer. Yes, but it's hard to predict when. At the present time we are negotiating the opening of legations in major cities of your country. This may help you to understand us better.

Question (this one on the lighter side). Do you have anyone in Russia who compares with James Bond?

Consul Zimchuk didn't appear to understand the question. He exchanged a few words in Russian with an aide and then asked to have the query repeated.

His answer, We're somewhat old fashioned in Russia, we still believe in Sherlock Holmes, brought down the house.

The camaraderie was spreading. It was easy to see that the Russians could parry with the best of them.

Question. If I went to Russia, my travel would be restricted, why?

Answer. I don't know why, my own travel here is plenty restricted.

Question. How did you react to the U.S. orbit conquest of Grissom and Young?

Answer. It was a great achievement.

Question. Did you celebrate it in the embassy?

Answer. No, we didn't even celebrate our own triumph in space a week earlier.

The hour went by rapidly. Most of us concluded that these diplomats could not be embarrassed. Their answers slick, yet positive, didn't create fury—only sound. It was the kind of afternoon we would enjoy repeating. Even though the answers weren't satisfying, the intellectual vying is good mental therapy.

Settlement in Vietnam?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK E. EVANS
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, One of the major concerns of our country today is our position and attitude regarding the conflict in Vietnam. I am therefore pleased to insert an editorial from the Denver Post of April 8 on the President's position:

PRESIDENT EXPANDS CHANCES FOR PEACE

President Johnson took the firm, positive course in his address to the Nation on American policy in southeast Asia. It was clearer than any previous statement on that difficult and frustrating subject, and it held more hope for decent, peaceful settlement in South Vietnam.

The speech was obviously the product of thorough analysis and painstaking preparation. It was not merely the response of a sensitive political leader angry at his critics, as some had suggested it might be, but rather a responsible, detailed policy statement, framed for world consumption.

There was in it something for all interested parties. There was, of course, repetition of the administration's determination to continue in strong support of South Vietnam. Military attacks against the North Vietnamese will continue for now, he said, "because they are a necessary part of the surest road to peace."

The enemy and his allies, as well as those at home who feared this determination might falter at a critical juncture, will mark this statement well.

But while saying that the United States would not grow tired and withdraw "under the cloak of a meaningless agreement," the President announced his willingness to enter "unconditional discussions" on a Vietnam settlement.

If this was not a radical departure from previous statements in which he has said that the government in Hanoi would have to indicate readiness to cease aggression against its neighbors before we would talk about negotiations, at least it was a far more direct expression of our willingness to seek peace.

The President for the first time appeared to be going at least half way in the quest for peaceful settlement in Vietnam. His statement was a major effort to gain the diplomatic initiative in southeast Asia. At the same time, it was clear that the other half of the distance would have to be covered by Hanoi, or Peiping or Moscow, or by all of them together.

But the willing hand he extended to friend and foe on the subject of peace also held the promise of dramatic and massive American aid.

He called for a large-scale cooperative effort "to improve the life of man" in conflict torn southeast Asia while pledging a

$1 billion assistance program. And, significantly, he invited North Vietnam to "take its place in the common effort just as soon as peaceful cooperation is possible."

He is soon going ahead to name a special team to inaugurate U.S. participation in economic aid programs in southeast Asia—without waiting for response from Hanoi.

This is in the Johnson pattern: expand the Great Society, as it were, into the most trouble-stricken area of the world, and ask the enemy to help you.

It could, in the long run, work.

Meanwhile, the speech from the campus in Baltimore answered the President's doubters and his critics about where the nation stands on the issue of South Vietnam. At the same time it pledged American aid on an unprecedented scale while expanding on American willingness "to bring about the bright and necessary day of peace."

Johnson's "Idea War" Weapon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL D. ROSTENKOWSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Friday, April 9 issue of the Chicago Sun-Times:

JOHNSON'S "IDEA WAR" WEAPON

President Johnson has cut through the confusion of the Vietnamese war and made a point that must be made clear to every Communist in southeast Asia, whether he be a guerrilla in the rain forest or a high official in Hanoi. Continued warfare is futile and senseless. Peace will bring a better life for all. The choice is up to the Communists. If they choose continued warfare, the United States has a total commitment—"we will not be defeated" Mr. Johnson says.

The United States will stay in South Vietnam and continue to slug it out with the Communists, if that's the way they want it. But the United States also is willing to engage in "unconditional discussions" to stop the bloodshed and to help all of southeast Asia to a better life.

The billion dollars the President says the United States is willing to put into the backward area for economic development was quickly termed a carrot—part of the classic carrot and stick approach. It also has been labeled a bribe or an attempt to buy friends with dollars, to get out of a sticky mess in South Vietnam.

This is a superficial viewpoint. It ignores fundamentals. Marshall plan aid could have been described as a bribe, too. So can all forms of foreign aid. But they also are acknowledgments that it takes more than firepower to fight the Communists.

The battle against communism is also a fight against an idea. Ideas cannot be fought with guns. They must be fought with other ideas. Americans win this part of the battle when they convince the people in underdeveloped countries that capitalism and the democratic way can do more for them than communism.

President Johnson once again has put in perspective both types of warfare against the Communists.

Communism promises the people a better material life. But they would lose the right to govern themselves.

The United States and other free nations stand ready to help poorer nations build a better life and enjoy the fruits of modern science and invention. They would retain their political independence.

Mr. Johnson has reminded the people of North Vietnam as well as South Vietnam that they have an alternative to war that would mean more than the end of bloodshed—it would mean a better life, better than ever before.

In offering unconditional discussions, the President lets it be known that discussions can begin even while the fighting goes on. The United States will not accept the Communist condition that the United States withdraw troops from Vietnam before any talks begin. On Wednesday, before Mr. Johnson talked, Soviet President Anastas I. Mikoyan repeated that the first step toward peace was withdrawal of U.S. troops. It may be significant that yesterday he did not mention this in discussing Vietnam.

Perhaps Mr. Johnson might have made the "unconditional discussion" speech a few weeks ago and if the Reds had agreed to talk, have saved many lives. But a few weeks ago, the United States would have made the offer from a position of military weakness. Today, with the North Vietnamese taking punishment from the air and the battles in South Vietnam going against them, the United States makes its offer from a posture of strength and has given convincing proof that it "will not be defeated."

The Soviet Union still prates about the "aggression" of "American imperialism" against North Vietnam. But no reasonable person anywhere could read Mr. Johnson's speech and conclude that America wants to dominate the people of southeast Asia. It wants to help them govern themselves.

Secretary General U Thant, of the United Nations saw President Johnson's position as a favorable response to the recent appeal of 17 nonalined countries to bring about a political settlement of the Vietnam war. It was "positive, forward looking, and generous." This seems to be the attitude of most non-Communist countries.

Mr. Johnson has challenged not only the Communists but the Communist system to show whether they are sincere in their protestations that they stand for peace and for a better life for the common man. The world awaits their answer.

The Pittsburgh Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to another chapter in the story of "Pittsburgh Research: Key to Tomorrow," published by the Regional Industrial Development Corp. of southwestern Pennsylvania. This chapter is entitled "The Pittsburgh Story," and I include it as part of my remarks:

THE PITTSBURGH STORY

The Pittsburgh area has much to offer—in scientific and technical talents, laboratory facilities, and research and development effectiveness.

The contents of this brochure are convincing evidence of the high level of scientific and technological activities in the nine-county area. They also point out the numerous opportunities for interaction among industrial, governmental, and institutional organizations in the region.

The Pittsburgh area has achieved an R. & D. balance in scientific disciplines, industrial fields, laboratory sizes, source of support, and nature of research. It has the professional manpower, specialized equipment, and supporting services necessary for creative investigation and enterprise.

Always strong in the materials field, it also has become the center for nuclear power research—and is making significant contributions in a variety of other fields—chemicals, machinery, electronics, medicine, and instruments.

Most of the research is of an applied or developmental nature, but a surprisingly large amount of basic research is underway. Unlike many other parts of the Nation, an unusually high percentage is funded by industry, rather than Government, thereby providing greater economical stability.

The R. & D. activities range from small one- and two-man operations to some of the largest research laboratories in the Nation. The Pittsburgh story, however, is more than generalities.

Getting to Work and Back

SPEECH
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I recommend for the attention of the House the third article in Consumer Reports' informative and thorough series on the cost and convenience of metropolitan transportation, "Getting to Work and Back." Since many of our major urban centers are facing key decisions on mass transportation, I know my colleagues will be interested. The article follows:

GETTING TO WORK AND BACK

(By Ruth and Edward Brecher)

Before a new expressway or transit route can be built, it must be planned. Most of the planning has been done by highway engineers employed in State highway departments. The plans have been designed to get people from place to place in their own automobiles—with relatively little concern for the areas through which the roads run or for other means of transportation. Since most of the money for new urban expressways has come from Washington, and most of the planning from the State capitols, local communities have had relatively little voice in their own transportation futures.

But a change is underway. The 1962 amendment to the Federal-Aid Highway Act declares that, beginning in July 1965, plans for new urban expressways shall be drawn up with "due consideration" of their probable effect on the cities through which they run, and shall be "properly coordinated with plans for improvements in other affected forms of transportation."

There are teeth in this amendment, moreover. For the bulk of the money for new urban expressways—90 percent in the case of Interstate System routes—is allocated by the Secretary of Commerce; and, beginning in July, the Secretary is forbidden to give approval to new urban freeway routes "unless he finds that such projects are based on a continuing comprehensive transportation planning process carried on cooperatively by the States and local communities."

In other words, no more freeway funds will be coming from Washington after July unless an areawide planning study is underway. Federal funds to assist in comprehen-

sive regional planning are available through the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

The new planning studies are being sponsored by the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads, and the BPR has established a laudable framework for them. The Bureau is insisting, for example, that planners give full consideration to all transportation facilities, "including those for mass transportation," instead of just to new highways; the factors analyzed are to include "zoning ordinances, subdivision regulations, building codes, etc."; and area planners are instructed to consider "social and community-value factors, such as preservation of open space, parks and recreational facilities; preservation of historical sites and buildings; environmental amenities; and aesthetics."

The boundaries of the new planning areas are based on Census Bureau maps; in general, each city or cluster of cities with its suburbs is considered a single area. Each local government within the area is expected to participate in the planning process. "The State highway department," the BPR states, "will be expected to show by suitable evidence that scrupulous efforts have been made to carry out the intent of the act with respect to cooperative action by all political subdivisions. If there is an unwillingness on the part of a local political unit within the entire urban area to participate in the transportation planning process in such area, a determination shall be made as to whether the percentage of the urban area affected is such as to negate an effective planning process for the whole area"—and thus warrant curtailment or withholding of Federal highway funds.

An exciting feature of both the BPR and HHFA approaches is that Washington is not dictating solutions to local problems, but rather insisting that local machinery be established to solve them.

WHERE THE CITIZENS GROUPS COME IN

The mere establishment of these new transportation planning studies, of course, is no guarantee that urban transportation problems will be more effectively solved in the future than in the past. As CU noted in February, the new planning projects could prove to be mere facades, behind which the same old highway engineers will continue to make the same old highway-oriented decisions from a regional planning office. Here is where a vigilant citizens group comes in. It can start by asking questions.

Is your community, for example, properly represented on the body that is preparing a comprehensive plan for your urban area? Is your spokesman an impartial representative concerned primarily with the community—or is he a highway contractor, a gasoline company executive, or someone else with a personal ax to grind? If your local government office can't answer these questions, you can get the name and address of the body making the transportation study for your urban area from the State highway department; and you can then check with the planning agency itself to learn whether your community has an authorized spokesman. If it doesn't, urge your local officials to establish effective liaison with the agency at once.

Next a citizens group should ask the local representative to explain how the planning agency is going about its task. Planning a sound transportation network for a metropolitan area is so complex a job that planners necessarily make use of electronic computers to aid them in their work. What counts is how they are used—what questions are asked and what data is given the machine to use in arriving at its answers.

The first primitive attempts to use computers in transportation planning were woefully inadequate. The planners divided an urban area arbitrarily into 10-block or 20-block zones and determined by a survey what trips were being made by the residents of each zone. These trip data were fed into the computer along with population predictions, automobile ownership trends, land-use trends, travel time figures, and other such statistics. The computer then produced a set of desire lines showing how many people would want to drive from A through B to C a decade or two hence, and multilane expressways were bulldozed through to carry the anticipated traffic. Local protests were ignored, on the theory that the computer knows best. This approach may still survive in a few local projects.

A much better approach, however, is now in common use. The computer no longer dictates an expressway plan; instead it is fed alternative plans, and their cost and adequacy are compared. Thus, planners, elected officials, and local voters can make the final choice on the basis of the helpful findings emerging from the computer.

Despite this improvement, there remain many pitfalls. One results from the fact that computer estimates of future traffic are generally based on recent trends toward an automobile-dominated society. Thus the worst features of our past decade of urban chaos are projected into the future on an inflated scale.

Moreover, many of the planners in control of the urban planning projects were trained in automobile-oriented university engineering schools; and many are former employees of highway planning departments. Thus the alternatives with which they are most familiar are expressway alternatives. They are less likely to program for the computer a thoroughly detailed evaluation of a modern, highspeed rapid-transit system like the San Francisco BART system, described in the February Reports (with its 80-mile-an-hour top speeds, scheduled speeds of 50 miles an hour including stops, abundant and convenient peripheral parking, average platform waits of only a minute or two at rush hour, comfortable seats, low noise levels, air conditioning, and other amenities).

Finally, the computer is generally asked about getting travelers from neighborhood A through neighborhood B to neighborhood C. The rights, wants, and needs of the residents of neighborhood B are seldom consulted in advance, much less reduced to a form that the computer can assimilate. But this lack can be remedied. And citizens groups can provide the drive if it is not initiated by the regional planning office. How they can participate is very well illustrated by what is now going on in the Boston area.

HOW BOSTON IS DOING IT

Under the Boston Regional Planning Project (BRPP), a thorough transportation planning study is currently underway in the Boston area, comprising the city itself and scores of its suburbs. This study is supported by the Massachusetts Department of Public Works and Department of Commerce & Development. Its director is a community-minded regional planner, Donald M. Grama. And its incomparable virtue is that Graham. And its incomparable virtue is that community representatives before rather than after the computers are put to work. Researchers for this series of reports attended a meeting called by BRPP, one of a series of 10 for representatives of 6 suburbs 30 miles northwest of Boston. The meetings were held in the evening so that ordinary citizens could participate. Graham himself presided.

The communities represented learn from one another at these meetings. "My town isn't interested in better rail service to Boston," one representative may remark. "Our commuters own at least two cars and drive one in."

A representative from a neighboring town disagrees. "How do you know your commuters wouldn't be delighted to sell their second car and take the train if more comfortable, convenient, and speedy service were available?"

"My town's a mess every morning and evening when the trains come in," someone remarks. "The cars around the station tie our downtown district up in a knot until it looks like Boston."

"My town, too. Why not tear down both miserable old stations and build a new one in the country halfway between?"

"Good idea. Then we would have enough room to park near the station instead of five blocks away."

Out of such local exchanges, new ideas—and new projects—are born. BRPP is holding a similar series of meetings in each of its 18 districts. Later these expressions of local concern and need can be included among the data fed into the BRPP computers.

The meetings work in the other direction, too. The BRPP men bring news of projects that may affect local interests. A new freeway is being planned around Boston, for example—even further out than the famous Route 128, once touted as the solution to the area's traffic snafus but now itself congested. Where should the interchanges along the new beltway be located? One suburb may welcome an interchange because of the boom in land values it will generate; another may be horrified by the destruction to a settled community the interchange will bring. If neither knows of the plans, neither can speak up while there is still time.

Some traditional planners are appalled by Graham's cards-on-the-table approach. They warn that if plans become known in advance, land speculators will reap windfall profits; and they predict that if so much time is allowed for opposition to mobilize, nothing will ever get built. Graham disagrees. Windfall profits are only possible, he point out, when knowledge of plans is limited to a few insiders who can then prey upon the ignorance of their neighbors. And he predicts that if the BRPP plan is devised from the start with adequate consideration for community needs and wants, support rather than opposition will be engendered through most of the area.

"The way to recognize a sound urban-area planning program," Graham told CU, "is by its approach to your own community. Do the planners come in with a completed plan and try to sell you on its merits? Or do they come in with an open ear to learn in advance your community's needs and wants—and then try, with the help of their computers, to reconcile your needs and wants with those of the rest of the area?"

Where official planning projects fail to do their work well, a citizens group with sufficient determination—and the necessary talent—can do a great deal of investigating and publicizing on its own. A CU subscriber Ernest Ratterman, has reported one unusually comprehensive effort of a few years ago in Cincinnati.

Concerned with the traffic jams and commuter delays that were plaguing the city of Cincinnati back in 1957, Ratterman and a handful of his friends—most of them professional engineers like himself—asked why a high-speed rapid transit system could not be built with a modest investment to operate along an existing, little-used railroad right-of-way into the city. As a contribution to the city's progress, this citizens group, headed by Alvin L. Spivak, submitted a study of the possibility, including "data on costs for rights-of-way, electrification, new trackage, purchase price of rolling stock, operating costs, and income." Then, they organized themselves as the "Rapid Transit Study Committee" and published their full report. "We dug deeply into Cincinnati's transportation picture both past and present," Ratterman recalls. "As engineers we were able to present well-thought-out plans and ideas to generate interest in our goals. * * * At no

time during our many presentations did we encounter any dispute about our facts or questioning of our conclusions about Cincinnati's transit needs. Ordinary citizens * * * showed their eagerness for something new and better in urban transportation. What they lacked, however, was a strong, coherent leadership which could achieve action on their wants."

Inevitably, the Cincinnati committee came into conflict with the local highway lobby. One issue that evoked the clash was a controversial plan to build a four-level underground parking garage in the downtown district.

"Building such an enormously expensive facility struck us as foolish," Ratterman writes, "unless it could be planned to accommodate mass transit facilities at some future date. We made proposals to the city council on this subject and even developed plans for using the first deck of this garage as a central point of a modern downtown subway system integrated with surface lines to the suburbs. We studied the downtown parking facilities and their location, cost, utilization, rate structure, and financing. These studies cast grave doubt on the feasibility of the proposed new structure.

"But we soon learned that politics rather than facts would decide the parking-garage issue. Our proposals and recommendations were graciously received by the city government—and blissfully ignored.

"We were handicapped rather seriously * * * by being unable to garner the support of some business and professional groups. Individuals in these groups privately lauded our work and expressed envy of our freedom of expression; but the groups themselves were dominated by many conscious and some unknowing supporters and members of the highway lobby. * * * The expressway and parking plans which the city had developed, and the ease with which Federal funds could be secured to finance the expressways, blocked serious consideration of more effective approaches to the city's transport problems. One city councilman told us candidly that, until the Government passes out transit money as it passes out expressway money, there would be no rapid transit in Cincinnati."

The Cincinnati committee broke up in 1961 when Spivak, Ratterman, and several other key members moved to other cities. Cincinnati still lacks a rapid transit system. But Ratterman does not regret the effort expended on the project. "I am sure other members would agree," he writes, "that it was a great personal experience."

Such a committee if launched today, it should be added, would have working in its favor many factors that the Cincinnati committee lacked from 1957 to 1961. Among these factors are:

San Francisco's successful adoption of the BART plan for high speed, comfortable, convenient rapid transit of a quality that should exceed any now available in the United States. When it is in operation, the precedent may engender a demand for better transportation in other areas.

The likelihood of Federal funds for transit systems (see last month's article in this series) so that cities will no longer be faced with a Hobson's choice between Federally-supported freeways and transit systems that must be financed at home.

The existence of area-wide planning programs, which at least provide a forum for presenting ideas.

Finally, even some urban interests that would normally form a part of the highway lobby now realize that mass transportation must be improved and expanded to unclog the expressways. The Jenney gas station chain with 600 filling stations in the greater Boston area, to cite one example, has taken full-page advertisements urging public support of transit expansion there. The Standard Oil Co. of California and the California State Automobile Association both endorsed San Francisco's BART transit plan.

With such new factors affecting the situation, committees like the one in Cincinnati should have a considerably better chance of success in the future.

Some are already at work. Examples are the District of Columbia Rapid Rail Citizens Committee, the Bergen County (N.J.) Transit Association, the Intermunicipal Group for Better Rail Service (New Jersey), the Westchester Commuter Association (New York), and the Committee for Better Transit of Greater New York. Also important are the long-established planning groups such as the Regional Plan Association of Greater New York. If there is a sound organization of this kind in your community or region, by all means join and support it.

If a city's residents do not value it they are of course free to move out. But much of the shift to the suburbs today is not the result of an innate dislike of the cities. Rather, it is being forced on families and business concerns alike by the failure of the cities to solve their most pressing problems, including the transportation. Thus, willy-nilly, we are drifting toward a future of urban sprawl.

At least four major North American urban areas—San Francisco, Montreal, Toronto, and Philadelphia—are bucking this trend toward sprawl by investing in high quality rail transportation that will link city to suburbs for balanced growth. The residents of other areas may prefer different patterns. If so, they are free to plan differently, but let them get what they really want, not merely what the requirements of automobile transportation dictate.

The new comprehensive planning projects now underway or soon to be launched in every urban area make it possible to plan for the future of people, rather than just for automobiles. Let us make the most of this opportunity.

THE STAKES ARE HIGH

Much more is at stake in such local efforts than merely an opportunity to get to work and back a few minutes faster or for a few cents less each day. The entire future of American cities hangs in the balance.

An increasing number of people today, looking at our blighted central cities and traffic jams, have concluded that large cities are obsolete. They therefore envision a future in which all of us will both live and work in suburbs, surrounded by vast parking lots, and linked together by multilane freeways along which we can all whizz in uncongested private-car luxury.

One objection to such plans is that they leave out of account the many services that people want and need but that each suburb cannot possibly supply for itself—a symphony orchestra, to cite a striking example.

Right To Be a Bum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the remarks of Mr. Paul Harvey, made on his news broadcast on February 27, 1965. I think the emphasis he has correctly placed on freedom is one which each of us should consider carefully in preparing his legislative program. There is plenty of security in a jail cell but I have never heard of anybody beating down the doors to get in.

[Excerpt from Paul Harvey News, Feb. 27, 1965]

RIGHT TO BE A BUM

I had meant to confine this next just to generalities. And embellish it with some fervent plea for the preservation of the Republic. Then I got to thinking about a parttime dishwasher I know, who's a bum the rest of the time, and I tried to figure what's his stake in all this free enterprise. How about the ragpicker, or even that good-natured old janitor in the North Western train station, what's his percentage?

If he votes right and puts up a fight for freedom, what's his cut? "The Government can't give you anything which it has not first taken away from you." He's heard that. But he has nothing anybody can take away from him. So who's he to worry about whether the Constitution gets chopped up or the flag hauled down?

He's got nothing they can tax and nothing anybody'd want, so why shouldn't he take a bottle of cheap wine from the precinct committeeman and just vote the way the man says.

I had meant to talk about the American heritage, and I got to thinking about Joe the bootblack. What has he inherited? Well, I've been asking around. And the rest of you tune out, now. And dial in 3 pages later. Because right now I aim to talk just to Joe the bootblack. And to Lennie, the part-time bum.

You know, I think that's what's wrong with the fervent flag wavers in this country. We spend too much time talking to one another. But Joe and Lennie and Paul Harvey understand one another, too. Because they've all been flush and they've each been hungry and any one of them knows what it's like to work a hard 17-hour day for $1 packing or sacking or stacking somebody else's groceries. So we can speak the same language, and it's that language we're going to use here. The kind that'll be understood by Lennie and Joe and the vast mass of unorganized, unterrified human beings whose two-by-four house or third-floor walkup is as close to the silk as they're ever going to get. The rest of you just excuse us for a bit—if you will.

A while back a chap named Dean Russell made a speech out in Billings, Mont. Probably talking to a gathering of folks who already agreed with him. I'm going to try to remember how he compared the American Negro slaves and the American Indians.

For a lot of years now we've been voting for the men who promise us Government aid—of all kinds. We figured we wanted the Government to guarantee to look after us. Well, sir, in the early American slave States the law specified that the slaves must be taken care of. The constitutions of the slave States generally specified that the slaveowners must provide their slaves with adequate housing, food, medical care, and old-age benefits. And the Mississippi constitution contained this additional sentence: "The legislature shall have no power to pass laws for the emancipation of slaves (except) where the slave shall have rendered the State some distinguished service."

Now get this—The slave was guaranteed food, lodging, medical and old-age care, but the highest honor the State of Mississippi could offer a man for distinguished service was to set him free from this security. The State's highest reward was to give a man the personal responsibility of looking after his own welfare. Freedom to find his own job or to be a bum if he liked.

Do you see why that's so important, just the right to be a bum? And so the slaves eventually found freedom to earn money they could keep, to save for their own old age and then they weren't slaves any more.

Let us, on the other hand, take the American Indians. These we made wards of Government. These we gave security. We took away their freedom and gave them security. So they have become steadily less self-supporting. I speak of the average, of course, not the spectacular exception. In 1862, most American Negroes were slaves. Look at the remarkable progress in just one lifetime later. Today the average American Negro is self-supporting, self-respecting, and responsible. Today the average American Indian, it is said, will actually die of starvation unless he is fed by the Government.

So we have to hire 13,000 Federal employees to take care of 380,000 reservation Indians. That's one Federal employee for every 30 Indians. This has nothing to do with the color of a man's skin or the shape of his cheekbones. The Negro was free to work or loaf; to starve or to win a potfull. The Indian was secure. There was no reason for him to educate himself or learn to manage his own affairs or to be productive. It's no fault of his; it's ours. Just as it's going to be our fault, Joe and Lennie, our fault if we let them repeat this tragic error on us.

Simply because some arrogant would-be masters are convinced that today's Americans are too ignorant or too worthless to be trusted with their own destiny. They actually think that we would literally starve in the streets unless the Government looked after our welfare. Welfare! Man, this is where we came in. They're on the way to buying and selling us again!

Now maybe you see what I started out to say. You—you're a gandy dancer, you're a hod carrier, a trolley pilot, or you take tickets at the ball park. What have I got to lose, you say? Why shouldn't I take their offer of free medicine, money for work I don't do or crops I dont' grow? Why not?

Here's why not, and don't ever forget this. "If your Government is big enough to give you everything you want, it is big enough to take away from you everything you have."

And don't tell me you've nothing to lose. That's what they thought in Britain, too. But already in Britain, elected leaders can force the citizen to work wherever the government decrees they are most needed. Force!

In Russia, where this kind of security got a slight head start, they'll make him work—if necessary in leg irons.

You've nothing to lose, you say, because you're a bum? That, sir, is a priceless privilege. In Russia you would be whipped or shot for it. It is your American right to be a bum. That is part of being free.

So for Heaven's sake don't let them peddle this absurd security idea as something new. It was written into the Code of Hammurabi over 4,000 years ago. The Romans called it "bread and circuses" to keep the crowd pacified while their sons died.

Karl Marx called it "socialism." It's where the state makes laws for your own good whether you like them or not. And Russia will imprison those who object.

It can't happen here?

Wait a minute, mister—it has happened here. Don't tell me you're still 100-percent free or I'll tell you about the owner of a small battery shop in Pennsylvania.

They told him he had to kick in money for his own social security. He didn't like the idea of being forced to buy insurance, and resisted. The State confiscated his property.

Still he refused to obey.

So the State preferred criminal charges against him. And the Government gave him the choice of conforming or going to prison. An enemy of the State because he had refused to pay social security. He paid. His 6-month prison sentence was suspended.

From now on, Lennie and Joe, get this straight. You do have plenty to lose. Whenever some of us try to warn you that big Government wears brass knuckles we're not trying to get you to fight for any other man's mansion. We're trying to protect your equally important right to be a bum.

Listen and remember. The guaranteed gifts are just bait, nothing more. They'll offer the rewards of 1864—a free meal, a free roof, a guaranteed job, and then—

We're trapped into being somebody's slaves again.

New Vietnam Blueprint

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. RHODES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, an interesting editorial on the situation in Vietnam and southeast Asia was published in the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin on April 11.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this informative editorial:

NEW VIETNAM BLUEPRINT

(By Melvin K. Whiteleather)

What is your primary interest, to better the lot of the people or to make revolution for revolution's sake?

This is the question President Johnson put to Ho Chi Minh, the North Vietnamese Communist boss, with last Wednesday's proposal to end the war in Vietnam and embark on an imaginative effort to lift up the whole of southeast Asia.

U.S. effort to bring the struggle in Vietnam to a close has centered on Ho Chi Minh, rather than on Peiping or Moscow. To bombing north of the 17th parallel is now brought the additional pressure of the cooperative scheme benefitting all of North Vietnam's neighbors.

North Vietnam can be included if it is willing to stop attacking South Vietnam. But if it doesn't, President Johnson gave emphatic notification that Ho Chi Minh stood to see his territory and people injured rather than improved.

AN ALTERNATIVE TO WAR

The United States no longer is just bombing; it has put its weight behind a constructive plan and those around the world who have been calling for an alternative to destruction, now have one. There was wisdom in choosing the Mekong River development skeleton plan already in existence and in inviting U.N. Secretary General U Thant to take the initiative in getting the plan off the ground and expanding it. The 21 countries already contributing to that development plan and the authority of the U.N. are brought into a direct relationship to the struggle in Vietnam. Thus it is not just a raw U.S. "imperialist" plot.

Except for countries with a revolutionary bias, this relationship should lean toward a settlement suitable to the Saigon government. The 17 nonalined countries, led by Yugoslavia, which made a plea for peace negotiations to all parties concerned, can hardly be opposed to a development scheme that would touch a whole section of Asia and 50 million persons. The 17 need not accept at 100 percent face value the claim that the Vietcong is a tool of Hanoi in order to press for a settlement of the struggle that would leave the Saigon government in control of its own territory.

PRESSURE PUT ON OTHERS

The Johnson proposal definitely has put the pressure on the other side, relieving the United States of onus that had been building up over the bombing in North Vietnam. Unimportant as the whole affair was, there is no doubt that the use of nonlethal gas by the South Vietnamese army, supplied by us, sharpened world opinion against us. British Prime Minister Harold Wilson's path in defending our purposes and practices has now been eased and the critical Japanese have been given something else to think about.

The President's proposal hit Red China hard and Peiping is striking back with the full force of its propaganda machine. Southeast Asia blooming under other than Chinese influence is the last thing Peiping wants to see happen. The region is regarded as a Chinese preserve, and beyond that, for such a plan to get moving with U.S. dollars and moral backing would be a far cry from bringing U.S. imperialism to its knees, as Peiping says it must be brought. For the United States to put the United Nations and a cooperative plan to the forefront cuts straight across Communist propaganda.

MOSCOW'S DILEMMA CONTINUES

Peiping in its fury is losing sight of its only recent adoption of the Russian argument that any settlement in Vietnam must be between the United States and the Vietcong's political arm, the National Liberation Movement. It seems that after all, Red China does have a stake.

Mr. Johnson has not eased Moscow's dilemma a bit. On one hand the Russians might be pleased to see southeast Asia developed independent from China, and the President suggested that the Soviets should contribute to the scheme, but on the other hand there is the commitment to helping all revolutions. Russian irritation over its dilemma has been manifested the past few days by the worst cold war polemics that have been heard in the U.N. in a long time. These took place in an obscure committee where ordinarily nothing ever happens.

Peiping will do its utmost to prevent Ho Chi Minh from nibbling at the President's proposals. No one expects Ho to run up a white flag in broad daylight, but he has been given an opportunity to work his way out of his box with a certain amount of face saving.

The signals are still warning that a big attack on a Dien Bien Phu scale is in the making with the expectation that the South Vietnamese and Americans can be done in with one big swoop. If this is tried and fails, Hanoi may be ready to listen to U Thant.

Manned Space Flight's New Phase

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Robert B. Hotz' editorial in the April 12 issue of Aviation Week & Space Technology aptly describes the new era that our space program is entering. Mr. Hotz' analysis clearly describes the value of the Gemini program to our national security and to the Apollo lunar landing in this decade. He compares the current status of the Soviet and United States space programs and his reflections concerning this are important to all Americans:

MANNED SPACE FLIGHT'S NEW PHASE

The flights of the U.S. Gemini and the U.S.S.R. Voskhod spacecraft herald a new phase of manned space flight.

The Vostok and Mercury flights were aimed at determining man's ability to survive during prolonged space missions. The era begun by Gemini and Voskhod will determine his ability to operate spacecraft for a variety of useful purposes, many of them not even dimly discernible at present. This period in manned space flight is similar in many respects to the early years of World War I, when the airplane was suddenly transformed from the stunt and racing machine of the prewar era into the fighters, bombers and observation aircraft that dominated the western front.

The Voskhod and Gemini spacecraft are aimed at similar goals to extend the capability of manned space vehicles to a series of basic functions, such as:

Maneuvering in space: The technical feasibility of this has been demonstrated in the flight of Gemini 3, but a major effort remains to develop this maneuverability into an operational capability.

Extravehicular activity: This has been successfully demonstrated by the Soviet cosmonaut, Alexei Leonov, during the flight of Voskhod 2. It is a keystone in the process by which large structures can be erected for functioning in space.

Rendezvous and docking: Both Gemini and Voskhod are scheduled to demonstrate this function soon, using different techniques.

BROAD CAPABILITY

In this area, the achievements of whoever is first to accomplish a new feat in space will continue to attract major public attention. But the real significance of this second phase of manned space flight lies not so much in short chronological gaps between the first and second achievements, but rather in the broad capability being developed and the speed and certainty with which it is applied to specific operational tasks. For example, it is relatively unimportant that Cosmonaut Leonov did the first extravehicular maneuver in space if a Gemini astronaut expands this operational technique within a few months. Nor will the historic first maneuvers—both in changing orbits and changing orbital plane—of Gemini 3 retain much significance if the Soviet Voskhod accomplishes these same feats later this year. The interval between these two types of spacecraft demonstrating rendezvous and docking is not likely to be long or particularly significant.

Although both the United States and U.S.S.R. are committed to an attempt to land the first men on the moon, we believe that the most important aspect of this second phase of manned space flight, and of the third and operational phase that will certainly follow, will be in near-earth orbits. With the heavy U.S. commitment of resources to the Apollo lunar landing mission, it may appear to be both expedient and safe to defer the development of earth-orbital operational capabilities until after the financial and technical peak loads of Apollo have passed. We think this procedure could be a dangerous mistake.

The Soviets obviously have chosen the earth-orbital approach to their lunar landing mission. Therefore, they necessarily must develop rather fully their hardware and operational techniques in this area as a vital prelude to their lunar landing attempts and not as a postlude, in the manner of current U.S. planning. They also have made little attempt to conceal their primary military interest in the development of manned spacecraft operations in the earth-orbital area.

Thus, it is entirely possible that unless U.S. policy is drastically changed soon, the Soviets may have an opportunity to achieve the technical surprise in space that they so narrowly missed in the race to an intercontinental ballistic missile.

OPERATIONAL GOALS

If the United States had gone directly from Mercury to the Apollo program, there would be no chance to thwart this possibility of disaster. Fortunately, the Gemini program was conceived and properly expanded to provide not only a spacecraft system for developing the vital earth-orbital techniques but also for applying them to achieve operational goals. Gemini has been severely criticized in the daily press and the Congress for its rising costs and lagging schedules without much understanding of how the goals of this effort have been extended and its scope broadened. We think that in the years just ahead these same critics will switch to praise and thanks for the existence of the Gemini hardware and operational concepts as the national need for them becomes painfully apparent to all.

Now, the U.S. space policy planners are facing a decision on how best to develop fully and swiftly an earth-orbital operational capability during the same period that Apollo needs the hardest push to achieve an early lunar landing.

Because of the existence of the Gemini program it is still possible to do both without serious danger of being confronted with a major military surprise by the Soviets in the next few years. But some hard decisions are required almost immediately if this opportunity is not to slip from this Nation's grasp. National Aeronautics and Space Administration can contribute to this goal by pushing developmental testing of Gemini systems as a top priority. The Air Force should be able to develop the required operational capability by pushing its military orbital laboratory program based on Gemini hardware as fast as technically feasible. But nothing can be achieved without some swift decisions in the Pentagon and White House on the course of a sound military space program. The time is growing late.

ROBERT HOTZ.

Farm Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, JR.
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, March 23, 1965

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the farmers, businessmen, and community leaders in the First District of Idaho anxiously awaited the announcement of the agricultural message and recommendations of President Johnson. In the past years, they have been plunging deeper into debt, hoping for better programs and prices. Since the date of H.R. 7097's introduction, I have received many letters about the wheat provisions of that bill, most of which could be called "less than enthusiastic". All are in accord with the stated objective of putting farm income into balance with that of other industries, but many are skeptical about the success of H.R. 7097 toward that end. One-hundred percent of parity for wheat domestically consumed is applauded widely, and most farmers would like to be assured of this absolutely. The discontinuance of export subsidies and certificates is not opposed, but nearly every one agrees that a 4-year program is necessary, rather than the 2-year proposal. Diversion payments are necessary to reduce surplus production, but many say that a strategic resurge of wheat, based on 50 percent of our annual domestic and export needs would be wise. Continuance of the feed grain program is regarded as a very important element for equitable farm returns, but the elimination of oats and rye from the base very adversely and inequitably affects many farmers in my area. Overall, I think the observation of a very astute farm reporter is accurate:

The present provisions of the farm bill will probably be condemned by faint praise.

A good analysis of the present provisions of the farm bill were made by a very highly regarded newspaper editor in my district. Under unanimous consent I included it in the RECORD:

[From the Lewiston (Idaho) Morning Tribune, Apr. 7, 1965]

MR. JOHNSON'S NEW FARM BILL

President Johnson's first major farm bill presented to Congress Monday offered no sweeping changes in philosophy—simply higher support prices for wheat and rice, with citizens paying more of the costs in grocery bills rather than taxes.

Despite prompt and vigorous criticism from the heads of two major farm organizations, the President's proposal is likely to be fairly popular with wheat and rice farmers. It probably will be accepted without much complaint by most consumers—who tend to object more to taxes than to higher prices for goods. And it will help ease the strain on the Federal budget, if Congress approves it—which seems likely for that reason alone, if no other.

The new bill did not develop an earlier hint by the President that farm legislation might be offered which would emphasize benefits to small farmers, rather than across-the-board subsidies to small and large producers alike.

Such an arrangement is economically feasible, perhaps under some variation of the controversial plan once presented by former Secretary of Agriculture Charles Brannan. That plan called for direct Federal subsidies to farmers proportioned on the basis of need, with consumers getting the benefit of lower costs of food products sold on an open, unsupported market.

However, this approach probably is not politically feasible. The "family-sized farm," which for many years was the foundation of American agriculture, is fast becoming a rarity. Farmers who work sections instead of acres also have their economic troubles these days—and vigorously insist upon their full share of any benefits provided by Government through direct subsidies or price supports.

Mr. Johnson's farm bill naturally did not satisfy the quarreling leaders of two of the Nation's big farm organizations.

James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, which generally represents small farmers looking to Government for aid, declared that "the major deficiency is the failure of the bill to provide the income that farm families and rural Americans need if they are to survive * * * It is high time that the direction of agricultural policies be given back to the Department of Agriculture or to people with experience in farming."

Charles B. Shuman, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, which generally reflects the big-farmer view that the law of supply and demand should be allowed to function in agriculture, whatever the results to "submarginal" farmers was even more caustic.

The President's bill, he said, was "a hoax designed to trap both farmers and consumers." The proposals, he said, "would make farmers more dependent on Government subsidies for their livelihood, and at the same time raise the price of food to consumers, especially those with low incomes."

The gulf between these spokesmen obviously is too great for any farm bill to bridge. One wants higher price supports or subsidies to insure the survival of small farmers, with taxpayers footing the bill. The other wants an open market in agriculture without Federal subsidy and with many small farmers liquidated if necessary in a drastic "readjustment" based on survival of the fittest.

Neither alternative is politically acceptable to most farmers or consumers. As long as the wide gulf exists in farm opinion, any administration will be forced to seek some middle ground. Despite his earlier hints, this is what the President did.

Under the proposed bill, wheat grown for domestic use would be supported by Government at full parity prices—at about $2.50 a bushel instead of the present $2. Other wheat grown within acreage allotments would be supported at about $1.25 per bushel—which is about the world price.

The Government would eliminate present export subsidies on wheat to be sold abroad. It would require millers to pay $1.25 a bushel for domestic-use wheat, or 50 cents more than the present price. Millers and bakers would pass the extra cost on to consumers.

While the price of wheat has had little relation to the price of bread in recent years, the change probably would increase bread prices about a penny a loaf. A similar program would increase retail prices of rice from 5 to 7 cents a pound.

Thus, the wheat and rice growers would earn substantially more. Consumers would pay more at the supermarkets. The Federal Government would save some $200 million per year.

Wheat and rice farmers might gain more than additional income from the arrangement. They might be exempted from some of the irate complaints from taxpayers about the cost of Federal price support programs—even though the taxpayers would be paying farmers more as consumers.

The Federal Government would save sizable sums in an arrangement which once again illustrates Mr. Johnson's tendency to shift Federal expenditures from long-established agricultural programs to some of the newer, long-neglected problems of the Nation's population centers and poverty pockets.

The consumers would pay prices for wheat and rice which would be artifically high in terms of world markets, but still a bargain as compared with other products they buy.

The new wheat-rice program proposed by the President isn't a dramatic new approach to the chronic problems of agriculture. Perhaps no such approach is possible unless farmers unite behind common objectives or until population pressures or wider world trade abolish the problem of crop surpluses.

The new bill does seem to represent a politically shrewd innovation to offer some relief to wheat and rice farmer—and the Federal Treasury—with consumers paying the bill in pennies instead of tax dollars.—B. J.

A New Look at Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, in the April 22, 1965, issue of the New York Review of Books, the Washington journalist, I. F. Stone, has written an incisive review of two new books on Vietnam: "The New Face of War" by Malcolm W. Browne, and "The Making of a Quagmire," by David Halberstam. Mr. Stone's review is a welcome addition and insight into the complex problems facing this war-torn area. I urge all my colleagues to read the following review:

[From the New York Review of Books, Apr. 22, 1965]

VIETNAM: AN EXERCISE IN SELF-DELUSION

(By I. F. Stone)

("The New Face of War," by Malcolm W. Browne, Bobbs-Merrill, 284 pages, $5; "The Making of a Quagmire," by David Halberstam, Random House, 312 pages, $4.95.)

The morning I sat down to write this review, the Washington Post (March 25) carried the news that Malcolm W. Browne had been arrested and held for 2 hours by South Vietnamese Air Force officers at the big U.S. air and missile base at Da Nang. The incident is symbol and symptom of the steady degeneration in the conduct of the Vietnamese war. These two books by two newspapermen who won Pulitzer Prizes last year for their coverage of the war, Browne for the Associated Press, David Halberstam for the New York Times, record the agony of trying to report the war truthfully against the opposition of the higher-ups, military and civilian. The books appear just as the war is entering a new stage when honest reporting is more essential than ever, but now restriction and censorship are applied to black it out. Da Nang, the main base from which the was is being escalated to the north, was officially declared "off limits" the day before Browne's arrest and newsmen were told they could not enter without a pass obtainable only in Saigon, 385 miles to the south. "Newsmen," the dispatch on Browne's arrest said, "doubted such a pass existed." The incident occurred only a few days after the highest information officer at the Pentagon claimed that its policy on coverage of the war was "complete candor."

What makes these books so timely, their message so urgent, is that they show the Vietnamese war in that aspect which is most fundamental for our own people—as a challenge to freedom of information and therefore freedom of decision. They appear at a time when all the errors on which they throw light are being intensified. Instead of correcting policy in the light of the record, the light itself is being shut down. Access to news sources in Vietnam and in Washington is being limited, censorship in the field is becoming more severe. Diem is dead but what might be termed Diemism has become the basic policy of the American Government. For years our best advisers, military and civilian, tried desperately to make him understand that the war was a political problem which could only be solved in South Vietnam. Three years ago the head of the U.S. mission spoke of the war as a battle for the "hearts and minds" of the people, and primarily the villagers, whose disaffection had made the rebellion possible against superior forces and equipment. To win that battle it was then proposed to spend $200 million to bolster the Vietnamese economy and raise living standards. Though much of this money seems to have been frittered away, it was at least recognized that the military effort was only one aspect of the problem. Now we have adopted Diem's simple-minded theory that the war is merely a product of Communist inspiracy, that it is purely an invasion and not a rebellion or a civil war, and that all would be well—in Secretary Rusk's fatuous phrase—if only the North let its neighbors alone. This is the theory of the white paper and this is the excuse for bombing North Vietnam.

While the war expands, the theory on which it proceeds has narrowed. Washington's "party line" on the war has been shrunk to rid it of those annoying complexities imposed by contact with reality. The change becomes evident if one compares the white paper of 1965 with the blue book of 1961. The blue book was issued by the Kennedy administration to explain its decision to step up the scale of our aid and the number of our "military advisers" in South Vietnam. The white paper was issued by the Johnson administration to prepare the public mind to accept its decision to bomb the north and risk a wider war. The change of policy required that rewriting of history we find so amusing when we watch it being done on the other side.

Four years ago the blue book told us that the basic pattern of Vietcong activity was "not new, of course." It said this followed the tactics applied and the theories worked out by Mao Tse-tung in China. It said much the same methods were used "in Malaya, in Greece, in the Philippines, in Cuba, and in Laos." If there is "anything peculiar to the Vietnam situation," the blue book said, "it is that the country is divided and one-half provides a safe sanctuary from which subversion in the other half is supported with both personnel and materiel." This implied a conflict which was doubly a civil war, first between the two halves of a divided country and then between the Government and Communist-led guerrillas in one-half of that country.

The white paper disagrees. It abandons complexity to make possible simpleminded slogans and policy. It declares the conflict "a new kind of war * * * a totally new brand of aggression * * * not another Greece * * * not another Malaya * * * not another Philippines * * *. Above all * * * not a spontaneous and local rebellion against the established government." [Italic in the original.] The "fundamental difference," the white paper says, is that in Vietnam "a Communist government has set out deliberately to conquer a sovereign people in a neighboring state." This implies that there is no popular discontent in the south to be allayed, no need to negotiate with the rebels. The war is merely a case of international aggression and the aggresor is to be punished by bombardment until he agrees to call off the invasion. The rebellion can be shut off, all this implies, as if by spigot from Hanoi. The truth about the war has been tailored to suit the Air Force faith in "victory by airpower." This was Goldwater's theory and this has become Johnson's policy.

Browne's book sheds some sharp light on the white paper's thesis. The white paper says the war is "inspired, directed, supplied and controlled" by Hanoi. But Browne reports that "intelligence experts feel less than 10 percent and probably more like 2 percent of the Vietcong's stock of modern weapons is Communist made." He also reports that "only a small part of Vietcong increase in strength has resulted from infiltration of North Vietnamese Communist troops into South Vietnam." An astringent examination of the white paper and its supporting appendixes will show that it really proves little more than this, despite the sweeping headline impressions it was intended to generate. Browne also tells us that "Western intelligence experts believe the proportion of Communists (in the National Liberation Front) is probably extremely small." He describes it as "a true 'front' organization appealing for the support of every social class." Browne declares the front a "creature" of the Vietnamese Communist Party and says it has "strong but subtle ties" to the Hanoi regime. For many Vietnamese, nevertheless "the front is exactly what it purports to be—the people's struggle for independence." This is what our best advisers tried to tell Diem. This is what our bureaucracy now refuses to see rather than admit past error and defeat, preferring to gamble on a wider war.

The really terrible message in these books is not that the bureaucrats have tried to deceive the public but that they have insisted on deceiving themselves. The Vietnamese war has been an exercise in self-delusion. David Halberstam tells us in "The Making of a Quagmire" that when the first Buddhist burned himself to death, Ngo Dinh Diem was convinced that this act had been staged by an American television team. The Buddhist crisis, as Halberstam describes it, "was to encompass all the problems of the Government: its inability to rule its own people; the failure of the American mission to influence Diem. * * * Observing the Government during those 4 months was like watching a government trying to commit suicide." The stubborn insistence of the South Vietnamese dictator on insulating himself from reality spread into our own Government. The most important revelation these two books make is the unwillingness of the higher-ups in Saigon and Washington to hear the truth from their subordinates in the field.

South Vietnam swarmed with spies, but apparently they were only listened to when they reported what their paymasters wanted to hear. Halberstam says that at one time Diem had 13 different secret police organizations. Browne provides a vivid picture of how our own intelligence agencies proliferated. The CIA, Special Forces, the AID mission, the Army, the provost marshal, the Navy, and the U.S. Embassy each had its own operatives. But they were not, in Browne's words, "one big happy family." On the contrary they "very often closely concealed" their findings from other agencies "because of the danger that the competitors may pirate the material and report it to headquarters first, getting the credit."

All this fierce application of free enterprise to the collection of information seems to have been of little use because of a top level political decision. "Ever since Vietnamese independence" (i.e., 1954), Browne reveals, "American intelligence officials had relied on the Vietnamese intelligence system for most of their information." This was "because of Diem's touchiness about American spooks wandering around on their own." In the interest of preserving harmony, "somehow the intelligence reports always had it that the war was going well." We circulated faithfully in orbit around our own satellite. Diem's men told him what he wanted to hear, and ours passed on what he wanted us to believe. Halberstam confirms this. In those final months before Diem's overthrow, "CIA agents were telling me that their superiors in Vietnam were still so optimistic that they were not taking the turmoil and unrest very seriously." John Richardson, then CIA chief in Vietnam, displayed a kind of infatuation with Diem's brother Nhu and his wife. Halberstam describes a lunch with Richardson in 1962, shortly after the New York Times sent him to Saigon, in which the CIA chief dismissed Nhu's notorious anti-American remarks as simply those of "a proud Asian." As for the tigerish Mme. Nhu, Richardson thought her "sometimes a little emotional, but that was typical of women who entered politics—look at Mrs. Roosevelt."

A persistent Panglossianism marked our entire bureaucracy up to and including the White House. General Harkins, our military commander in South Vietnam, said "I am an optimist and I am not going to allow my staff to be pessimistic." Halberstam describes a briefing at his command post after the battle of Ap Bac in January 1963, the kind of set-piece battle for which our military had long hoped and which they first described as a victory though it turned out to be a disastrous defeat. With "the government troops so completely disorganized that they would not even carry out their own dead," "a province chief shelling his own men" and "the enemy long gone," General Harkins told the press a trap was about to be sprung on the enemy!

The enemy was the press. When the facts about Ap Bac could no longer be concealed, headquarters became angry "not with the system" that brought defeat, Halberstam writes, nor with the Vietnamese commanders responsible for it "but with the American reporters who wrote about it." Adm. Harry Felt, commander of all U.S. forces in the Pacific, gave classic expression to the bureaucratic attitude toward the press when he was angered by a question from Browne. "Why don't you get on the team?" the Admiral demanded.

When Halberstam, Browne, and Neil Sheehan,[1] then with the UPI, visited the Mekong Delta in the summer of 1963 and saw for themselves the deterioration of the war, their reward for reporting it was a campaign of denigration. Rusk criticized Halberstam at a press conference. President Kennedy suggested to the publisher of the New York Times that Halberstam be transferred to some other assignment, a suggestion Mr. Arthur Hays Sulzberger, to his credit, rejected. The bureaucracy counter-attacked through Joe Alsop, who insidiously compared the reporters on the scene to those who a generation earlier had called the Chinese Communists "agrarian reformers." The New York Journal-American wrote that Halberstam was soft on communism. A friend in the State Department told Halberstam, "It's a damn good thing you never belonged to any left wing groups or anything like that because they were really looking for stuff like that." Victor Krulak, the Pentagon's top specialist on guerrilla warfare, was vehement in his criticism of the press:

"Richard Tregaskis and Maggie Higgins had found that the war was being won, but a bunch of young cubs who kept writing about the political side were defeatists." The official attitude was epitomized by Lyndon Johnson, then Vice President, on his way back from Saigon in 1961. He had laid the flattery on with a shovel, calling Diem "the Churchill of Asia." Halberstam reports that when a reporter on the plane tried to tell Johnson something of Diem's faults, Johnson responded, "Don't tell me about Diem. He's all we've got out there." A brink is a dangerous place on which to prefer not to see where you're going.

The hostile attitude toward honest reporting is made the more shocking because reporters like Halberstam and Browne, as their conclusions reveal, were critics not of the war itself but only of the ineffective way in which it was conducted. The forces for which they spoke, the sources on which they depended, were not dissident Vietnamese but junior American officers. Their books disclose little contact with the Vietnamese. The battle between the press and the bureaucracy arose because the newspapermen refused to report that the war was being won, but there was not too much reporting of why it was being lost.

For Halberstam the war was a lark, a wonderful assignment for a young reporter; his pages reflect his zest and are full of graphic reportage, though also marked by some egregious errors, such as locating Dienbienphu in Laos and attributing the origin of the agrovilles to the French whereas they really sprang from Nhu's mystical authoritarianism. For Browne the war was less romantic. The life of a wire service reporter on call 24 hours a day in so tense a situation is no picnic. His book is written in flat agency prose. Both men acquitted themselves honorably, in the best tradition of American journalism, which is always to be skeptical of any official statement. But both books are marked by that characteristic intentness on the moment; the idea that the past may help explain the present appears only rarely. There is no time for study, and American editors do not encourage that type of journalism in depth which distinguishes Le Monde or the Neue Züricher Zeitung.

This defect is most damaging in reporting on the origins of the revolt against Diem. The average American newspaper reader got the impression that this was brought about by esoteric and long-distance means, by Communist plotters activated from Hanoi to engage in that mysterious process referred to in our press as "subversion." This is the closest modern equivalent to witchcraft. Halberstam's account of the origins is better than Browne's, but the real roots of discontent are touched on only peripherally. We get a glimpse of them in Halberstam's report that General Taylor after his first mission in 1960 recommended "broadening the base of the Government, taking non-Ngo anti-Communist elements into the Government; making the National Assembly more than a rubber stamp; easing some of the tight restrictions on the local press." The prescription was for a little of that democracy we were supposed to be defending, but Diem would not take the medicine. The accumulation of grievances, the establishment of concentration camps for political opponents of all kinds, the exploitation and abuse of the villages, the oppression of the intellectuals, the appeal of the 18 notables in 1960, and the attempted military coup that year, "the longstanding abuses" which finally led to the revolt, are not spelled out as they should be[2] and would be if U.S. reporters had more contact with the Vietnamese. In a flash of insight Halberstam writes:

"Also, though we knew more about Vietnam and the aspirations of the Vietnamese than most official Americans, we were to some degree limited by our nationality. We were there, after all, to cover the war; this was our primary focus and inevitably we judged events through the war's progress or lack of it. We entered the pagodas only after the Buddhist crisis had broken out; we wrote of Nguyen Tuong Tam, the country's most distinguished writer and novelist, only after he had committed suicide—and then only because his death had political connotations; we were aware of the aspirations of the peasants because they were the barometer of the Government's failure and the war's progress, not because we were on the side of the population and against their rulers."

This accounts for how poorly these reporters understood the central problem of land reform, how few realized that from the standpoint of the peasants, particularly in the delta, Diem's land reform policy, like his hated "agrovilles" and our equally unpopular "strategic hamlets," seemed to be mechanisms for reinstating the rights of the landlords who had fled during the long war against the French. Diem's downfall and the rebellion's success were largely due to the fact that he tried to do what even the Bourbons in France after the Revolution were too wise to attempt. He tried to turn back the clock of the revolutionary land seizures. In the name of land reform, many peasants found themselves being asked to pay rent or compensation for land they had long considered their own.

This lack of contact with the Vietnamese people and this fellow feeling for the junior officers who were sure they could win the war if only headquarters were different, also accounts for the weak way both books fizzle out when the authors try to supply some conclusions. Both oppose negotiation and neutralization. Halberstam is indignant with the indifference to Vietnam he encountered

[1] See the vivid account in his preface to Jules Roy's agonized and eloquent "The Battle of Dienbienphu," Harper, $6.95.

[2] The best account is by the French historian, Philippe Devillers in "North Vietnam Today" (Praeger, 1962) edited by P. J. Honey.

on his return home. He believes Vietnam a legitimate part of our global commitment. He feels we cannot abandon our efforts to help these people no matter how ungrateful they may seem. For the ungrateful majority, the American presence had only succeeded in polarizing the politics of the country between authoritarian Communists and authoritarian anti-Communists; the former, at least, have the virtue of being supported by native forces. The anti-Communist minority was grateful, of course, and feared that with American withdrawal they would be treated as mercilessly by the National Liberation Front as Diem had treated veterans of Vietminh after 1954, although a specific provision of the Geneva agreement forbade persecution of those who had fought against the French.

The files of the International Control Commission from 1955 onward were full of complaints that ex-Vietminh had been thrown into concentration camps or executed without charge or trial. In any eventual settlement in Vietnam, the future of minorities must certainly be a matter for concern, but the notion that we have a mandate from Heaven to impose on an unwilling people what we think is good for them will strike few Asians or Africans as an object lesson in democracy. Browne's feeble ending is even worse. "Perhaps in the end," he writes, echoing the cliches of the counterinsurgency experts at Fort Bragg, "America will find it can put Marx, Lenin, Mao, and Giap to work for it, without embracing communism itself." This was the delusion of French military men like Colonel Lacheroy and Colonel Trinquier, who returned from Indochina thinking they could apply Communist ideas in reverse to the pacification of Algeria. When frustrated, they tried to turn their borrowed techniques of conspiracy and assassination against De Gaulle and the French Republic. To apply Communist methods in reverse, the favorite formula of our counterinsuragency experts does not make them any less unpalatable or dangerous to a free society. The basic tactic confuses the effect with the cause. To see wars of liberation, the Pentagon's dominant nightmare, simply as a reflection of conspiracy, to overlook the social and economic roots which make them possible, to prescribe counterconspiracy as the cure, is not only likely to insure failure but it tends to shut off debate on peaceful alternatives. Here the growing tendency of the Johnson administration to make it seem disloyal to question the omnicompetence of the Presidency is reinforced by the natural tendency of the Pentagon to see doubts about resort to force as unpatriotic. There is the danger here of a new McCarthyism as the administration and the military move toward wider war rather than admit earlier mistakes.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided,* That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided,* That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided,* That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further,* That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided,* That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

Appendix

Tribute to State Senator Ray W. Rigby, of Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CHURCH
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 21, 1965

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, there are some who say that service in either house of a State legislative body is a training program for future national office. This may be true, Mr. President; but I feel that such a claim falls far short of the mark. To find truly outstanding men willing to take the time and effort to serve their neighbors in the State legislature is a most difficult task. When a young man comes along for the first time and then distinguishes himself in his first term of office, it is a noteworthy event. Such a man is State Senator Ray W. Rigby, of Idaho's Madison County. This young Democrat served so diligently, intelligently, and cheerfully during the past session of the Idaho State Legislature that he was named "Outstanding Legislative Freshman" by the men and women who are our most telling critics, the news people who cover the capital.

Senator Rigby's contributions during 74 days of regular session and the subsequent special session have been reported in the Rexburg, Idaho, Standard of March 30; and I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWSMEN NAME RIGBY OUTSTANDING FRESHMAN

Senator Ray Rigby, Democrat, of Madison, was named the outstanding freshman of the Idaho Legislature at an Idaho Press Club banquet following the recent special legislative session in Boise.

Senator Rigby was selected by capitol correspondents as winner of the "Best Contribution by a Freshman" Award, it was learned here.

The freshman Madison County senator served on four committees during the 38th regular session, which last 74 days, and the special session, which lasted 7 days. These were the judiciary and rules committee, the education committee, the local government committee, and the irrigation and reclamation committee. He also served on a special liaison committee between the legislature and the Idaho State Supreme Court.

Senator Riby also was recognized possible future timber for the Governor post.

Political writer John Corlet, of the Boise Idaho Statesman, said that the Madison senator was a definite possibility for the Democratic nomination for Governor.

One of the noteworthy pieces of legislation passed at the recent legislative session, Senator Rigby believes, is the condominium law, which establishes a new concept in property ownership. He helped draft this law. He also helped push through the senate the Narcotic Drugs Regulatory Act, which is aimed at giving law enforcement better power to deal with situations like that which occurred in Madison County last summer.

Other outstanding legislation, in his opinion, included the establishment of a court coordinator and court study plan for court revision, the creation of the water resources agency, which was created by a compromise bill Senator Rigby helped draft; the sales tax and its accompanying relief measures for income and property taxes, increased aid to education, several measures approved by the Madison Fish and Game Committees, the creation of a State government organized study to determine ways of creating better efficiency in the State government, the urban redevelopment law authorizing procedures to rid cities of degenerated areas.

Senator Rigby feels that "certainly one of the most far-reaching actions of the 38th legislature was the act establishing a uniform method of assessing property, which will take a few years to get into effect, and which is intended to equalize the ad valorem tax burden on all properties."

He noted that there was "very little support to the move to repeal parimutual betting" and that Idaho drivers' licenses will soon be issued with colored photographs of the license holders.

He also personally drafted and carried through the senate a memorial to the U.S. Congress asking that Congress appropriate funds for the Fremont Dam project. This memorial was approved without dissent.

"The two school districts in Madison County benefit greatly from the new appropriations because the districts have a lot of students for a small taxable area," Senator Rigby noted. The Rexburg district will receive an additional $108,994.92. Sugar-Salem will receive an additional $34,739.42.

America's Stake in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include in the RECORD today my statement which was presented to a conference on water and peace sponsored by the Zionist Organization of America in Chicago on April 4.

I believe that this is a subject which deserves the widest discussion and it is my hope that our own Government will take a more active role in helping find a solution to this very serious problem.

I believe the Zionist Organization of America deserves great credit for leading the way in an orderly discussion of this very important subject.

Mr. Speaker, my statement, which was read in Chicago by Mr. Milton J. Silberman, follows:

AMERICA'S STAKE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Ladies and gentlemen, I am honored that I have been asked to speak to you on two of the most important issues facing not only the United States, but also the countries of the Middle East—peace and water.

One might wonder, at first blush, how peace and water can be so thoroughly related in the Middle East. I am very happy that the Zionist Organization of America has arranged this discussion today so that we may be able to put this entire subject in its proper perspective.

We, of course, have been seeking many ways to maintain peace in the Middle East. But I think we can all agree the task is becoming increasingly more difficult with the obvious lack of cooperation from Nasser and the Arab States.

While it is wise for us to discuss today the basic factors which we hope could lead to peace in the Middle East, it would be a great tragedy if we were to be blinded to the immediate problems at hand. This is one reason why the House of Representatives quite properly placed a ban on any further foreign aid to Nasser until he ceases his aggressive moves against Israel. I regret that the Senate found it necessary to somewhat temper the House action, but even with the Senate amendment it is significant that the House has demonstrated its patience is wearing thin with the arrogance of Nasser.

I believe the Congress must also recognize the realities of life in the Middle East by approving, as quickly as possible, legislation barring Nasser and the Arab States from boycotting American industry which does business with Israel. This attitude by the Arab States is contemptible, and one has a right to ask how much longer will the U.S. Government continue to tolerate such impudence.

We are aware that Israel has never been, in my judgment, in greater danger, and it would be my hope that the U.S. Government will again reaffirm its unequivocal determination that any act of aggression by the Arab States against Israel is an act of aggression against the United States and the Western democracies. We cannot permit an act of miscalculation by the Arab States to plunge the Middle East into open warfare. Nasser has been riding high, and it is my hope that the United States will make it crystal clear exactly what our position is.

This Nation is now historically committed to the proposition that Israel's independence must be maintained at all costs.

It is within this framework that we today undertake a discussion of water and peace in the Middle East.

President Kennedy enjoyed recalling the old Chinese proverb that even a journey of 1,000 miles requires a first step.

I would suggest that resolving the water problem in the Middle East might indeed provide the first step in the long and arduous road toward finding a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

The problem of maintaining the present shaky peace in the Middle East is, as I am sure you are all aware, one of the most delicate issues facing the American policymaker. We as Americans are concerned with a great number of related objectives—all of which have some bearing on whether or not this most important goal is achieved. For example, we want to maintain access to the essential transportation routes which traverse this area; we want to limit the in-

Senate

MONDAY, APRIL 19, 1965

The Senate met at 9 o'clock a.m. and was called to order by Hon. JOSEPH D. TYDINGS, a Senator from the State of Maryland.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The Chief Clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., April 19, 1965.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JOSEPH D. TYDINGS, a Senator from the State of Maryland, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore.

Mr. TYDINGS thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

ADJOURNMENT TO WEDNESDAY, APRIL 21, 1965

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of Tuesday, April 13, 1965, the Chair declares the Senate adjourned until 12 o'clock noon, Wednesday.

Thereupon (at 9 o'clock and 23 seconds a.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order of Tuesday, April 13, 1965, until Wednesday, April 21, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

fluence of the Soviet Union; we want to make sure that the oil of this region continues to flow to Europe, for the latter's economic strength depends upon it; we want to help in creating political stability in the individual countries; we want to see an accommodation between Israel and its Arab neighbors, and, perhaps most important in that it can materially assist in achieving many of the above, we want to see the economic development of this area proceed as rapidly and as intelligently as possible.

Now, an indispensable element of the future development of this region, as well as of many others, is a sufficient supply of fresh water. However, Israel is perhaps more than others aware of this necessity. With a growing population, little naturally arable land, and an announced policy of industrialization, the problem of water is of the utmost importance. Large quantities of water are needed; for irrigation of land presently uncultivated because natural rainfall is insufficient, for large and complex industrial enterprises, for consumption by the population, and, for purposes of recreation and a great variety of other uses.

There are at present only two possible sources of additional water for Israel, as well as the other Arab States of the area, because they too lack sufficient quantities of this necessary resource. The first consists of a more rational utilization of presently available sources, as for example, the Jordan River. The second consists of artificially increasing the supply, as for example, through extensive desalinization projects.

The Jordan River is the major river in the area of the Middle East where Israel is located. It has its origins in Lebanon, Syria, Israel, and Jordan. After meandering through the Sea of Galilee and an age-old trough, it finally makes its way into the lowest spot on earth—the Dead Sea. By the time it has arrived at its destination, the Jordan River has become more a river of minerals and salts than one of water. Both Israel and Jordan are "mining" the Dead Sea for this extensive mineral content. But what of its waters farther upstream? Here they are fresh, and could provide all of the riparian countries with sufficient water to irrigate many thousands of additional acres. Israel as well as the Arab States are aware of this, and have at various times proposed plans for the utilization of these precious waters before they are lost to the Dead Sea. So far, however, extremely complex psychological and political fears and disagreements have prevented the creation of any overall regional approach to the apportionment of the Jordan River waters. Consequently, both Israel and the Arabs have gone about the construction of their own diversion projects.

I think it is extremely important to note at this point that construction of diversion projects by the Israel Government along the Jordan River is in line with the broad plan included in the Johnston proposal. It was Eric Johnston who in 1953 proposed the Jordan Valley plan for water power and irrigation projects to benefit the Arab States as well as Israel. We are well aware of the wrecking tactics used by Nasser to upset the carefully worked our Johnston proposal. But I think that this conference should not lose sight of the fact that President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, and today, President Johnson are formally committed to the Johnston proposal for distribution of water resources in the Middle East.

I know of nothing which has occurred since Eric Johnston first proposed this plan which has either changed the American position or would justify any change in American position. What is needed today is a bold reaffirmation by the United States of the Johnston proposal and then, if necessary, a complete assurance of assistance by the United States if Israel decides to unilaterally complete this proposal.

We are well aware of the tension that such action will produce in the Middle East, but I am quite certain that development of this program would help lead toward a partial solution of the water problem. Firmness on our part at this time in supporting Israel, in my judgment, will bring the Arab States into line even though we know the extent of mischief and actual brutality that they are capable of generating in their protest.

But the free world has tried to work both sides of the street on this very difficult problem too long. It is my hope that we will take a decisive position in supporting Israel on this matter at this time.

So much for the waters from the Jordan. The United States has also embarked upon the second of the possible means of increasing the available water supply of the Middle East; namely, desalinization schemes. Because the issue of the insufficient water looms so large as a source of both present and possible future friction between Israel and the Arabs, we have undertaken discussions with Israel for mutual programs to discover an economical way to desalt sea water.

The first step was taken last June when Prime Minister Levi Eshkol and President Johnson established a joint survey team to conduct technical surveys in order to define the scope and requirements of the program. On the basis of the economic and engineering studies which were carried cut, the Chairman of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, the Acting Secretary of the Interior, the Israel Ambassador, and the Coordinator of Israel's water desalting project signed a principles of understanding agreement in October. Both Governments have issued invitations to American engineering and consulting firms to participate in the second step: a detailed engineering study for a large desalting project in order to meet Israel's pressing demands for more fresh water.

This international effort to develop an inexpensive and feasible method of desalinization of sea water may one day prove to be one of the greatest technical feats of human engineering. Huge tracts of the earth's surface could be made productive if only sufficient supplies of fresh water could be brought to them. In this way, one may hope that not only will the problem of insufficient food for much of the world's population be alleviated, but also that disagreements over a limited supply of water will loom less large in an overall settlement for areas such as the Middle East.

American policy has in recent years shown a greater awareness of the aspirations of the peoples of the Middle East, as well as a willingness to assist those who desire our help in building for the future. It is our hope that by continuing to maintain a balanced and constructive relationship with the whole area, and by cooperating in mutual development schemes such as I have outlined, both the problem of water and that most precious of all goals—peace—may eventually be solved in at least this corner of our globe.

But ours is not an easy road to travel in the Middle East. Nor is it easy for our ally Israel to continually turn the other cheek when the Arab States repeatedly renege on their agreements—agreements executed in good faith by both Israel, the United Nations, and the United States.

It is my belief that peace can be brought a little closer to reality when the water problem is resolved in the Middle East. It would be my hope the United States will stand firm in supporting the moderate proposals of Israel in bringing about such a solution. It is only a firm position that the Arab States understand. I am sure in our firm and resolute support of Israel lies the only road to peace in the Middle East.

Price Stability

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 21, 1965

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial of the Wall Street Journal of April 19, 1965, on the issue that price stability and equilibrium in the balance of payments constitute an indispensable prerequisite for sustained development.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 19, 1965]

REVIEW AND OUTLOOK—A GREEK HAS THE WORDS FOR IT

If a nation wants a satisfactory rate of economic growth, it must reconcile itself to "a little" inflation and some difficulties with its balance of international payments. So, anyway, runs the reasoning prevalent in Washington and certain other world capitals.

In that context it is interesting to browse through "Monetary Equilibrium and Economic Development," a book published by Princeton University Press and written by Xenophon Zolotas, governor of the Bank of Greece. For Mr. Zolotas has no patience at all with the idea that a nation can inflate itself into long and sustained economic growth.

"The maintenance of relative price stability and equilibrium in the balance of payments," he declares, "is not only compatible with a rapid and sustained development process but is, in fact, an indispensable prerequisite of it." Mr. Zolotas is concerned mainly with his own underdeveloped Greece, but his assessment also applies to more "advanced" nations.

The European banker cheerfully concedes that for "a certain limited period" rapid economic growth can go hand in hand with inflationary monetary policies and a persistent deficit in the balance of payments. Sooner or later, however, lax financial policies will begin to cut into a nation's economic growth, a process that can become cumulative.

One reason is that a nation at some point runs into shortages of some types of material and manpower, as is already beginning to happen in the United States. A government which nonetheless continues the stimulus of artificially easy money, high spending and budget deficits may contribute less to the growth of the economy than it does to the growth of price inflation.

Inflated prices, of course, can only worsen a nation's balance-of-payments problems by making its exports relatively less marketable abroad. In the United States, it's worth noting, those payments problems have stemmed in large part from "expansionary" domestic financial policies; the economy has been flooded with so much money that investors and businessmen generally have been pushed into finding new outlets for funds overseas.

If a government in that situation merely forces businessmen or investors to bring a lot of their money home, the result can hardly help but be new pressure for domestic price inflation. Nor is the result likely to be different when, as is the current U.S. case, the governmental tactic is chiefly "persuasion" instead of outright compulsion. And more inflation means more pressure on the balance of payments, and so on.

Mr. Zolotas does not suggest that governments should give up trying to spur economic growth—far from it. What he is urging is that, for the sake of economic growth among other things, a government should pursue a policy of financial moderation.

This means, as we read his views, that a government should gear its creation of money and credit to realistically attainable estimates of future economic growth. He would look askance, in other words, at a condition such as that of the United States, where bank credit for several years has been growing a good deal faster than the economy.

A policy of financial moderation, by lessening fears of inflation, would promote business confidence—which is, after all, essential to economic growth. By eliminating artificially low interest rates, the policy also would encourage more investment at home instead of abroad.

A government following a policy of moderation in its own spending can open the way to beneficial tax reductions, not just those that increase budget deficits. In that way private resources are freed to boost the growth of the economy instead of the growth of the government.

As a government grows, Mr. Zolotas implies, so does its estimate of its ability to guide the economy to endless expansion. The result in Greece is a growth-impeding "multitude of uncoordinated and often contradictory measures which have accumulated over a long period of time and are now piled up in a chaotic whole."

Although Mr. Zolotas deals mainly with his native land rather than the United States, this Greek obviously has the words for it, too. Were Washington but listening, the advice is a gift not to beware but to be heeded.

Proposed Voting Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 19, 1965

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, at the outset I wish to reaffirm and reemphasize my support of the Constitution of the United States and particularly in reference to the 15th amendment which assures the right to vote to all citizens regardless of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

While this may seem a superfluous and unnecessary statement to make, I do so in view of the recent fervor and wave of emotionalism concerning efforts to implement the provisions of the 15th amendment.

I do not believe that there is great difference among the people of the United States as to the meaning of the 15th amendment, and the desirability as well as the necessity for enforcing it whenever the rights of any of our citizens to vote are denied or abridged. It seems, however, that any objection or criticism voiced against the pending proposal made by the President of the United States causes an immediate inference that the individual making the criticism is not sympathetic to the 15th amendment or willing to support enforcement of it.

I recognize that the 15th amendment provides for its enforcement by the Congress and I am willing to support legislation to achieve this. In fact, I will support legislation far more extensive in character than the proposal made by the President, if such action is required.

However, I think we should make every effort first to establish just what is required. The President's bill obviously was hurriedly written under the stress of great emotion. It is fraught with inconsistencies and inequities and therefore must be thoroughly studied and debated.

We must make certain that in our effort to prevent violation of the 15th amendment we do not "burn down the barn in order to get rid of the rats." I am afraid that this is what the proposal made by the President does as it now stands and certainly we can all agree that two wrongs do not make a single right.

Among my objections to the proposal offered by the President is that while it attempts to protect the rights of citizens under the 15th amendent, it violates article I, section 2, as well as the 17th amendment of the Constitution, which specifically provides for the States to set the qualifications of voters.

The present bill, in my opinion, denies due process and equal protection of the law, as guaranteed by the 14th amendment, to a large segment of our people in the States to which it applied. Further, it would seem that the bill as written inflicts punishment without judicial hearing and is therefore a "bill of attainder" in violation of section 9 of article I of the Constitution.

It seems that there should be some way of preventing unfair application of voter qualifications without eliminating the qualifications entirely. While we all agree that there should be equal right to vote I think we likewise can agree that there should be a reasonable requirement of intelligence. However, if the separate States do not care to make this minimum requirement they are not required to do so by the Constitution but neither are they prevented from so doing.

Another serious deficiency in the President's proposal is that it uses an arbitrary, and, in fact, punitive formula by which we would enforce the 15th amendment. The formula assumes, that discrimination exists in some six States in this Nation, but not in the other States. Its double application would make it necessary for Federal registrars to come into my own State, Virginia, and register an illiterate voter because less than 50 percent voted and we have a literacy test. But in New York State, where a literacy test is also required, the same illiterate voter would not be allowed to register because New York's literacy test is not questioned since more than 50 percent of the adult population voted in the last election there.

It has been observed that because of the literacy test embodied in the Constitution of the State of New York, thousands of Puerto Ricans, who are literate in Spanish but not in English, are disfranchised. Under the administration's proposal this practice is perfectly legal. The question could well be asked about other States, particularly the State of Texas, where less than 50 percent of the adult population went to the polls in 1964. But Texas is not included in the legislation because a literacy test is not used. Could public apathy and lack of a strong two-party system in Texas have been responsible for less than 50 percent participation—or could there have been discrimination which should bring the State of Texas under this bill, which certainly should be seeking to enforce the 15th amendment equally for all citizens regardless of where they live?

Mr. Speaker, I will support a proper proposal that will implement and enforce the provisions of the 15th amendment equally and uniformly throughout every State of this Nation without prohibiting reasonable provisions requiring minimum intelligence and standards of citizenship. The present proposals do not meet these standards.

Tribute to Earl J. Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. PEARSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 21, 1965

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, Earl J. Johnson, chief of the worldwide news operations of United Press International, retired not long ago. Kansas is proud to claim Mr. Johnson as a native son, as he was born, raised, and educated in Kansas. We congratulate him at the conclusion of a unique and distinguished career.

I ask that an article, appearing in the New York Times, saluting Mr. Johnson, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHIEF UPI NEWS EXECUTIVE RETIRES

(By McCandlish Phillips)

Within a century Kansas has produced two unusual news editors. One was William Allen White, of the Emporia Gazette, who became famous in the English-speaking world. The other is an editor virtually nobody but newsmen know.

White was born at Emporia in 1868. He won renown as an editorialist and interpreter of Middle Western small town culture.

Earl J. Johnson came out of the grain and livestock center of Winfield, Kans., where he was born at the turn of the century. He caught on as a wire service reporter in Chicago in 1921, and found it "precisely my dish right off."

Last week he retired as chief of the worldwide news operations of United Press International.

THIRTY YEARS ON THE JOB

For 30 years he was editor of the round-the-clock wires that never cease their rapid clacking. Reporters and editors under him in 265 bureaus fed a continuous flow of news to 6,066 newspapers and radio-television stations in 114 nations and territories.

Mr. Johnson's aim was to make the news report "digestible, even if not appetizing," as he edited the service through World War II, nuclear bombings, Korea, Vietnam, and the emergence of satellites and men in orbit.

Five long days a week—roughly from 9 a.m. to 7:30 p.m.—Mr. Johnson's post was in his office at 220 East 42d Street, with the UPI's wire always running at his left hand. The top foreign and domestic reports rolled out on yards of yellow paper at 3,000 words an hour.

On the job, he said in an interview last week, "you sort of tie in with the leased-wire system, and you and it seem to become all part of the same nervous system."

Mr. Johnson lived close to the office—a 4-minute ride by taxi in an emergency—at 455 East 57th Street. The apartment had two tie-lines direct to the office, one in his bedroom and one in the library.

Said a man who used to run the late-night desk at United Press here: "A story would be breaking and Johnson would call and ask two or three questions and would have you nailed right to the wall. He knew everything going on in the world and he would go immediately—immediately—to the crux of the matter and how you should get at it."

In Mr. Johnson's view, "the main thing is to stay flexible and on top of the news. The emphasis in the news shifts from hour to hour, and there's never a point at which you can stop and say, 'that's that.' Unlike a newspaper, here you never have a complete product."

Anywhere in the world, a reporter who was really coming in with a good job on a fast-breaking story was likely to get "a cheer" from the boss: A short message—"Well handled. Terrific performance." or "You hit that one right on the nose."—signed E.J.J.

Because of Mr. Johnson's singular ability to inspire enthusiasm in reporters, a great many young men were willing, as one old hand put it, "to knock their guts out for 3 years for Earl Johnson and good old team for $30 a week" before moving on to bigger news jobs elsewhere.

TOOK A JOB AT 17

The war draft was on in 1917 when he quit high school to take a job with the Winfield Courier (3,000 copies daily). The Courier found itself with "an overage editor and one or two women," so the draft-proof lad of 17 became "quite a wheel covering city hall, the courts, and the chamber of commerce.

At the University of Kansas he became the campus correspondent for the Kansas City Journal, the morning paper, and the Kansas City Post, the evening paper.

"The Post was a very flashy paper, and they paid $7.50 a column," Mr. Johnson recalled. "So, if you discovered that the girls in some sorority were shaving their legs because some doctor told you he'd gone over to treat a cut, they'd take it and run in right down page 1."

At 22 he headed the Cleveland bureau of the United Press, then went back to Chicago as night editor in 1925. He ran the European service as "Hitler was coming up and things were beginning to bubble" in 1933–34, and became editor of the entire service in 1935.

Mr. Johnson, an articulate, undramatic, "deeply inquisitive man with a curiosity that ranges over the whole field of human experience," as a former UPI foreign editor put it, showed a capacity to work fast and remain "completely unflustered" in the midst of any crisis.

AN ABLE CONVERSATIONALIST

With a ready wit and an almost bottomless store of anecdotes, Mr. Johnson was able to converse on a staggering variety of subjects. As one former subordinate put it:

"He would talk with you about the most abstruse point of religious doctrine that you could think of. Then when the next guy walked in, he would talk with him about the bawdy houses of Cairo."

At one time Mr. Johnson had working under him a foreign news analyst who made a habit of leaving the office several times a day to drop into a nearby tavern.

One day the analyst's absences were longer and more frequent than usual. His wife telephoned Mr. Johnson next morning to say the man could not come to work because of a cold.

"I know," Mr. Johnson replied. "I saw him catching it yesterday."

Associates knew Mr. Johnson as "a real stripped-down kind of pro" who never projected his own personality into his work. Yet he savored deeply the romance of journalism.

"Surely these have been golden years for newsmen, and the end is not in sight," he wrote in a final weekly memo to editors. "Yesterday a man walked among the stars. Tomorrow he will step onto the moon."

After 44 years of facing "a deadline every minute," Mr. Johnson will not cover that story. He and his wife are having a house built at Southampton, L.I., far from the endless chatter of the teletype machines.

Uncreative Federalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, in the Wall Street Journal of April 13 there appeared an editorial entitled "Uncreative Federalism." On April 15 another editorial entitled "The Veneer of Pragmatism" appeared. Both of these editorials should be of real interest to the Members of the House:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 13, 1965]

UNCREATIVE FEDERALISM

When President Johnson signed the bill authorizing $1.1 billion for Federal programs in Appalachia, he hailed it as a true example of creative federalism. Yet that same federalism is impeding possibly more significant developments of private enterprise in the same area.

Specifically, a private electric power company in Appalachia is ready to spend $910 million of its own money on two power projects. So far it is being held back from spending a dime by Congress and a Federal agency.

For several years the Duke Power Co., serving customers in North and South Carolina, has been trying to get Congress to approve a proposed $210 million powerplant on the Savannah River. Federal law provides that Congress must sanction any powerplant built on a navigable river or stream. Some Congressmen are insisting that unless approval of a neighboring Federal power project is tied to any bill allowing the Duke project, they won't vote for the latter, though it is hard to see why each should not be considered on its own merits.

The second project, in upper South Carolina, requires only a license from the Federal Power Commission. It would represent an investment of $700 million in an area now qualifying for aid-to-Appalachia funds, but the project is opposed by federally financed rural electric cooperatives on the ground that some day a Federal plant might be built there (none now is planned) from which they could get preferential treatment. Meanwhile the FPC amiably has granted a delay in further hearings on the project at the request of the Interior Department, which also wants to intervene.

Moreover, the Duke projects actually involve more than the $910 million plant cost. An industry rule of thumb is that for every $1 spent to generate power in an area, another $3 is invested by industrial customers there, old and new. That new business is gained by adequate power is reflected in the company's claim that, serving 25 percent of the Carolinas' land area, it has helped to attract 50 percent of the States new industries in the last 5 years.

So if creative federalism is active in Appalachia, it does not seem to be doing much for what could be, by the $3-for-$1 rule of thumb, a revenue-producing private investment of much larger scope. Surely it is a strange inconsistency when federalism—which can create nothing without first taxing the rewards of private initiative—whoops it up for a $1.1 billion handout while it lets creative business, with its own spending program potentially three times as big, go begging.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 15, 1965]

THE VENEER OF PRAGMATISM

The education bill President Johnson signed Sunday is offered as, among other things, a monument to his administration's professed pragmatism. By so completely stressing the educational plight of children from poor families, public argument for the bill painted it as neatly tailored to attack a specific pressing problem, not the sweeping aid-to-education proposals liberal Democrats have pushed in prior years.

The argument, while it proved an effective sales pitch, seems based far more on illusion than reality. A few largely political concessions helped create an impression the bill was pragmatically designed to meet particular needs. In substance, though, it would take real effort to devise a program departing less from the old doctrinaire proposals.

A more specific approach would respond to an important criticism of most Federal aid programs—that they spread themselves so thinly they end up almost completely ineffective. Moreover, there are unquestioned educational problems related to poverty in certain areas. Some rural school districts do not have the funds modern education so often demands. In big cities the exodus to suburbs has eroded tax bases just as the growth of slums created huge educational demands.

The current act's proponents stressed these needs, pointing to that part of the measure's fund allocation formula based on the number of students from poorer families. A specific aid for the poor, this approach is indirect enough to begin with. Certainly there are poor students everywhere; but most districts can help their own without outside help. In most schools a good education is already there for the taking by either rich or poor. Giving such districts aid intended for the impoverished merely takes it away from those with real needs.

Even this modest attempt to help poorer districts, though, was largely undermined by a second item in the allocation formula giving more help to States which already have high per pupil expenditures. The formula gives to the poor districts with one hand and takes away with the other.

The upshot is that Federal aid will go to 94 percent of the Nation's counties. Only some 10 percent of its funds will go to the four Southern States most often cited as educationally backward. Less than 20 percent will go to the 24 largest cities with distinct urban problems. Moreover, it gives local districts large latitude in spending which doubtless means that the funds will often go into general coffers rather than specific programs for the poor.

So it seems the Nation now has the general educational aid proposed so often in the past. Underlining the departure from pragmatism, this innovation comes just at a time local districts have pretty well validated the con-

tention that the need is far from widespread.

Current school enrollments reflect the peak of the "baby boom" which originally engendered the pleas for Federal help. Yet, as our Mr. Sullivan pointed out on this page recently, the average class size per teacher is at a low record low. Teachers' salaries have increased at twice the national average in the last decade. Local districts are building classrooms at a rate 15 percent above the Government's own estimate of need.

Choosing this time to press for what amounts to general aid certainly seems to indicate only the most rigid thinking. The only strong evidence of pragmatism in the education act comes in its clever political opportunism. It gives parochial schools just enough aid to quell their opposition, but not enough to inflame their opponents. It creates an impression of aiding the poor, but courts votes from other districts by actually broadcasting Federal funds.

Unfortunately, it may be true that this is typical of what passes for pragmatism in the current administration. Under analysis, it seems nothing more than the old doctrinaire formulas covered with a deceptive political veneer.

President Johnson's Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH M. MONTOYA
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 21, 1965

Mr. MONTOYA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial relative to President Johnson's farm program. This editorial was published recently in the Independent, an Anderson, S.C., newspaper.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Independent, Anderson (S.C.), Apr. 12, 1965]

PRESIDENT TAKES STEPS TO BRING FARMER IMPROVEMENTS HE DESERVES

The trouble with the American farmer is that he's just too efficient.

He can produce enough food to feed himself and 45 other people whereas, by contrast, the collectivized peasant-farmer of the Soviet Union can manage to do no better than to feed himself and seven others. The American farmer surpassed that level at the turn of the century.

The American farmer does well by the American consumer, whose food bill now amounts to only 18 percent of his income, while in the Soviet Union the figure is 53 percent, and in the United Kingdom and France it's 30 and 32 percent, respectively. Mississippi Senator JAMES EASTLAND estimated recently that if, in 1965, Americans were paying the same percentage of their income for food as they paid in 1935, they'd be shelling out another $24.6 billion for food.

But the American farmer has done less well by himself. While the incomes of most other segments of the economy have been rising within the last several years, his has been falling. His enormous efficiency, as President Johnson pointed out in his message to Congress the other day, has left him "working harder and enjoying it less." His prices are 5 percent lower than they were 15 years ago, and the parity index, which stood at 100 percent in 1949, stands today at about 75 percent. That means the farmer's dollar is worth only three-fourths of what it was worth 15 or 16 years ago.

The President is proposing a number of adjustments in present commodity programs which, he expects, will improve things considerably. His aim is to see that the farmer gets more for his work while the consumer is getting more for his money—and if the Federal Goverment is able to save some money in the process, so much the better.

Mr. Johnson's proposed farm bill is concentrated on four commodities—rice, wheat, feed grains and wool; a cotton program will come later. Basically, the programs are designed to increase domestic support levels, with somewhat larger price supports for small producers of rice and wool than are received by the big producers, while providing lower prices for export markets.

To a degree, the President's farm plan involves a shift of the cost of the support burden from the Federal Treasury to the consumers, but the displacement—as far as consumers are concerned—will be scarcely noticeable, whereas the added income for farmers will be significant and welcome.

The direct relationship between the price of commodities on the farm and the price in the grocery store is, as the President pointed out, a thing of the past. Marketing charges now account for nearly two-thirds of retail food prices. "A 50-cent increase in the price of a bushel of wheat, for example, will increase the cost of a loaf of bread by little more than 1 cent," Mr. Johnson declared.

Following the suggestions of a recent Presidential study panel, Mr. Johnson is suggesting a long-term crop adjustment program which could assist elderly farmers to retire, help ease the transition for those small farmers who want to quit operations themselves and, in the process, retire about 50 million acres from production.

There's nothing radical about any of these ideas, which is just as well, and there's nothing sacred about them, either. Congress will take a long, hard look at all of them, as it should. But the direction seems sound. The American farmer is not looking for special favors, but he wants—and he is entitled to have—an equal chance.

Cigarette Debate Still Smoking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 19, 1965

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, because of the great concern expressed over cigarettes of late, I believe it is timely to include in the RECORD the informative article by Charles Bartlett appearing in the April 13 issue of the Washington Post. As usual, Mr. Bartlett's analysis of this important matter is masterfully done and I am proud to insert it in the RECORD:

CIGARETTE DEBATE STILL SMOKING

(By Charles Bartlett)

Congress appears ready to require cigarettes to be labeled as hazards to health but the reform spirit may not be strong enough to require that the warning be projected into the wonderful world of cigarette advertising.

This world in which freshness, taste, and flavor abound is protected on both sides of the Capitol by agents of the 22 States in which tobacco farmers abound. The latent perils medically ascribed to cigarettes seem less persuasive at present than the momentum of an industry with annual gross sales exceeding $7 billion.

The hearings have been partially distorted by an effort to convince the legislators that the Surgeon General's Advisory Committee erred in its finding that cigarette smoking is "causally related to lung cancer in men" and bears some relationship to other lung diseases. A parade of dissenting doctors and scientists has gone before the Senate and House committees.

Congress is ill equipped to make medical judgments, particularly upon the mountain of evidence that was analyzed by the advisory committee, as impartial and qualified a panel as could be assembled. These findings are supported by similar studies in Britain, Italy and Sweden, and by a recent poll of American physicians. Of the 62,000 doctors responding to the poll, 95 percent described smoking as a health hazard and only 2.8 percent maintained that it was not.

The tobacco industry wants national legislation in order to avoid the complexities of State legislation. It will accept a labeling requirement, which will ward off lawsuits by victims of lung cancer. But the industry does not want to be forced to include the health warning in its advertising, as the Federal Trade Commission proposes.

Some Senators ask why advertisers should not similarly be obliged to warn against the danger of detergents if you drink them or of automobiles if you crash them. The answer is that those advertisers are not trying to induce people to drink detergents or crash automobiles. The cigarette ads, on the other hand, specifically entreat the consumer to take a step known to be hazardous.

The cigarette companies maintain that the value of their television advertising will be negated by a necessity to include the health warning. But many have noted from the tobacco sales figures that this advertising, doubled by some companies since the concern over cigarettes arose, has managed already to negate the impact of the warning by the Surgeon General's Committee.

Congress' dislike to intrude upon freedom of advertising is challenged in this case by the potency of the cigarette advertisers, who currently sponsor 55 television programs on 3 networks. Against this propaganda, the warning by the advisery committee will be no more likely to stand than the words of England's King James I, who denounced smoking in 1604 as "a custom loathsome to the eye, harmful to the brain, dangerous to the lungs."

Now marked as more hazardous and habit-forming than alcohol, cigarettes enjoy a freedom from advertising restraints that Congress took away from alcohol in 1935. The Treasury Department supervises liquor advertising in a way that has kept it off television and free of the romantic and social inferences that figure in the cigarette ads.

The tobacco industry has just begun to police itself with a code that bans testimonials by celebrities along with other misleading appeals to youth. This is evidently a sincere effort, but it does not come to grips with the basic issue of whether the public interest is served by urging people to smoke without warning them that their health may be damaged.

President Johnson has stood aloof from this issue. Aids say this is not because two close friends, Abe Fortas and Earle Clements, have been retained by the tobacco companies or because of his own television properties. The President's aloofness is ascribed to the fact that intervention will bring problems with powerful legislators from tobacco States.

The House is expected to pass a bill that will defer to the wishes of the tobacco industry. The Senate is uncertain because of the zeal of Senator MAURINE NEUBERGER, Democrat, of Oregon, and the optimism that Sen-

ator WARREN MAGNUSON, Democrat, of Washington, the cigar-smoking chairman of the Commerce Committee, will prove reluctant to leave the health of the young within reach of the admen.

Lexington, Ky., Keeps Clay's Memory Fresh

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 21, 1965

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the Washington Star of April 17, 1965, entitled "Lexington, Ky., Keeps Clay's Memory Fresh," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. This article was written in connection with the Consultation on Church Union, which met in Lexington last week, and it pays tribute to the town, its people, and the memory of a great Kentuckian, Henry Clay.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star, Apr. 17, 1965]

THE HUMAN SIDE OF RELIGION: LEXINGTON, KY., KEEPS CLAY'S MEMORY FRESH

(By Caspar Nannes)

The memory of Henry Clay, the great Kentucky Senator who ran for President three times, is still very much alive in Lexington, Ky., where the Consultation on Church Union met last week.

There is a large and attractive Henry Clay High School plus many other institutions and places of business using the statesman's revered name. Nearly 100 student band members of the high school came to Washington last Sunday to take part in the Cherry Blossom Festival parade along Constitution Avenue.

Recently, Clay's still-beautiful home in a fine residential section of Lexington was designated by Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall as "a registered national historic landmark."

DESIGNED BY LATROBE

It is good this was done, for the building and the surrounding estate are visual monuments to the glories of an earlier period in our country's life. Born in Hanover County Va., Clay came to Lexington in 1797 when a young man of 20. About 1805 he bought land for his home. Seven years later he added to it, so that he owned about 400 acres when Benjamin Latrobe, architect of the U.S. Capitol, designed the building.

Taking cognizance of the many majestic ash trees on the grounds, Clay named his home Ashland. A great deal of the ash woodwork in the house came from the trees on the estate.

Ashland is two stories high in the center, with wings of one story on either side. Today it is partially covered by ivy, adding a special charm to the 18th-century style of architecture. The building, set back from the street, is surrounded by well-wept gardens, 50 kinds of trees and numerous walks.

Four Presidents—three while in office—visited at Ashland. They were James Madison, James Monroe, Martin Van Buren and Abraham Lincoln. The last came before he was elected President. His wife, Mary Todd, was born in Lexington, knew the Clays intimately and visited them frequently. After moving to Springfield, Ill., and marrying Lincoln, she brought him to Lexington for a visit.

Daniel Webster and Marquis de Lafayette also were among the great figures to stay at Ashland. The latter visited Clay in 1825.

FURNITURE REMAINS

Ashland has been kept very much as it was in Clay's time. Much of the original furniture, some of which had been brought from France, is still in the home.

Statues, statuettes, and portraits of Clay are everywhere. A huge oil portrait, copied by Andrews in 1852 from the John Neagle painting which belongs to the Union League of Philadelphia, hangs at the top of the stairway at the second floor.

Probably best remembered for his Missouri Compromise of 1821, Clay played a leading role in laws still influencing our Nation. Among them were legislation for good roads, stabilizing the national currency and laying down fiscal policies that still affect the banking system.

Recently Members of the U.S. Senate voted to honor the five most influential Senators by having their portraits painted and hung near the Senate Chamber. Those chosen were Daniel Webster, John C. Calhoun, Robert M. LaFollette, Robert A. Taft, and Henry Clay. It was reported Clay received the highest number of ballots.

TWO MORE KENTUCKIANS

Press rooms are too often uncomfortable, poorly lighted places set aside by conventions as an afterthought. But those at the Phoenix Hotel during the Consultation on Church Union were light, airy, and spacious.

Perhaps this came about because the two rooms were named after famous Kentucky figures—Stephen C. Foster and John C. Breckenridge.

Foster's fame is still fresh as his beloved songs—"My Old Kentucky Home," "Old Black Joe," "Swanee River" among others—are still sung.

Breckenridge, one of three candidates who opposed Lincoln in the 1860 presidential election, has receded into history for most people, but his importance receives tribute in Kentucky.

SOLDIER HONORED

Another home having historic associations stands a few streets from the heart of Lexington—the Morgan house. Set in a quiet neighborhood near Transylvania College, oldest school of higher education west of the Alleghenies, the building of gray stones, white doors, and narrow elongated windows is enclosed by a low iron fence. Behind the house is a small garden with shade trees and red brick walks.

Outside the house a plaque has been erected. It states this is the "Home of John Hunt Morgan, 'Thunderbolt of the Confederacy'; born, Huntsville, Ala., June 1, 1825; killed at Greenville, Tenn., September 4, 1864; lieutenant, Kentucky Volunteers in the Mexican War, 1846–47; major general, CSA (Confederate States of America), 1861–64."

A legend still heard in Lexington is that on one occasion Morgan rode his horse into the livingroom of the house, leaned down to kiss his mother goodby, and then galloped the animal out the other side as pursuing Union soldiers came on the scene.

Presidential Inability and Vacancies in the Office of the Vice President

SPEECH
OF
HON. RODNEY M. LOVE
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 13, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases when the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office.

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 1, as amended because I believe the U.S. Constitution is not only ambiguous, but defective, on the subject of presidential disability and that we, as a nation, have been extremely fortunate that our Presidents have been able to discharge their constitutional responsibilities. The office of Vice President was made vacant due to the tragic death of President Kennedy and there has been no procedure for filling it.

In support of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], the American Bar Association and its affiliate, the National Forum, I submitted a bill of my own, House Joint Resolution 236, for not only does my bill support House Joint Resolution 1, it calls attention to the problem relating to the period of time before a disabled President should resume the powers and duties of his office.

I know the people of my district would want me to speak out in favor of such an amendment to the Constitution because they are very aware of the problems created by the tragic death of President Kennedy. I was encouraged by the fact that my remarks—made at the many meetings throughout my district prior to my election—on the Senate resolution passed during the 88th Congress engendered much public interest and support.

In my testimony before the House Judiciary Committee I made no references to history. This had been most carefully documented and repetition is unnecessary. I merely wanted to emphasize that prudence requires this representative body to act now to submit to the State legislatures an amendment to correct a defect known to us for many, many years.

In addition to supporting the overall effort, I wanted to point out to the committee what I considered to be a danger in the event a President would transmit to the Congress his written declaration that no inability exists. The aforementioned resolution originally provided that the President shall resume the powers and duties of his office unless the Vice President, with the written concurrence of a majority of the heads of the executive department, or such other body as Congress may by law provide, transmits within 2 days to the Congress his written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office.

My question was: What could happen within that 2-day period in the event an incompetent President resumed the duties of his office and issued orders affecting the security of the Nation? While I agreed that the President should be able to regain the powers and duties of his office easily when his inability ceases to exist, nevertheless, the Vice President should have time to file a written declaration with the Congress before the presumption in favor of the President's ability is restored.

To accomplish this, I provided in my resolution that the President shall resume the powers and duties of his office on the third day following the transmittal of such declaration to the Congress unless, prior to the end of the third day, the Vice President, with the appropriate consent of executive department heads, transmits to the Congress his written declaration that the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office. I used 3 days on the theory that the President's written declaration could be submitted on Friday and Congress might not be in session over the weekend.

However, during the committee deliberations the majority adopted language, as set forth in section 4 of House Joint Resolution 1, which I find to be satisfactory and will correct for the most part that which my resolution points out as needing clarification.

I support this resolution and urge its passage.

Farmers Can't Tailor Production to Demand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. PEARSON
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 21, 1965

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, Clifford R. Hope, formerly a Congressman from Kansas, and the esteemed chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, continues to serve Kansas in a number of ways. In his widely read column published in the Salina Journal, Cliff Hope explains in a few short paragraphs the problems of agriculture in general, the plight of the farmer, and the effect of pending Federal legislation on the agriculture of western Kansas.

I ask that this concise, informative article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARMERS CAN'T TAILOR PRODUCTION TO DEMAND
(By Clifford R. Hope)

Most of the economic problems which affect farmers today have come about because farm capacity for production has increased faster than effective demand for farm products.

The greater part of the benefits of this increased capacity and efficiency has gone to consumers. Our people as a whole are spending a smaller part of their income for food than ever before in this or any other nation.

The farmer's trouble is that he is unable fully to participate in our economic system, where prices in general are based on supply and demand. Other producers are in a position to equate production with market demand. They produce what they think they can sell. Even if they miscalculate, they can make adjustments before too much harm is done.

Labor, through organization and legislation, has seen to it that workers get their share of increased efficiency in industry—not only in wage increases and protection against unemployment, but in retirement provisions and other fringe benefits. This fits in with our general economic system and strengthens it.

NO WAY FOR FARMERS

But 3 million widely scattered farmers competing with each other, whose production depends on the vagaries of the weather and the uncertainties of plant and animal diseases, and whose products are for the most part perishable, have no way to use the devices available to other producers to adjust supply to expected demand.

The principle of using the instrumentalities of government to do those things which need to be done, and which people cannot do for themselves, has been accepted and used since our birth as a nation. This is the basis of our Government farm programs. Some have succeeded, some have failed. It has been a matter of trial and error. A lot has been learned by experience.

Perhaps the most important lesson has been that each commodity or group of commodities has its separate problems. That is easily illustrated in western Kansas where four-fifths of our farm income is derived from three commodities—wheat, cattle, and feed grains. While all three of them may be, and frequently are produced on the same farm, there are differences in both production and marketing which put each in a different category as far as farm programs are concerned.

CATTLE FUTURE GOOD

For many years cattle have been produced almost entirely for the domestic market, although byproducts like hides and tallow have been exported. Traditionally, the policy has been to afford some protection from imports by duties on both live cattle and beef. Sanitary regulations have also had the effect of restricting imports. Recently enacted legislation has imposed quotas on a moderate scale. This, together with increasing world demand, has reduced imports considerably below the levels of a year or so ago. Domestic prices are also more stable. While there will always be ups and downs, the future for cattle in western Kansas looks good.

Until recently, feed grains have been grown mostly for domestic consumption. Since they are largely fed on the farms where grown, or in the same area, market prices are not as important as livestock prices although they are necessarily related. Hybrid corn and sorghums, together with expanded use of fertilizer, better farming practices and irrigation, have substantially expanded production.

EXPORT FEED

New markets in Western Europe and Japan have increased feed grain exports tremendously. Prospects for further expansion are good. During the past year or two it has been possible to export without a subsidy.

Voluntary acreage diversion programs in recent years plus exports has resulted in diminishing the carryover to reasonable proportions. It is expected that the 2-year program now in effect which also provides for substitution between feed grains and wheat will be extended during this congressional session.

REALISTIC PLANS

As to wheat, the programs offered under the McGovern and Young-Carlson bills in the Senate and the Purcell bill in the House, all of which extend the present voluntary program with some improvements, are expertly tailored to meet today's problems. It is understood that the administration bill will be similar.

The wheat and feed grain bills which I have mentioned and the quota legislation on beef imports, while differing in many particulars, have two important things in common. One is that each deals realistically and effectively with the special problems of the commodity affected. The other is that taken together, they constitute a consistent overall program for most of our agricultural activities in western Kansas.

Oklahoma's Kay Bass Named Nation's Outstanding Cotton Ginner of 1964

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 19, 1965

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that Mr. Kay Bass, of Durant, Okla., who is one of my constituents and also one of my best friends, was recently named "Outstanding Cotton Ginner of 1964" by the National Cotton Ginners' Association.

This is the highest honor possible for a member of the cotton ginning industry. I have known Kay Bass for many years. While I knew of his great abilities as a cotton ginner only by repuations, I have always known personally of his great human abilities. He is a man of character, intelligence, and affable charm. I am proud of his receiving this great honor and enclose for all Members an article which appeared in the April 10 issue of the Cotton Gin & Old Mill Press:

NATION'S TOP GINNER IS PRODUCER AND MERCHANT

Kay Bass, of Durant, Okla., is well aware of the problem when the cotton merchant tells the ginner the mills want a better quality cotton. He's equally familiar with the ginner's dilemma when he tells the grower to get cotton to the gin in the cleanest possible condition.

You see, Kay Bass is all three—grower, merchant and ginner. And he has combined all three into a successful business. His work in the ginning industry earned him the Horace Hayden Memorial Trophy as the Nation's Outstanding Cotton Ginner of 1964. This is the highest recognition given a member of the industry by the National Cotton Ginners' Association.

Bass has a background in merchandising cotton that dates back to his childhood. "I sampled cotton for my dad from the time I was able to cut a bale," he added. "That's when they brought cotton in by wagon to the square.

He admits he bought his first gin to stay in the cotton business. He bought an interest in the gin at Kenefic, Okla., north of Durant, in 1956. They later bought a gin at Coalgate.

Bass went to work in 1933 with the Cotton Co-op Association buying cotton in the Hobart area. He pasesd the Government classer's examination in Oklahoma City and returned to Durant in 1937. He classed cotton for the Government program in 1938, and operated his own f.o.b. business from 1938 to 1956. "That's when I saw the handwriting on the wall," he explains, "and got into the ginning business."

He merchandises the cotton he gins. From the producers' viewpoint—and he qualifies with 450 acres of cotton—Bass believes the small acreage producers may be on the way out. "Looks like the 15- to 25-acre farmer is a thing of the past. His cost of production is so high." Bass compares the operation with a small business in town. They major factor is volume.

"This loss may force some gins to close up," he adds. "There's no question we are

going to have to sell cotton cheaper." Cost of production must be lowered, and insect control is one of the major items, he says. One of the two gins in 1963 sold $40,000 in insecticides which represented the grower's profit.

Bass encourages his customers to follow all modern practices to obtain efficient production. The gin office at Kenefic is open year-round to provide customer services. "We try to keep up with the latest information and are trying our best to help the farmer to raise cotton. If we don't do this, we're in trouble."

For example, Bass delayed stripper harvesting of his tenant-produced crop last year to reduce the number of green bolls. The heavy harvest of green bolls was costing some of his customers as much as cent and a half a pound.

The gins also employ an entomologist who checks the fields of customers once a week during the season. "He make us money," Bass says.

The extra services, which include a fertilizer plant, help keep the gin in business. And Bass echoes the obvious opinion of many ginners when he adds: "A cotton gin just is not worth a dime if you can't gin cotton."

But he is more optimistic about his own interest in the cotton industry. "Any man in the cotton businesss this long is hooked. You can't get away from it. I can't."

That's Kay Bass. He doesn't want to get away from ginning, either.

The Bank Merger Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 21, 1965

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Richmond Times-Dispatch of April 21, 1965, entitled "The Bank Merger Bill"; and an editorial from the New York Journal-American of Thursday, April 15, 1965, entitled "Antitrust and the Banks—This Bill Needed."

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Richmond Times-Dispatch, April 21, 1965]

THE BANK MERGER BILL

Because banking is a highly sensitive, complex and nationally interdependent business, it has long been under control, regulation and supervision by the Federal Government.

For more than a century the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency has been an integral part of the national banking system.

In 1913, the Federal Reserve System was established to provide, among other major functions, additionally effective supervision of banking in the United States.

To further protect depositors (and the banking system as a whole) the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation was created in 1933, under a subsection of the Federal Reserve Act.

Under these pertinent laws, three Federal supervisory agencies must give their approval to consolidations or mergers of national banks.

Under the Bank Holding Act of 1956, as amended, the Federal Reserve must also pass upon certain acquisitions of bank stock or assets by bank holding companies, and approve mergers or consolidations of bank holding companies.

In other words, specific provisions of relevant laws repose in these competent agencies the responsibility of deciding whether bank mergers applied for would serve necessity and convenience of business and depositors in a phenomenally expanding population's economy.

However, to "make assurance doubly sure," Congress in 1960 passed a Bank Merger Act, specifying that control of mergers should be exclusively in control of the Federal supervisory agencies.

Even into this triple-protected and regulated area, the U.S. Supreme Court intruded, when it ruled (in the Philadelphia National Bank and the Lexington Bank cases) that the mergers were in violation of antitrust laws. More recently a lower Federal court, at the instigation of the Justice Department, followed the High Court's lead, and ruled that the Manufacturers-Hanover merger, in New York, was illegal.

The Federal courts not only usurped the responsibility of three executive agencies, but "vetoed" the will of Congress, as expressed in the Bank Merger Act of 1960. The reaction, in Congress and among the business and banking community, was instantaneous and wrathful.

Virginia's A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, lost no time in responding to the challenge. On April 6 he introduced Senate bill 1698 to reconfirm and amend the Bank Merger Act of 1960. It serves notice on the Justice Department, that—

"No proceedings shall hereafter be instituted or prosecuted under the antitrust laws, including the Sherman Antitrust Act and the Clayton Act against any bank insured under the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, by reason of or respect to any merger, consolidation or acquisition of stock * * * consummated before May 1960, pursuant to approval of the appropriate State or Federal bank supervisory authority.

Prompt passage is called for to let the Justice Department and Federal courts know "who's boss on the Hill."

[From the New York Journal-American, Apr. 15, 1965]

ANTITRUST AND THE BANKS—THIS BILL NEEDED

(By Leslie Gould, financial editor)

The Supreme Court being what it is today—a lawmaking body as much as it is the law-interpreting arm of the Government—the Congress is being asked again to spell out in words of one syllable its intent as to authority over bank mergers.

This is necessary because of Supreme Court decisions in bank mergers in Philadelphia and Lexington, Ky., and the U.S. district court finding in the Manufacturers Hanover Bank merger in New York.

In the first ruling ever on application of the antitrust laws to commercial banks, the Supreme Court, five to three, held in 1963 the merger of the Philadelphia National Bank and the Girard Trust Co. illegal under the Clayton Act.

On another precedent-setting decision, the Supreme Court, April a year ago, held a merger already consumated was illegal. This was the 1961 merger of the First National Bank & Trust Co. and the Security Trust Co., of Lexington. Last month the U.S. district court in Lexington ordered the merger undone.

The decision holding the Manufacturers Trust and Hanover Bank merger violated both the Sherman and the Clayton Antitrust Acts was made by U.S. District Judge Lloyd F. MacMahon in New York on March 10, last.

FILES SUIT 7 MONTHS LATER

The two banks were merged on September 8, 1961, after the Federal Reserve Board of Governors had approved the plan 2 days before. The New York State superintendent of banks had approved it on May 23, and stockholders had voted on March 8. The Justice Department, although it had 7 months notice—since stockholder approval—waited until after the merger became effective on September 8 to file its antitrust suit.

The court actions in these mergers so infuriated Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON, chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, that he has introduced Senate bill 1698 to exempt bank mergers approved under a 1960 bill sponsored by him and passed by the Congress, and signed into law.

In introducing his bill, the Virginia Senator blasted the Supreme Court, saying:

"The Supreme Court in the Philadelphia and Lexington cases has rewritten the antitrust laws and has nullified the intention of the Congress in passing the (1960) Bank Merger Act.

"My bill will reinstate the original purpose and intent of Congress when it passed the Bank Merger Act. Since, in my judgment, the Supreme Court has erroneously interpreted antitrust laws and the Bank Merger Act, my bill is drafted so as to be applicable not only to future mergers but to all mergers heretofore consumated pursuant to appropriate regulatory approval including mergers now under attack by the Department of Justice under the antitrust laws."

UP TO APPROPRIATE AGENCY

Senator ROBERTSON's bill would place bank mergers in the same category as mergers in other regulated industries approved under other statutes which delegate to the specialized agencies the responsibility for enforcement of antitrust policy. The Senator points out:

"This is the case with railroad mergers," adding:

"I am sure no one here (in the Senate) would want to turn over the problems involved in the New York Central-Pennsylvania Railroad merger to the antitrust division and the district court under the antitrust laws."

BILL COULD CLEAR AIR

When the 1960 Bank Merger Act was passed, the then Senator L. B. Johnson said:

"It provides for a thorough review by the appropriate Federal bank supervisory agency * * * and with the benefit of any information which may be supplied by the Department of Justice in the report required from them, of mergers by asset acquisitions and other means which are now and will continue to be exempt from the antimerger provisions of section 7 of the Clayton Antitrust Act."

The Robertson bill will clear up the confusion and misunderstandings resulting from the court rulings. As things stand today, any bank merger—no matter how long ago consumated—can be attacked by the antitrust lawyers.

Distinguished Wisconsin Attorney Answers False Statements in Hate Book

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 19, 1965

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, many of us last fall were astounded by

the proliferation of hate books which flooded the newsstands and sought to becloud the issues and confuse the American people.

A thoughtful speech delivered by Mr. Bruno V. Bitker, chairman of the Wisconsin Governor's Committee on the United Nations, called "The Tract That Attacked," was presented on January 29, 1965, and has been distributed by the League of Women Voters.

I recommend this statement to all who wish to keep the record straight. I believe Mr. Bitker has performed a most useful public service by carefully compiling the facts so that reasonable people can refute the wild and unsupported claims of the hate groups who seek to undermine the confidence of the American people in their institutions.

The speech follows:

THE TRACT THAT ATTACKED

There have been those who opposed the United Nations from its very beginning. There are those who philosophically stick to the comfortable thought of isolating this country from the world—a fortress America. Others, for a variety of reasons, have objected to our participation in any international organization.

The force of this opposition has flamed and faltered over the years. But for a brief period in 1964 it took on the appearance of scholarliness through the publication of a paperback book entitled, "None Dare Call It Treason." Because 1964 was a presidential year, the book managed to ride the wave as a campaign tract. It was, however, a nonpartisan treatise, attacking Republicans and Democrats alike, including some of the most distinguished Americans high in the administrations of Eisenhower and of Kennedy. In the 1964 campaign, both candidates, President Johnson and Senator Goldwater, had announced support of the United Nations.

Every charge ever made against the U.N. was made again, directly or by implication, in the book. All of them have long ago been shown to be groundless. But they now appeared in a seemingly respectable format, apparently well documented with footnotes and references. Startling as it sounds, more than 6 million copies were distributed during 1964. With such a number of potential readers, even those who recognize the tract for what it is should have the charges measured against the facts as they relate to the U.N.

CHARGE—THE U.N. WAS CONCEIVED IN SIN AND PRODUCED IN CONSPIRACY

The general overall implied charge is that the U.N. was actually organized as a part of a Communist plot to take over the world. The basis for this charge is that Alger Hiss, as a Communist agent, secretly drafted the U.N. Charter as a part of the Red scheme. It is a fact that, prior to his conviction of perjury, Hiss was an employee of the State Department. As such he undoubtedly participated in preliminary discussions about the proposed organization.

History may grant to many men the honor of inspiring the United Nations. Winston Churchill played a great part, as did others in the war period. Our own President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, took the lead in pressing for a new international organization that might prevent the horrors of another world war. The United States was determined to avoid repeating the mistakes which had kept it out of the League of Nations. After President Roosevelt's death in April 1945, while the U.N. was still in the discussion stage, one of President Truman's first acts as the new President was to direct our Government's representatives to bring about, if possible, the creation of the United Nations.

Implicit in these charges against the U.N. is the conspiratorial manner in which our country's representatives operated. Now who were our country's representatives in this undertaking?

The American proposals were prepared by a planning committee established by Secretary of State Cordell Hull. The first U.S. draft was written by Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles; Isaiah Bowman, president of Johns Hopkins University; James T. Shotwell, Columbia University historian; Hamilton Fish Armstrong, editor of Foreign Affairs; Benjamin V. Cohen, counsel for the Department of State; and Clark M. Eichelberger, director of the League of Nations Association, later the AAUN. They and the Secretary of State conferred frequently with eminent private citizens, with Members of the U.S. Congress, and with a wide crosssection of the American people to ascertain their views.

At the San Francisco Conference in July 1945, where the charter was finally drafted, Alger Hiss held an administrative post. He was Secretary of the Conference. As Secretary, he dealt with the organizational and housekeeping problems of the Conference, such as arrangements for meetings, providing translators, furnishing duplicating machinery and similar facilities. He was not a member of the U.S. delegation and did not have a vote on any question before the Conference.

THE U.S. DELEGATION AT SAN FRANCISCO

The U.S. delegation at San Francisco was headed by Edward R. Stetinius, Jr., then Secretary of State, as chairman, and Cordell Hull, former Secretary of State, as senior adviser. In addition, the U.S. delegation consisted of: Tom Connally, Democrat, U.S. Senate; Arthur H. Vandenberg, Republican, U.S. Senate; Sol Bloom, Democrat, House of Representatives; Charles A. Eaton, Republican, House of Representatives; Comdr. Harold E. Stassen, U.S. Navy, later Governor of Minnesota; and Virginia Gildersleeve, dean of Barnard College.

Twenty-nine principal advisers, from various departments of the Government, accompanied the delegation. Forty-two national organizations sent consultants to the Conference. Among those were: American Bar Association, American Federation of Labor, American Legion, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Council on Foreign Relations, Federal Council of Churches, American Jewish Committee, National Catholic Welfare Conference, National Association of Manufacturers, National Grange and many of the recognized service and community organizations.

When the charter was presented, after its adoption in San Francisco, to the U.S. Senate for ratification, the Senate did so by a vote of 89 to 2. This reflected a national endorsement that was almost unanimous.

CHARGE—THE U.S.S.R. CONTROLS THE U.N. ARMY

The basis of the charge that the Soviet Union controls the U.N. army is that the U.N. military staff committee is controlled by a Communist and therefore the Communists control the U.N. army. In the first place, there is no U.N. army. There are special and local U.N. police forces for specific limited purposes. But there is no regular U.N. police force or army.

The U.N. Charter provides for the creation of a group to assist the Security Council on military questions in the maintenance of international peace. Such a committee was established in 1946 and it has met more than 500 times since then. For the first 2 years the committee met daily in an effort to agree on plans for an international force, including land, sea and air contingents. High ranking officers, representing the five permanent members of the Security Council, frequently in full uniform, gathered in a designated room in the U.N. headquarters.

After 1947 it became obvious that the five powers could not agree on any means of creating a regular U.N. police force. Thereafter the committee limited its meetings to one every 2 weeks. It has continued this schedule to the present day. The meeting is called to order, the agenda is adopted, the minutes of the last meeting are approved, the date of the next meeting is set, and the meeting is adjourned. That's the story of the Soviet controlled military staff committee.

CHARGE—THE COMMUNISTS CONTROL SPECIFIC U.N. PEACEKEEPING FORCES

Although there is no permanent U.N. peacekeeping force, different forces have been provided, on a voluntary and ad hoc basis by member states, for each separate peacekeeping operation in which the United Nations has been engaged. With the exception of the U.N. action in Korea, for which the United States contributed the major portion of the troops, the U.N. forces have been drawn, not from the Great Powers, but from the smaller countries. The U.N. emergency force in the Middle East, for example, consisted of troops from Brazil, Canada, Columbia, Denmark, Finland, India, Indonesia, Norway, Sweden, and Yugoslavia. The Congo operation involved 20,000 men from 29 different countries, none from the big nations. The latest police force is in Cyprus. It was assembled with much difficulty and consists of troops from Canada, Sweden, Ireland, and Finland.

THE COMMANDERS OF POLICE FORCES

When the U.N. Security Council, under the leadership of the United States, in 1950 authorized U.N. action to repel North Korean aggression against South Korea, the Council set up a unified command and requested the United States to appoint the commander of the U.N. forces. The first head of the U.N. command was Gen. Douglas MacArthur; succeeding commanding generals (Ridgway, Clark, Hull, Taylor, Lemnitzer, Magruder, Meloy) were also designated by the United States from the U.S. Armed Forces.

The commanders of all other U.N. peacekeeping forces—in Egypt, Suez, Lebanon, the Congo, Yemen, and now in Cyprus—have been from the small nations. The latest commander appointed by U Thant (Jan. 25, 1965) is Maj. Gen. Sysemo Sarmento, of Brazil, to lead the U.N. emergency force in the Middle East.

CHARGE—THE U.N. CONTROLS THE MILITARY FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES

The U.N. General Assembly can recommend police action. It can request member states to contribute troops, but the decision to furnish troops rests with each national government. The United Nations cannot require the United States to put its Armed Forces into action.

The Security Council might direct the use of force for the maintenance of international peace and security. But since the United States, as one of the permanent members of the Security Council, has the power of the veto, the Council could not require the use of force without the concurrence of the United States.

Even if the United States did not exercise its veto power, the approval of the U.S. Congress is required for the transfer of U.S. forces to the U.N. The U.S. President does not have the authority to hand over U.S. Armed Forces to the United Nations at will.

The U.N. Participation Act of 1945 authorized the President to negotiate special agreements making armed forces available to the United Nations Security Council. But the act specifically states that such agreements "shall be subject to the approval of the Congress." The U.N. Participation Act

does authorize the President to detail Armed Forces personnel to serve in a noncombatant capacity, but sets a ceiling of 1,000 as the number of such personnel that might be detailed at any one time even for such purposes.

CHARGE—A U.S. DICTATOR IS EMPOWERED TO DISBAND U.S. MILITARY FORCES

In 1961, the Congress of the United States creatd an agency called the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. The Agency is in part under the direction of the State Department, but also reports to the Congress and to the President. Its Director is William C. Foster, a distinguished American industrialist.

The Agency is to seek agreements under which nations could safely reduce armaments. The United States has proposed that armaments be reduced in graduated stages under strict international supervision and control, while at the same time the peacekeeping machinery of the United Nations be built up. Although the law authorized the Disarmament Agency to negotiate disarmament agreements, it did not give the Disarmament Agency or the U.S. President or anyone else blanket authority to reduce U.S. Armed Forces or to place the security of the United States at the disposal of the United Nations.

Section 33 of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act provides: "That no action shall be taken under this or any other law that will obligate the United States to disarm or to reduce or to limit the Armed Forces or armaments of the United States, except pursuant to the treatymaking power of the President under the Constitution or unless authorized by further affirmative legislation by the Congress of the United States."

Thus, any disarmament treaty negotiated by the President could become effective only through congressional action or Senate ratification, as required by the U.S. Constitution. Even the limited treaty banning the atmospheric testing of bombs came into force only after approval by a two-third vote of the U.S. Senate.

CHARGE—THE SOVIETS CONTROL THE U.N. SECRETARIAT

The key position of the Secretary General has been filled by a Norwegian, Trygve Lie; by a Swede, Dag Hammarskjold; and now by a Burmese, U Thant.

As of May 1, 1964, there were 19 posts in the Secretariat at the Under Secretary level or of comparable importance. Of the 19, 1 is from India; 1 is from the U.S.S.R.; 4 are from the United States; 1 is from the United Arab Republic; 1 is from France; 1 is from Yugoslavia; 1 is from Nigeria; 1 is from Greece; 1 is from New Zealand; 2 are from the United Kingdom; 1 is from Brazil; 1 is from Czechoslavakia; 1 is from Panama; 1 is from Burma; 1 is from China (Taiwan).

As of the same date, May 1, 1964, there was a total of 1,389 professional and executive positions at the U.N. Of that total, Americans held 255 or about 18 percent plus. If clerical staff is counted, the proportion is much higher. The U.S.S.R. citizens in executive or professional positions was less than 6 percent.

CHARGE—UNESCO IS A PART OF THE WORLD COMMUNIST CONSPIRACY

Since its founding 19 years ago, UNESCO has been a favorite target for those attacking the U.N. The most frequently repeated charge that UNESCO is part of the world Communist movement is through international control of education in the United States and elsewhere. UNESCO is charged with infiltrating and influencing U.S. public schools by brainwashing children and teaching "one worldism."

Ever since World War II, heroic efforts have been made to teach the whole world how to read. UNESCO was created to advance education throughout the world, as well as to further a better and more tolerant understanding among nations and people. If these objectives are un-American or against our national interest, then we do not understand the spirit or basic philosophy of our country.

"TOWARD WORLD UNDERSTANDING"

One of the publications of UNESCO is entitled "Toward World Understanding." This booklet is alleged to contain the master plan for domination of American schools.

The volume is a collection of views of participants in education seminars. The charge that this booklet serves to foster "world government" in any way in the United States could not possibly be deduced from a reading of it by any reasonably minded person, It is true that the phrase, "world understanding," appears frequently. This phase, of course, refers to a better mutual understanding of the peoples of other lands. Certainly such understanding is greatly needed in the world today. It is hard to conceive in what way it is inconsistent with the American way of life or the teaching of American citizenship.

Such a furor was raised over this particular booklet that a special committee of the American Legion undertook a study of it. It reported that it was about "as subversive as the tales of Hans Christian Anderson."

UNESCO'S charter, like that of the U.N. itself, specifically prohibits the Organization from intervening in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of its member states. Accordingly, UNESCO restricts itself to providing assistance only upon a direct request from the government of the member state concerned. The United States has never requested any UNESCO assistance for its public educational system. In the field of education, UNESCO's assistance is concentrated in the newly developing countries.

UNESCO publications (there are over 3,000 of them) are for sale in this country as in any other member nation. Any teacher, like any private citizen, may buy them. But no attempt has been made by UNESCO to force its materials on any teacher or any school board which, in our country's tradition, is responsible for the selection of any classroom materials. So far as can be determined, these materials have never been so used in the United States.

UNICEF

The attacks on UNICEF, the Children's Fund, have always been beyond comprehension. The organization was originally created upon Herbert Hoover's recommendation. He had gone to Europe immediately after World War II to survey the needs of the people in the war-ravaged countries. It was apparent that the children were the war's worst sufferers. To meet the emergency needs of children, the special agency, UNICEF, was created within the U.N.

In the first few years of its existence, UNICEF concentrated its aid to the children of the European countries that were most cruelly devasted in the war.

Many of these countries eventually fell behind the Iron Curtain. In 1950 UNICEF moved its emphasis from the war emergency areas to meeting the long-term health and nutrition needs of children in the underdeveloped countries, in Africa, in South America and in the Far East.

Are there children in Communist countries helped by UNICEF? Yes, of course. Children are children, including children in Poland and Yugoslavia, the two remaining European countries whose babies and mothers are receiving such aid. Should infants be required to take loyalty oaths? Ridiculous.

UNICEF believes, and the United States endorses this principle, that children who are starving or ill because of lack of medicine or medical care are entitled to help regardless of what kind of a political regime under which they happen to live. If a government requests assistance, if it agrees to accept certain responsibilities set by UNICEF, including freedom of the UNICEF staff to check on the distribution of supplies within the country, then assistance is forthcoming. It is given without regard to race, or religion, or political belief or national status.

Now what kind of a Communist takeover conspiracy is that?

THE POPULATION EXPLOSION VERSUS YOUNG DEATH

We hear much about the population explosion and dangers therefrom are alarming. The statistics of newborn life are startling. It has been estimated that three children are born into the vast human family every second of the day. By midnight tonight, more than 260,000 children will have come into being.

But the statistics of young death are equally startling. There are more than 1 billion children alive in the world today. Of that number, 850 million are faced with the evils of hunger, of poverty, of ignorance, of fear, of disease. In most families of mankind, childhood is not a time of play. It is a time of premature suffering and dying. In the new countries half of the children die before their fifth birthday. They are victims of what we would consider as anachronistic scourges such as leprosy, yaws, trachoma, and malaria. In our own country these diseases have become medical curiosities. It is said that there are very few doctors in the United States that have treated or even seen a case of smallpox.

The U.N., through UNICEF, seeks to improve these miserable conditions. It is for this purpose that UNICEF has carried on the trick-or-treat fundraising program on Halloween and has raised money through the famous greeting card and note paper program.

CHARGE—THE U.N. IS ATHEISTIC AND OPPOSES ALL RELIGIONS

The members of the U.N. include representatives of all the major religions on the face of the earth. No one is required to observe any religious practice or to prefer one religion over another. U.N. meetings open with 1 minute of silence for prayer or meditation. It is true that the U.N. Charter does not mention God. But neither is God mentioned in our own U.S. Constitution. Like the United States, the U.N. permits every man to be guided by his own conscience.

Perhaps the best response to this charge is the extensive support of the U.N. by the major Christian churches, Protestant and Catholic, as well as by Jewish congregations. Over 30 religious organizations, representing all faiths, maintain permanent observers accredited to the U.N.

The support of the Catholic Church has been widely publicized by the late Pope John XXIII in his universally proclaimed encyclical, "Pacem in Terris." Recently, Pope Paul appointed Msgr. Alberto Giovannetti as the Vatican's permanent observer to the U.N. He headquarters at the Holy Family United Nations Parish, 324 East 47th Street. The Protestant Church Center for the U.N. is at 44th Street and U.N. Plaza, directly across the street from the U.N. The Jewish Center for the U.N. is being constructed at the Sutton Place Synagogue and will complement the Holy Family Parish.

"GET THE U.N. OUT OF THE UNITED STATES AND THE UNITED STATES OUT OF THE U.N."

One of these days some major issue before the U.N. is going to be resolved in a manner unsatisfactory to this country. It is then that the hue and cry to "Get the United States out of the U.N. and the U.N. out of the United States" will again be heard.

New York City may not be the most logical place to house the organization. It was due to the generosity of the Rockefeller family in making the valuable tract of land in New York available that served as an inducement

to establish the headquarters of the organization in the United States.

Most specialized agencies of the U.N. are headquartered elsewhere. The International Court of Justice is at The Hague; UNESCO is in Paris; WHO is in Geneva; FAO is in Rome; and so on. The original buildings of the League of Nations in Geneva are now extensively used by the United Nations for a variety of meetings. Several years ago the Soviet Union suggested moving the U.N. Headquarter to Moscow because of some incidents of discrimination against several African Ambassadors in New York.

The U.N. could establish its headquarters outside of the United States. There are those who would not only move the U.N. out of the United States but who would have us get out of the U.N. and construct a solid wall between ourselves and the peoples of the Communist world. They want a wall of implacable hostility and rigidity, a Berlin wall in reverse.

Obviously, this is impossible in the 20th century. We cannot stop the world and get off. A major effort of our foreign policy is to carry into world affairs what we have learned here at home: how men and women of different national backgrounds, of different religions, of different regions, of different cultures and colors, and of different politics, can somehow manage their lives without murdering each other most of the time.

The existing international organization through which we seek these objectives is the United Nations. These are the purposes spelled out in the U.N. Charter. The Preamble and the first two articles of the charter are but a restatement of our own Declaration of Independence. That is why such an overwhelming number of Americans are proud of the fact that no nation in the world has given more positive leadership or greater support to the U.N. than has our own country.

Most human beings prefer peace to war, and practically all of them would rather be alive than dead. Yet in every part of the world, men and women have been brought up to regard war between nations as something inevitable. But was is obsolete. Nuclear war, if it is ever waged, may prove to be incompatible, not only with civilization, but perhaps with human survival.

Yes, we could move the U.N. out of the United States, but we cannot move the United States out of the U.N. Like it or not, we are in the world to stay. It is the one existing international organization where men of all nations can meet and talk and disagree, but where hopefully they can finally resolve their differences without a war that nobody wants.

Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 21, 1965

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a series of articles on Vietnam by J. A. Dear, who has been on the ground in South Vietnam and in the area of operations. Mr. Dear is president of Dear Publication & Radio, is a distinguished correspondent, and his reports will be of great value to the Congress and to the committee. The reports have appeared in many papers. I send to the desk the series of articles from the Henderson Gleaner-Journal, Henderson, Ky., for insertion in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIETNAM: THE WAR WITHOUT FRONTLINES

(By J. A. Dear)

EDITOR'S NOTE.—J. A. Dear, president of Dear Publication & Radio Inc., is on a tour of the Far East. This dispatch is the first of a special series on Vietnam where Dear observed the war first hand.

SAIGON, VIETNAM.—Almost every night the heavy air of this hot city throbs with the sound of artillery and mortar fire in the suburbs.

Duc Hoa, only 12 miles from the center of the city, is thought of in Washington as a striking example of how successful the pacification program can be. But in fact Americans go there by day and leave at sundown.

Saigon, which hasn't been painted in years, retains an aura of seedy elegance. Coupled with the bustle of a booming black market and a vigorous night life, this dulls the sense of danger. Most Americans check their guns when they come to the city.

WAR IS EVIDENT

But everyone is very conscious of the war, which can be grim. In the north, for example an army officer with the Special Forces was caught by the Vietcong, who skinned him.

At the lonely outposts of the Special Forces life is difficult and dangerous. The lot of Army men serving as advisers to the regional and popular forces of Vietnam—our fellows call them Roofpoofs—is no better. There is more safety at the larger installations, perhaps, but everywhere outside Saigon the paraphernalia of war is visible.

Not counting the men of the 7th Fleet, American forces in Vietnam total about 27,000. We have never fielded a finer team. Almost without exception they are optimistic, and take the view that withdrawal would be an unmitigated disaster for the United States. Incidentally, personnel of the State Department and Information Service are equally competent and dedicated, and for the most part, as optimistic.

But all are baffled. This is a war without frontlines. The enemy, until he chooses to show himself, is indistinguishable from friend. Arvin troops—American argot for the regular Army of Vietnam—are brave and endure high casualties without flinching. (Their losses, until recently, averaged more than 1,000 weekly.)

RED STOOL PIGEONS

Beyond doubt, however, Arvin is riddled with Communists who tip off the Vietcong before offensive strikes get underway. It is a rare occasion that we get advance warning of Vietcong operations.

Moreover, we have to do everything at once. Government stability in Saigon is a precondition for military success, which in turn depends on active assistance from the peasants, whose support hinges on the reintroduction of effective local government and a viable local economy. Of course that is an impossibility without military success and sensible guidance from Saigon.

American Economic Aid (Eusom) is channeled to the local level. But a portion of every dollar the United States commits to support the government of Vietnam in fact supports the Vietcong. For example, aviation gasoline is transported to Pleiku, headquarters of the Arvin 2d Corps and a base for American helicopters, via highway 14 from Saigon. The commercial contractors who haul this gas pay a road tax imposed by the Vietcong, which controls the highways. A study to determine how much help the Vietcong gets from us has been undertaken. (We have also begun a study, through the Rand Corp., to see what motivates the Vietcong.)

In some areas the Vietcong governs. Our grip on the central highlanders is tenuous. The coastal areas below the highlands are threatened. As inland towns and hamlets are cut off, thousands of refugees flee to the coast.

We budgeted enough money to care for 100,000 refugees this year. Already the camps are bulging with nearly 200,000 of them. Whether this is an insidious tactic of the Vietcong or an expression of people who are voting with their feet, no one knows.

REFUGEES POUR IN

With increasing frequency refugees of another category are stumbling to our lines. Mostly old men, women, and children, some horribly wounded, they are the survivors of American jet strikes against targets in Vietnam south of the 17th parallel. These are the villages that are humming with hate and fear, where the children are sullen and silent.

Air strikes against North Vietnam have raised the morale of American and Arvin forces. What else they have accomplished is at this point a matter of conjecture.

[From the Gleaner-Journal, Henderson, Ky., Apr. 3, 1965]

"WE'RE HOLDING OUR OWN" IN VIETNAM

(By J. A. Dear)

KIEN BINH, VIETNAM.—Far below, the cluster of steaming hamlets fade into the sameness of the landscape, a blur of delicate green, sluggish rivers, and countless canals.

We have just said goodby and good luck to Maj. Ralph Waara, leader of the five man American advisory group at Kien Binh. This is delta country, one of the great Asian breadbaskets, whose people eat better than the Chinese, the Koreans, the Filipinos, the Japanese. Yet the delta is a stronghold of the Vietcong, and some areas, Ca Mau, the Yumin Forest, the Plain of Reeds have never been under the effective control of the Saigon government.

When a helicopter drops down at Kien Binh side gunners hunch over their machine guns. "Yes," said Major Waara, "it's not so bad now." Gesturing toward a scratchy patch of land, "they used to shoot at us from there." Armed men stand guard over the plane.

Some nights the Vietcong fire mortars at Major Waara's command compound. But gradually Government forces are pushing out from their shaky toehold. Their aim is to pacify the region by the end of the year.

CAPTAIN GETS CREDIT

Capt. Nguyen Van Huynh, a babyfaced officer of 32, who was deflected from his studies for the priesthood by war, should get the credit for whatever success the Government is having, according to Major Waara.

"He's a remarkable man," said Waara. "Without him I don't think we'd be here. Puts out patrols at night. You know, they have a price of 500,000 piasters on his head."

(That's about $3,600 at the black market rate.)

The 55,000 people of Kien Binh live in an area of about 20 by 12 miles that is divided into 55 districts—10 of these districts are controlled by the government, 24 by the Vietcong, and 21 by no one. To conduct this campaign, Captain Huynh has 780 men, 200 of them fairly well trained members of the regional force, and 580 of them village volunteers of the popular force.

"We're holding our own and maybe better," said Major Waara. That's the assessment of most American officers everywhere in Vietnam. They note that the Vietnam, after getting clobbered in several engagements, is ducking set battles. But everyone agrees the Vietcong has the capability of striking hard. The question is when, and one theory is that the tempo of the war will increase with the advent of the rainy season.

SAFER IN LARGE TOWNS

Life in the larger towns where corps headquarters are set up—Vietnam is divided into four military districts—is easier and safer. Helicopters and advisory officers, are concentrated around the headquarters. But nobody's living it up, exactly.

Asian cities are poor, dirty, and disease ridden. (Many cases of the plague have been reported.) Since dependents were sent home life goes on without women, for the most part. (Queenie's and the place next to it are off limits.)

But even at headquarters area there is danger. At Pleiku, headquarters of the 2d Corps in the central highlands, about 100 Vietcong slipped through the scrub to attack Camp Holloway on February 7.

NATIVES ARE WARNED

Apparently every native in and around the camp knew the attack was coming, but we were unwarned. One informant from the Montagnard village where the Vietcong set up its mortars would have prevented the surprise. Local help at the base left promptly at sundown, and the cyclo drivers in Pleiku refused to take personnel back to the base.

"The apathy of the people is more of a problem than the Vietcong," one officer ruefully admitted. And after 20 years of war it does seem to be true that a majority of the population of Vietnam is uncommitted to either side.

This adds to the strain and perhaps the danger. But where there are as many guns as there now are in Vietnam, there is danger. On a passenger flight from Danang to Saigon there was only one item of cargo: a dead marine in a green sack off my left boot. He was shot and killed as he returned to his lines in the hills above the airbase by a fellow marine.

[From the Gleaner-Journal, Henderson, Ky., Apr. 4, 1965]

VIETNAMESE ARMY NOT STRONG ENOUGH TO COPE WITH VIETCONG

(Third of a series)

(By J. A. Dear)

SAIGON, VIETNAM.—No American out here faults the fighting spirit of Vietnamese Army troops (Arvin).

On more than one occasion Arvin troops have continued attacking until wiped out. And remember, this is an army that is underfed, underled, seldom paid, gets no leave. Its nine regular divisions are served by 500 doctors; that means there are only 200 doctors to care for a civil population of 16 million.

Having said this, the truth can be set forth. Arvin is riddled with Vietcong agents; staff work is very poor; there is no personnel setup at all except for the bureau of psychology warfare, which should be concerned with the enemy. Some political generals are incompetent, but the most serious shortage is of qualified junior officers. Approximately one-third of the companies composing Arvin are shaky. Above all, there simply are not enough government troops in the field to cope with the Vietcong.

REPLACEMENTS WERE FEW

Part of the trouble has its origin in Saigon. As a result of the coups and demicoups, Arvin received almost no replacements until recently. Because about 40,000 men were lost in operations, this means a badly wounded Arvin had to face an enemy that has been continually nourished by supplies and men from the North.

The first coup, which led to the murder of Diem, had the greatest impact. During the sorry interval between Diem's death and the present regime of Dr. Quat, effective government came to a stop. Since this is a political war for the hearts and minds of people effective government at every level is essential.

The legitimacy of the present government is questionable, but American officials are not anxious to explore this murky area. Another violent coup might destroy our excuse for being here. We are here at the invitation of the Vietnam Government; there must be a government to be the guest of.

MANY POLITICAL FACTORS

The political factors of immediate consequence in Vietnam are generals, Buddhists, Catholics, and two other religious sects, the Hoa Hao and the Cao Dai. The Cao Dai, which venerates Christ, Buddha, and Victor Hugo, once fought Diem and the Communists. Fortunately, the Communists assassinated its leader, and now the Cao Dai is with the Government.

Prime Minister Quat is confident that only a few dissidents in the religious groupings oppose his government. He is also confident that a promising economic program has been evolved, and he is sure military leaders appreciate the importance of governmental stability.

At present there is no single military strong man on the scene. Big Minh of the first coup may return, but a five-member armed forces council now advises Dr. Quat.

KY IS COLORFUL COMMANDER

General Ky, colorful commander of Vietnam's air force, is one of the most important members of the council. General Thi, commander of I Corps, is an influential general though not a member of the council. General Co of II Corps, called "dancing master" because of his fondness for this pastime, is another name to remember. Incidentally, Co's acute criticism of the deployment of the Special Forces led to the development of new tactics.

The traditional enmity of the Vietnamese and Montagnard has caused serious trouble in the central highlands. Saigon has made concessions, but not before Y B'Ham Enoul, former Saigon deputy in the highlands, skipped to Cambodia after fomenting an abortive uprising.

Most encouraging of all, said Dr. Quat, is that "your country has settled on a policy for Vietnam, for a month ago you had none."

ASSUMPTIONS ARE PLAYING THEIR ROLE IN SOUTHEAST ASIA BATTLE

(Fourth of a series)

(By J. A. Dear)

SAIGON, VIETNAM.—What are the considerations and thinking on which our policy here is based?

These are the assumptions: Southeast Asia is vital to American security. If Vietnam falls to Communist aggression, southeast Asia is lost.

In spite of obvious apathy to the war, the people of South Vietnam are by no means committed to the Communist regime in the north. There are hostilities between these regions we can exploit.

Likewise, there are differences between the Tokinese and Chinese that can be exploited. Even the most ardent Communist in Ho Chi Minh's government probably hopes North Vietnam can escape Chinese occupation.

Ho Chi Minh is indeed dependent on Red China. But to give his regime room for maneuver he plays Peiping against Moscow. If we hit him too hard, we push him into the hands of the Chinese. If we don't hit him hard enough, he has no incentive for easing his campaign against Vietnam.

If we threaten the destruction of Ho Chi Minh, we practically assure intervention by the Russians and the Chinese. Because of the parities of the situation, Moscow cannot stand on the sidelines if a Socialist state is threateded with destruction.

EQUATION CHANGES EVERY DAY

Thus, the air strikes against North Vietnam involve nice calculations. Further, the equation changes every day. So much for the assumptions.

Hanoi's support of the Communists in the war here is no longer disputed, even by Hanoi. But the amount and importance of the aid received from the North is a matter of dispute.

The Ho Chi Minh trail, so called, traverses difficult terrain. It has not been photographed for television because cameramen cannot get equipment to it.

The triple-ply jungle—there are trees, with secondary growth above them, and beyond that an additional growth that is rooted in the trees themselves—cannot be penetrated more than 75 yards in one day by a young man in excellent physical condition. An athlete would be hard put to make more than 3 miles a day on known trails through this growth. And a trail unused for 6 days disappears.

TRIP TAKES ABOUT 60 DAYS

It is agreed that a Communist trooper from the North will not reach I Corps or II Corps, the northern military districts of Vietnam, in less than 30 days. Probably the trip takes about 60 days.

Now, what is the capacity of the Ho Chi Minh trail? One estimate is 1,000 men and 40 tons of equipment per month. Considering the nature of the country, this does not seem unreasonable, though some say it is too low by half.

It is admitted that anyone who has traveled the trail must rest up before combat. Also, Communist arms and men reach Vietnam by sea.

But this aid—and here we are back to assumption—is crucial. Without it the Vietcong would lose vital momentum and the Saigon Government would triumph.

That is the rationale underlying our policy.

THERE IS A WEAPON WE HAVE YET TO USE IN VIETNAM: FOOD

(Fifth of a series)

(By J. A. Dear)

SAIGON, VIETNAM.—Nothing is lost until it is lost, in my opinion, unless you walk away.

In a nutshell, that's my thought about the miserable war.

Also, the other guy has real problems. Suppose you had to group 1,000 men for a battle 100 miles away, knowing that your communications were poor, that you didn't control the roads or the air, that your only transport was manback, that equipment had to be toted piecemeal, that your security hinged on the silence of everyone in villages your men had to sleep in, that your enemy could mobilize murderous firepower in minutes, and that you would face annihilation if caught in the open country? Well, that's the way it is for the Vietcong.

PROBLEMS OF OWN MAKING

For all that, we have problems too, and some of them of our own making. The most serious is that which results from our decision to embrace a strategy of terror.

That's what bombing is. It doesn't discriminate between soldiers and/or women and children. Especially, I have in mind American air strikes in South Vietnam. We are killing innocents almost every day. (Twenty-three structures and five water buffalo were destroyed, etc.)

Morality aside, can you think of a worse way to win the hearts and minds of people in a political war? Neither can I.

If we must be terrorists, let's be effective. And there is a weapon at hand we have not touched. Food.

NO WHEAT WITH A-BOMB

The technical achievements of the Communist world, including Red China, are impressive. But you can't grow wheat with an A-bomb.

Red China has the A-bomb, but not the wheat. At least she wouldn't have the wheat if Australia and Canada didn't sell it to her.

Why not stop this trade, if necessary by buying the entire wheat surplus of these allies? An accommodation with China might then be possible.

And we could abandon the strategy of terror that manufactures islands of humanity humming with hate and fear of Americans.

COULD HELP ECONOMY

At the same time, we could be breathing life into the economy of Vietnam, which is a surplus food country. Through Hong Kong, the showcase for Red China, go the water chestnuts, bamboo shoots, and so forth, that Chinese expatriates everywhere love. Vietnam could fulfill this need, given the chance.

We could do ourselves a good turn in Vietnam by becoming interested in education. That is what brought us victory in the Philippines, but the lesson has been forgotten.

In Danang I saw a French Lycee. But nowhere in Vietnam did I see an American school. If our interest is long term, why don't we think about schools and teachers?

SCHOOLS IN SAIGON

At the moment it would be impossible to establish American schools in the hinterlands. But a start could be made by bringing bright teenagers, with their parents' permission, to a first-rate academy in Saigon.

Though it will go against our Army's grain, we should consider lengthening the tour of our personnel here to 2 years. As I have said, we have never fielded a finer team than that we have in Vietnam. But considering the time for phase in and phase out, personnel spend only 9 months in action. By the time they have a grasp of the situation, they're up for reassignment. True, this system spreads counterinsurgency experience through the services. But it's victory, not experience, that we're after.

Finally, a word about the posture of the West in the Far East. Resorts in Formosa and South Korea, citadels we created, enjoyed a reputation that would attract the court of Elagabalus.

CALL GIRLS ON SCOOTERS

The playland of South Korea is closely guarded by house detectives who are charged with seeing to it that every room with a man has a woman in it before midnight. In the paradise of Formosa call girls arrive by motor scooter.

Journalists of the Philippines paint a different picture of Red China. It is a moral country, and its cities are unbelievably clean for Asia. In the battle for minds and hearts, this counts.

It would be a pity if our great country gets lost in the thoroughfares of life by forgetting this simple fact.

[From the Gleaner-Journal, Henderson, Ky., Apr. 11, 1965]

TO VIETNAMESE FARMER, WAR IS HELL

(By J. A. Dear)

TOKYO.—One reason so many Japanese are so critical of our Vietnam policy is that our effort to save the Saigon government from Communist aggression is not saving the people and their society from destruction.

The likelihood that what is to be saved by war will be destroyed in the process is a favorite irony of history. England entered the Second War to save Poland from Nazi Germany with the result that Poland became a fief of Moscow.

To understand what the war is doing to Vietnam, it is first necessary to consider the economy of the rural areas. About 70 percent of the farmers in Vietnam work holdings, which they do not always own, of less than 12 acres. Of the farmers who do own their lands, about 65 percent own less than 12 acres.

In the delta, the richest agricultural area of Vietnam, between 60 and 70 percent of the farmers are now in debt, and probably are falling deeper in debt every month. The plight of Farmer Tran Vannam, cited by Kenkichi Konishi of the Mainichi newspapers is typical.

The Tran family of six owns a delta farm of about 5 acres. They once owned a much larger farm, but gave it up because of the Vietcong. About 3 acres of the present farm are under rice. The other 2 acres had flourishing fruit trees, but these were cut down to enable Government forces to protect a bridge more easily.

Farmer Tran was not reimbursed by the Government for the loss of these trees. His family is able to live off the land, he sells the balance of his rice crop, and ekes out his existence in the off season by working as a laborer in the village. His total effort produces a yearly cash income for the family of 18,000 piasters—about $122.

INFLATION HURTS PIASTER

At this point it must be noted that in theory $230 is the dollar equivalent of 18,000 piasters. But inflation—war—has destroyed the integrity of the piaster. During the time I was in Vietnam the dollar equivalent value of the piaster decreased 7.8 percent. For families that must limit monthly purchases to an average of $4 this is murderous.

But the picture really is worse than painted thus far, for Tran's princely income of $122 yearly doesn't come in at the rate of $10 per month. In most months the income is about $2.25. So he has to borrow, and the going interest rate is from 5 to 10 percent a month.

He is already in debt to the Government and to other members of his family. Thus the prospects of additional debt is frightening, so frightening in fact that he often sells rice futures to escape the high interest rate. But he is caught, anyhow, because he can't get a decent price on these sales.

FACES FINANCIAL DISASTER

Of course, any serious sickness is catastrophic to a man as close to the cloth as Tran, and he has tuberculosis. The medicines he must buy drive him nearer financial disaster. Still, he is an optimist.

He dreams of another orchard that will make his small farm profitable again. In 5 or 6 years he hopes to be out of debt. He is hard working, literate, anxious that his children be educated, in every way a worthy man. In happier times he might make it. Times being what they are, he will die.

Tran is tough. Many others have long since succumbed to despair. Remember, the Delta is a fortunate region.

PEOPLE ARE WELL OFF

Parts of it are controlled by the Vietcong, and have been for a long time. But the people of these areas cannot be better off. Government forces, backed by American personnel and technology, are powerful enough to destroy the economic viability of any Vietcong area. Thus all of rural Vietnam is an area where the forces of the government and the Vietcong wage a ferocious war in a sea of human misery. Every day wavelets of misery wash into the overcrowded villages and cities, multiplying the danger of epidemic disease, drowning hope.

If the Communists win Vietnam, Red China will be encouraged to go after Laos, Cambodia, Siam, Burma, and Indonesia. And what is to stop them?

Surely no national leader in his right senses will ever again be anxious to save his country from Communist aggression by fighting a war in his country that will destroy it. Not after the lesson of Vietnam.

That is one reason why the airstrikes against North Vietnam make sense. The Communist leaders will not be as ready to embark on their adventures if it is brought home to them that all the damage will not be confined to the country in which they choose to wage war, that their own lands will be devastated.

For too long now Red China has been permitted to forget a simple fact: War is hell.

Vietnam Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, on April 2, former Vice President Richard M. Nixon addressed the Commonwealth Club of California on the subject of "Vietnam." Excerpts from that speech, as published by the Commonwealth, follow:

"STOP REDS IN VIETNAM OR FACE BIG WAR FOR PHILLIPPINES 4 YEARS HENCE," SAYS NIXON

(From address by Hon. Richard M. Nixon, former Vice President of the United States)

Today the most difficult decision facing President Johnson is South Vietnam, the most difficult decision he will make during his Presidency, I believe, at home or abroad. And it is the most important decision for the United States and the free world.

There are times when the loyal opposition should support an administration. Lyndon B. Johnson needs this support not only because of the validity of his policy but because there is a deep division in his own party.

Our greatest danger to the future of our policy on Vietnam is because the Democratic party is divided. Forty-five Democratic Senators have indicated opposition.

UNITED STATES DEFENDS WORLD—AGAIN

The interests of America, the free world and of South Vietnam are being served by the present policy.

Some claim the United States has no legal right in South Vietnam and that we are involved in a civil war. Some say the war will not be won because the Vietnamese are not willing to do what is necessary.

Others believe that, even if the war could be won, the risks are too great. Many suggest another way out—negotiation—neutralization.

Lyndon Johnson should answer each of these objections now. He might well have done this before now. Not enough people know why we should support the South Vietnamese.

First, who is responsible for the war? If it were not for support of the Guerrillas by North Vietnam there would be no war; no war, at least, which would require our support. If it were not for Chinese support for North Vietnam there would be no war requiring American support.

COMMUNIST CHINA THE REAL FOE

This is a confrontation—not fundamentally between Vietnam and the Vietcong or between the United States and the Vietcong—but between the United States and Communist China.

This must not be glossed over because if we gloss it over we underestimate the risks and do not understand the stakes.

Those who question our presence ignore certain facts. In 1954 a convention was signed in Geneva guaranteeing South Vietnam its independence. The North Vietnamese are there as lawbreakers. We are

there as law enforcers, by invitation of the South Vietnamese Government.

What are the risks, the stakes? First, the fate of 15 million Vietnamese. Two hundred thousand Vietnamese casualties in the fight against communism over the years, prove they have the desire and will to keep their country free and independent.

NEED FUNDAMENTALS

In Vietnam today there is determination of the people to save their freedom—provided they have the conviction they will win.

These are fundamental reasons the stronger course of action will be more effective than may seem today.

Fifteen million people are worth saving but many argue that this is not enough to risk major confrontation and Chinese Communist intervention.

If South Vietnam falls, through U.S. withdrawal, political settlement, or neutralization (which is surrender on the installment plan), there is no doubt that Cambodia (already on the brink) will go; that Laos, practically gone now because of our gullibility, will go; that Thailand (which wants to be on our side but has held her independence by being on the winning side) will go; that Burma, an economic basket case; and that Indonesia will go.

SUKARNO'S OVERRIPE MELON

Indonesia will follow Sukarno and Sukarno once said that because of the American failure in Asia, the Communists were the wave of the future and he would be on the winning side.

Indonesia has half the world's tin, half the world's rubber. It is only 14 miles from the Philippines where guerrillas and Huk activity have begun again—guerrilla activity easily supported by Indonesian Communists.

In 3 or 4 years, then, we would have the necessity of saving the Philippines. Could we avoid a major war to save the Philippines?

Japan is the biggest prize in Asia, a miracle of economic recovery, the only possible economic counterpart to China. Strong neutralist forces are now growing in Japan. If southeast Asia goes Communist, Japan will eventually be pulled irresistably into the Red orbit.

If the United States gives up on Vietnam, Asia will give up on the United States and the Pacific will become a Red sea. These are the stakes. And this is the reason the Johnson administration has decided to win in Vietnam—no more, no less.

AGAINST RED COLONIALISM

The possibilities of winning? How could it be possible that, where 300,000 Frenchmen on the ground failed, 25,000 Americans can expect success? But when the French were in Vietnam they were fighting to stay in—while the United States is fighting to get out.

The Vietnamese had very little interest in fighting to preserve French colonialism. The Vietnamese have a very great interest in fighting against Communist colonialism. That's why they fight with a will today.

THAT RISK OR GREATER RISK?

Risks must always be weighed. There is a risk of Russian intervention. This risk is small due to the logistic problems involved, and because the Soviets are not particularly interested in seeing the Chinese Communists succeed in their foreign policy objectives for Asia.

A greater risk is Chinese Communist intervention. Some say this is inevitable, that the Chinese Communists would come in to save North Vietnam from defeat. That is subject to serious question.

Comparing the situation now with Korea in 1950, there are major differences. Now Russia and Communist China are opponents. Then they were allies.

China without Russia is a fourth-rate military power. And that is the situation China must confront if it decides to intervene. That is probably the reason Communist China is talking big but acting little, without risking a confrontation with the United States, at this point, over Vietnam.

Adding it all, we must assume that Communist China might intervene. What should our decision be, weighing that risk and that possibility? It must be the same, because it is a choice not between that risk and no risk—but that risk and a greater risk.

NINE PINS IF UNITED STATES PULLS OUT

In the event that Vietnam falls, and in the event that the balance of southeast Asia falls, in 4 to 5 years, the United States would be confronted inevitably with a war to save the Philippines or in some other area in Asia and we would be confronting a China stronger than she is now. China today is diplomatically and militarily weaker than she will ever be in the future.

Today China has a minimal nuclear capability but that capability increases daily. It is a risk we must weigh. Do we stop Chinese Communist aggression in Vietnam now or wait until the odds and the risks are much greater?

The United States must make a decision as to what our goals are to be. Our goals are presently limited to winning the war, without unconditional surrender, without destroying North Vietnam, without destroying Communist China. It is a limited objective but one which must be achieved.

ROAD OF "GOOD INTENTIONS"

What are the alternatives? Many well-intentioned people have suggested, Why not negotiate? Negotiation is a good word. All wars are ended by negotiation. But to negotiate now would mean that the United States could negotiate only surrender, coalition government, a division of South Vietnam or neutralization, which is surrender on the installment plan.

Negotiating with the Communists now would be like negotiating with Hitler when he had France practically occupied.

We must negotiate independence and freedom for Vietnam. We cannot do that now. Once we have gained the military advantage, once North Vietnam and Communist China are convinced they cannot take over South Vietnam, then we can negotiate the freedom and independence of South Vietnam. Until then, we cannot.

Neutralization? Neutralism, where Communists are concerned, means only three things: we get in, we get out; they stay in, and they take over. That is why we can't agree to a neutralization of South Vietnam. The choice we have is to get out completely or to stay in until we achieve freedom and independence for Vietnam.

The future is our main problem. The world has been given the impression that this is our war; that we are there unilaterally for our own selfish purposes. We are there for our purposes, true, but we are there because the freedom of all Asia, not just Vietnam, is involved.

NIXON PROPOSES ASIAN COUNTERFORCE

Several suggestions can be made for future policy. Once the war is won in Vietnam, we must recognize that it will only be the winning of a single battle as far as the Communists are concerned.

It took Mao 20 years to conquer China. This is Mao Tse-tung's theory of a long war. He lost many battles, but he won the long war. If Vietnam is lost to Communist China, the long war will be stepped up in Indonesia or somewhere else.

There must be a counterforce, an alternative to Mao's long war. Let me make several suggestions. There is no question as to Communist China's purpose and plan. They have one, and they are determined. But free Asia does not have a plan. It does not have a purpose. It is necessary to mobilize free Asia's economic and military resources so there will be the lasting alternative of peace under freedom as against the long war of communism.

JOHNSON PROPOSAL INCOMPLETE

President Johnson started down this road when he suggested an Asian economic plan. Let's go further; we need a conference of free Asian nations, including South Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, Malaysia, Burma, Indonesia, Taiwan, the Philippines, Japan, South Korea, and possibly Australia and New Zealand.

Such a conference would have three major objectives: One, economic development—a Marshall plan for Asia; a Marshall plan involving industrial development, free trade areas, and all other aspects which mean economic development for the whole area.

The difficulty is in stopping there and that is all that is suggested by the administration. Economic strength alone is not enough to stop communism, for in South Vietnam, economic conditions are much better than in the North.

Second, in Europe, the Marshall plan could not have succeeded economically unless it had the NATO military shield. There needs to be a military alliance of free Asian nations to stop any Communist aggression against freedom.

The third step is to meet the problem of indirect aggression. There should be something like the Caracas resolution of 1954 that in event of a revolution with Communist-support from abroad (as in Vietnam), all nations involved would band together to resist conquest by indirect aggression.

Now that we've stepped up military activity in Vietnam, we need to step up our diplomatic offensive in all of Asia.

We need a charter for freedom for the Pacific—an alternative to the seeming inevitability, at least to many in Asia, of Chinese Communist domination.

MOBILIZE FREE ASIA'S ECONOMY

Often overlooked today is the fact that the economic power of the nations cited is twice as great, as that of Communist China today—if it can be mobilized, if it can be united; if the United States can support it.

There is no question but that this could be the great step forward which would stop Chinese Communist aggression and the inevitable takeover of the heartland and peripheral areas of Asia as well.

I spoke of the stakes—southeast Asia, Japan, the Pacific—but they're much greater than that. A great debate is going on in the Communist world and what happens in Vietnam will determine its course. The debate is between the hardliners in Peiping and the so-called softliners in Moscow. The softliners (oversimplified), because of a risk of confrontation with the United States, are not supporting revolutions to the same extent that they did. The hardliners say "we must step up our tactics and support of revolution all over the world."

In the event the hardliners succeed in Vietnam, that will be the green light for aggression in Africa, Latin America—all over the world. If they are stopped in Vietnam, that will be a lesson just as Korea was a lesson on the use of overt aggression.

It will be a lesson to the Communists attempting to take over a nation through indirect aggression that the United States and the free world have an answer to it.

So what is involved here is not just Asia, but a battle for the whole world and because that is so, risks must be taken—risks which, I believe, in the long run will bring peace and freedom. But the alternatives could be war and loss of freedom.

In 1938, immediately after Munich, Winston Churchill said: "The belief that you can

gain security by throwing a small state to the wolves is a fatal delusion." He was right about Czechoslovakia in 1938. And today, with regard to Vietnam, the belief that we can gain security by throwing a small state to the wolves is a fatal delusion. In this year when we honor Churchill the man, we will do well to heed Churchill's principles.

ANSWERS TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM FLOOR

Question. Will you be a candidate in 1968?

Answer. The Republican Party must get off the floor fighting. But Republicans must fight Democrats and not each other. To win in 1966 the party must be unified. Until we get the party off the floor, don't talk of 1968.

Question (William Nigh). Use of gas in Vietnam?

Answer. Under the circumstances it was proper. But when the President said he was not aware of its use he gave impression we were wrong to use it, and that field commanders could make decisions of this consequence without his knowledge. He should have said: (1) This was not gas used in World Wars I or II which nations have opposed; (2) it was used not by United States, but by Vietnam; (3) it was used in attacks on villages in which Vietnamese could not tell who were guerrillas and who the guerrillas' victims; (4) so instead of blasting out friends and foes indiscriminately, Vietnamese used tear gas so they could separate guerrillas from loyal citizens. It was humane warfare and President should have said so.

Question. (W. F. Bramstedt). Can we win without a major land war?

Answer. Depends on the extent to which the Chinese Communists choose to intervene. They are basically cautious in military policy—e.g., could have taken all India but they stopped. I don't believe the Chinese will intervene. Strategically and logistically, this is no Korean type of war. We must assume the risk. Some think China should be recognized and taken into the U.N. Chinese communism is in its aggressive, virulent stage. The Soviet Union was not tempered in its foreign policy by entrance into the U.N. It has been tempered only by the power of NATO and the U.S. confrontation in Cuba.

Question. (J. C. Russell). Johnson administration now doing what Goldwater advocated?

Answer. It's easy to say "I told you so." Johnson needs Republican support, he has been learning a lot since the campaign—but we don't want him to learn so much he gets reelected.

Question. (R. J. Jajalich). What if the United States asked to leave? (Col. James S. Hughes). Effects of Diem's murder?

Answer. If any future government gets in through a coup or anything but as representatives of the people—and if it's pro-Communist—we should stay in. Murder of Diem was a major U.S. mistake. Diem and his family were sometimes crosses to bear but since 1956 he had stood strongly with the United States. We supported the coup but did not expect him to be murdered. You can't set such things in motion. A free Asian leader told me shortly after Diem's death: "It is dangerous to be a friend of the United States—it pays to be a neutral and sometimes helps to be an enemy." U.S. policymakers must understand that American-style democracy is not necessarily the answer where traditions are different.

Question. (Ivor R. Parrott). De Gaulle's attitude on Vietnam question?

Answer. De Gaulle's attitude is first French and then European: (1) If you were French would you want to see the United States succeed where you had failed? (2) Europeans see clearly the Communist danger in Europe but have a blind spot on Asia. In the East particularly we are afflicted the same way.

Question. (Stanley Brooks). Proposed changes in the new civil rights bill

Answer. When faced with a volatile situation you can't delay action over 7 years for an amendment to the Constitution. There should be action but action of right kind. Voters should be literate but literacy test should be fair. Republican platform of 1960 considered a sixth grade education as sufficient qualification. The present law applies only in those States won by Republicans in 1964—bill should be extended to all the country.

Abuse of the Sick Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1965

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, a series of articles written by Lisa Hobbs recently appeared in the San Francisco Examiner which comprise a shocking exposé of the treatment of our sick and elderly citizens in some convalescent and nursing homes in California.

Because I believe these articles should be brought to the attention of the leadership in this Congress and the executive branch, I am inserting them in the RECORD as separate extensions of remarks. I am not including the third article in the series since it deals primarily with State legislation.

I am indebted to my constituents, Miss Violette Hofmann and Mrs. Frank H. Schryver, for bringing these articles to my attention. I sincerely hope the appropriate individuals will consider the possibility of corrective legislation.

The first article follows:

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Examiner, Mar. 14, 1965]

BUREAUCRACY'S VICTIMS: ABUSE OF THE SICK AGED

(By Lisa Hobbs)

Scandalous abuses are being heaped on the sick aged of California by a multimillion-dollar bureaucracy.

The powers of this bureaucracy have become so diffused in the mass of related and unrelated Federal, State, and county regulations that gross abuses of the aged are now inherent in the system's functioning.

The rise of California's newest industry—the nursing and convalescent homes—is an offshoot of this bureaucracy's attempt to deal with one facet of the problem of an aging population.

In a 3-week survey of nursing and convalescent homes in the city and East Bay, the Examiner found:

Elderly persons, unheeded, crying to be turned over.

One aid doing all the household cleaning, cooking, and nursing for up to 10 bed patients.

Grease encrusted stoves and filthy kitchen floors.

Constant reference to the sick aged as being like children.

Total lack of privacy for those paying up to $500 a month.

Debasing humiliations for lower economic aged.

These abuses are widespread throughout the State but the most scandalous fact is that for years the city of San Francisco has been dumping its sick aged into State mental asylums to die—whether mentally ill or not.

According to the department of mental hygiene's report to the legislature in 1963, the city's rate of commitment to a State mental hospital was 600 per 100,000 population. Eighty percent of these persons died within the first 3 weeks.

While San Francisco was committing 600 per 100,000 population, Los Angeles was committing only 54 per 100,000 and Alameda 300. Eighty percent of those committed were over 65 and were being committed for the first time.

Bureaucracy—the same style bureaucracy that controls the nursing-convalescent home situation today—not only allowed this but actually condoned it.

Purely economic reasoning lay behind the dumping of these aged persons into mental hospitals to end their days. By removing them from the county hospital where they were receiving medical assistance to the aged (MAA) under the Kerr-Mills bill, the city of San Francisco was freed of its 25 percent share of MAA costs for that patient. It is an old solution, however, being used long before the Kerr-Mills bill was introduced.

The procedure involved was a brief court commitment proceeding while the words "with psychosis" were added to the doctor's original diagnosis of "chronic brain syndrome." This syndrome covers everything from confusion to senility.

Officials of the department of mental hygiene are forced to play their part in the scandal, because the law requires them to accept into mental hospitals all patients committed by the court, whether mentally ill or not.

Dr. Robert Hewitt, chief deputy director of the department in Sacramento, said there are a substantial number of people in our State hospitals who do not require hospitalization, who are not mentally ill, and some of whom should never have been committed to our care.

This solution was practiced for years with the knowledge and tacit approval of the city and county of San Francisco, county hospital authorities, State mental hospital authorities, and the State department of mental health.

By setting up a honeycomb of regulations governing building and architectural requirements of housing for the aged, the State has paid a ritualistic tribute to the physical well-being of the aged.

Yet in those areas where the aged can be most easily victimized—all those areas in which they struggle to maintain a sense of value and dignity as human beings—the State has done nothing to protect them.

Instead, with slipshod regulations and ineffectual controls, the State has left the aged sick to suffer countless indignities at the hands of unskilled guardians, called nurse's aids, vocational nurses, or practical nurses.

Just as victimized are the families of the sick aged, in those cases where families exist. The expense is crippling, the load of doubt and guilt devastating.

I visited scores of homes where the price of a room for "a loved one" was plucked from the air. Only twice was I given a printed card with rates. Elsewhere, a score of little feelers as to the "loved ones" means—whether she was receiving old age assistance social security, a veteran's pension, a railroad pension—always preceded the final figures.

And the final figure was never cheap. No home will accept a patient receiving medical assistance to the aged if there is a change of selling the bed for a higher, private fee.

Twice it was intimated that if the "loved one" came in on MAA rates (which pay a maximum of $9.10 a day) a subsidy payment to bring the rate to $350 a month would have to be made privately to the nursing home operator.

This is illegal but there is little the State can do to police such arrangements.

Because the State rate covers two categories of care—basic care at $7.35 a day and extended (or bed) care at $9.10 a day—it is in the operator's financial interest that as many patients as possible are kept in bed rather than being helped and encouraged to remain ambulatory.

The taxation aspects also offer an inducement to the family to keep the old folks bedridden rather than up and around. The entire cost of keeping a bed patient in a nursing home is tax deductable. If the loved one remains ambulatory, however, the deduction is only 40 percent.

Tragic Lives in Nursing Homes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1965

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith the second of a series of articles written by Lisa Hobbs for the San Francisco Examiner regarding the deplorable conditions in some convalescent and nursing homes in the State of California:

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Examiner, Mar. 15, 1965]

ABUSE OF SICK AGED: TRAGIC LIVES IN NURSING HOMES

(By Lisa Hobbs)

"I can hear the traffic and see part of the sky out the window but it gets so lonely at times I go to sleep hoping I won't wake up.

"Sometimes in the morning I weep when I realize I'm still alive. I try and not let the nurse see me, she gets nasty. When you get old, people say you're senile if you complain.

"I do try not to be sorry for myself. But I never thought I'd end up like this, dependent on strangers and no use to anyone. When I want something personal, like a drink of water or a bedpan, I dread having to ask. I keep putting it off, the girl's always so busy."

FAMILY LIFE

The speaker was a 71 year old widow of an oil company accountant. Until 3 years ago, she lived in her San Francisco home and was an active churchgoer and worker and an integral part of her children's family life. She was "granny" to eight grandchildren, from time to time a baby-sitter, took place of honor at traditional family gatherings.

ONLY ALTERNATIVE

Then a slick pavement and a permanently damaged hip changed all that overnight. The road downhill was fast. Nursing care was required after hospitalization; the home had to be sold. One son lived out-of-State, another in Los Angeles. The only child living locally, a daughter, had a small home, four children and could not take on the responsibility.

Nor did the widow, wishing to remain independent as long as possible, wish to "impose" herself on any of her children. She chose the only alternative—a nursing home in the avenues.

"I pay $350 a month. It's the best I could find within my means. I don't know what I'll do when my savings run out."

The setting in which the pride and income of this widow are daily depleted is little different from scores of other avenue homes in the city, modern bungalows on low-rent Oakland sidestreets, or old Berkeley homes with smart facades—all with a State license to operate as a convalescent or nursing home.

Brown smudges from handprints rim the doorways and mark the walls, and dust covers the not so hard to reach places on the layered paintwork. In the bathrooms the tiles rarely seem to fit and often the baths are so bone dry it's anyone's guess when they were last used.

BLARING TV

Everywhere the air is heavy with the smell of deodorizers and, as if covering the "guests" terrible silence, a television set perpetually blares.

In all the homes visited I found only one that had any fresh-cut flowers. Like the modern graveyard, the decorations are plastic and covered with dust. Every room, with its 6 vinyl plastic chairs for 10 patients, to the rickety "sunroom" at the back that overlooks a garden that never gets finished, smacks of a cutrate operation.

In a 3-week Examiner survey of bay area nursing homes, I never met a volunteer visitor, pastor, or priest, and only once did I meet a doctor. That was in a home where the fees started at $500 a month.

FEE RANGE

Fees in these homes range from $280 (the maximum allowed by the State department of finance to medical assistance to the aged patients) to $500 and up. A fair average would be $350. This might or might not include such personal items as the cost of linen (for incontinent patients) and assistance with feeding ($1 a meal). This monthly board rate would not include doctor's visits, drugs, therapy, or any minimal medical services.

Because of the hodgepodge regulations and poor policing by the State department of public health, these homes have become a mint for unscrupulous operators.

I was 12 minutes in one sunset district home with 10 beds before I could locate a "nurse."

FOOD DEBRIS

A walk through the kitchen showed the refrigerator door wide open, two quart carton of milk which had turned warm on the table, and egg shell and other debris littered on the floor around an open garbage pail.

Dinner, set on trays without any protective covering, consisted of what I came to recognize as standard convalescent home fare—a fluffy white bread sandwich, potato salad, and gelatin dessert.

When the "nurse" arrived—she said she was a registered vocational nurse—she showed me a vacant bed, explaining how everyone in the home received loving care. In doing so she took me through a room where an elderly man was on a bedside toilet. His anguished protests were completely ignored.

A room in this haven costs a minimum of $300 a month.

PRIVATE ROOM

A Berkeley home offered a slightly more expensive room, for my "loved one," $350 a month, because it was a "private room," that is, it had a thin wire cable strung across the ceiling separating one bed from another with a piece of plastic shower curtain.

In the backroom of the same home, with no sunlight and little air, lay two men. The nurse explained that one was formerly a successful businessman whose family had predeceased him; in the nurse's eye his presence added "quality" to the home. He looked on indigently, but helplessly, as the nurse marched me without warning into his room.

The other man was tied by his wrists to the bed. The nurse—anyone employed at a convalescent home has this title even if they failed nurses' aid school—dismissed the old man's restraints has being "doctor's orders." The code specifically outlaws this kind of restraint under any circumstances.

In the small kitchen, where the grease and dust had found permanent havens in every corner, although the center of the floor was clean, the lunch trays were laid out. Cream in the coffee cups left a rim when moved, attesting to the length of time since it had been poured.

GARAGE MECHANIC

In a Richmond home, the proprietor took me into a private bedroom where the occupant, an elderly man, sat reading a newspaper. Stripping the bed to prove the hygienic standards of his operation, the proprietor (a garage mechanic until he stumbled on something better) pointed out a plastic sheet.

"He wets every night," he said. "They get just like children."

Unheard Cries in Nursing Homes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1965

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith the fourth of a series of articles written by Lisa Hobbs for the San Francisco Examiner regarding the deplorable conditions in some convalescent and nursing homes in the State of California.

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Examiner, Mar. 17, 1965]

UNHEARD CRIES IN NURSING HOMES

(By Lisa Hobbs)

The feeling of total abandonment which makes the aged sick indifferent about living any longer isn't the result of cutrate material standards but cutrate treatment as human beings.

Violations of human dignity are an integral part of the convalescent-nursing home system.

They are expressed in patients crying unheeded for a bedpan, in the television set roaring while the patient struggles for sleep, in aids barging into patients' rooms without their permission, the laughing references to the aged as being "like children" and the brisk teasing of patients before strangers.

These and similar assaults on the dignity of the aged sick can be directly traced to the fact that no education or training whatsoever is required either to run or own a home for the aged sick.

Only after a home has 25 beds are the services of a registered nurse required during an 8-hour daytime shift. For six or less beds, the State will issue a license to own or work in such a home to anyone "qualified by experience."

MEAN ANYTHING

This qualification "by experience" can mean anything. It not only includes nurse's aids but even janitors if they've worked around a hospital. The State health department has no resources to check all former employment claims in an industry that has such a gross turnover of transient labor.

For instance, the turnover of employed help in August 1964, was 42 percent.

Because of the State health department code, the only things an operator can cut back on, either to increase profits or just cut even, are labor, food, and clean linen.

The laws allow not only for ample cutting back but, in sections 293 and 294 governing the employment of both "nursing" and "supervisory" staff, foster the air of contradiction and confusion in which fringe operations thrive.

Sections 293 states that nursing homes with more than 6 beds but less than 60 shall have "awake and on duty at all times" one nurse "qualified by experience" to care for the type and number of patients.

Sections 294, which deals with "supervisors" states that 10 beds or less require a registered nurse or somebody "qualified by experience" to supervise.

It further states that homes with 11 to 25 beds must have a registered nurse, licensed vocational nurse or "someone that meets the department's approval."

Section 293 says that nursing homes licensed for 60 to 99 beds shall have at least 1 nurse licensed as a registered nurse in California on duty at least 8 hours a day, and other nurses who are "qualified by experience" covering the other two 8-hour shifts.

This means a home with 99 aged sick can be legally without a registered nurse 16 hours a day.

A survey of the results of the contradictions between sections 293 and 294 indicate that operators have solved the problem nicely by ignoring section 293 and choose to have supervisors—but no staff.

The Examiner survey indicated beyond any doubt that organized chaos surrounds every phase of the nursing-convalescent home industry.

A large part of this chaos is the direct result of the fact that medical assistance to the aged rates are fixed by the State department of finance and administered by the State department of social welfare in homes that are the sole responsibility of the State department of public health.

FIXED RATE

Further, while operators of other institutions receiving reimbursement for a wide range of services being received by their MAA patients, operators of nursing and convalescent homes receive a fixed rate.

This fixed rate has effectively blocked any solution to the most widespread and humiliating single burden of old age—incontinence.

The State finance department will authorize payments for 4 catheters a month regardless of the doctor's orders, which might specify 10. But if the nursing home operator wants to introduce a bladder retraining program, which involves expense, the State will not reimburse this expense.

A further curiosity exists in the fact that putting a catheter in a patient instantly puts the patient into MAA's extended care category—$2 a day more than the basic rate. At the same time, the State will not pay either for disposable diapers or excessive sheet changes, tempting the operator to cut costs with infrequent linen changes and placing further strain on the relationship between operator and patient.

The MAA eligibility clause provides another cause for both cut-rate standards and psychological stress.

A patient entering a county hospital becomes eligible the first day for MAA, the Federal Government paying 50 percent, the county 50 percent.

If you enter a nursing home or any private institution where the State must assume 25 percent of the cost, eligibility occurs only after the expenditure of $3,000 or a 30-day wait, whichever comes first.

This means that the sick aged who are not sick enough to be in hospital but require some minimal medical care must either stay in the county hospital or go without the required care until they become eligible.

COSTS RISE

Even more conducive to unsatisfactory care for the sick aged is the fact that the rate fixed by the Department of Finance is totally unrelated to the cost of individual care, the range of services provided, and the quality of these services.

The construction standards of the public health code have driven the costs of building and operating a rest home sky high. New homes cost an average of $5,700 a bed to build, but the State department of finance froze the rate back in 1962.

This has put the operators of the "grandfather" homes, which do not have to meet the building standards, at a tremendous advantage. While the new homes struggle to break even if they adhere to the code, the old substandard operations flourish.

What has been the result of these legal discrepancies in terms of patient care?

Dr. Leon Lewis is former chairman of the advisory committee on the aged for the State social welfare department. He is one of the best-known specialists in rehabilitation in the United States and is a former professor at both Stanford and the University of California, in Berkeley.

He says: "I believe most of these homes are a medical curse rather than a benefit. Most people who go there deteriorate and quickly go to pot. It's true of all of them with only one or two exceptions."

North Hills Clergymen Pledge Work for Equal Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, a group of clergymen in my home city of Pittsburgh have issued a significant statement pledging their efforts for equal rights and opportunities for all persons.

I include, as part of my remarks, a report on this statement, published in the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, April 12, 1965:

ONE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-NINE MINISTERS AND PRIESTS SIGN STATEMENT—NORTH HILLS CLERGYMEN PLEDGE WORK FOR EQUAL RIGHTS

A group of 139 Protestant and Catholic clergymen in North Hills have signed a statement urging equal rights and opportunities for all races, nationalities, and religions, and an end to racism.

"The House of God must be open to all peoples, and if we discriminate we deny the essential nature of the church as the fellowship in Christ," the statement said.

The statement, formulated by the North Hills Ministerial Association, was circulated through Allegheny County north of Pittsburgh and in a portion of Butler County. It was signed by 49 Roman Catholic priests and 90 Protestant clergymen, representing a total of 105 churches. The Protestant denominations are United Brethren, United Presbyterian, Protestant Episcopal, Christian, Baptist, Lutheran, Methodist, Presbyterian, and Congregational.

The statement called for equal rights in voting, law enforcement, education, employment, housing, public accommodations, and cultural advantages. One portion of the statement called for freedom for all people to live where "their economic means and their personal wishes permit."

The statement called upon the churches to "cease from being followers and dare to lead."

The committee said the purpose of the staement is "to further create a climate in the North Hills suburban area where people of all races, creeds, and national origin might live together in harmony and peace.

The ministers represent congregations in Ross Township, McCandless Township, Bellevue, Etna, Millvale, Aspinwall, West View, Northside, Glenshaw, Wexford, Natrona Heights, Tarentum, Mars (Butler County), Sewickley, Allison Park, Creighton, Fox Chapel, Bakerstown, Gibsonia, Cheswick, Laurel Gardens, Zelienople (Butler County), Wildwood, Leetsdale, Gilenfield, Springdale, and Harwick.

The Reverend Robert Ruble, of Berkeley Hills Lutheran Church, Ross Township, was chairman of the Racial Statement Committee. Other members were the Reverend E. L. Parks Jr., Ingomar Community Methodist Church; the Reverend Carl M. Roemele, St. Alexis Roman Catholic Church, Wexford, McCandless Township; and the Reverend Wilson H. Yost, Parkwood United Presbyterian Church, Allison Park.

The action of the North Hills ministry followed by less than 3 months, action by 54 South Hills clergymen who signed a fair housing pledge. That statement called upon "all persons to help bring about fair and democratic practices in housing."

TEXT OF PLEDGE

Following is the pledge signed by the North Hills ministers:

"We the ministers and priests of the Christian churches of the North Hills area believe that the racial situation is one of our most serious domestic evils. All forms and types of racism must be eradicated with all diligence and speed. For this purpose we appeal to the consciences of the Christian people of the North Hills area.

"Our Lord Jesus Christ teaches that all men are brothers. His gospel makes no room for the arbitrary distinctions and expressions of racial or group prejudice.

"The House of God must be open to all peoples, and if we discriminate we deny the essential nature of the church as the fellowship in Christ."

DEMANDS FOR JUSTICE

"The minimum demands for justice in the social order include the recognition of equal rights and opportunities for all races, nationalities and religions in voting, law enforcement, education, employment, housing, public accommodations; cultural advantages. We of the church confess with deep penitence that our deeds have not always measured up to our creeds. We call upon all peoples and groups of our area to practice fair employment practices and policies, and to render services to the public without racial segregation or discrimination.

"We support all Government laws established for the maintenance of equal rights and we urge their enforcement. A society that denies all but the most menial of jobs to a significant number of its minority race members is wasting its most precious resource—its people."

PLEA TO CHRISTIANS

"We believe that Christians must insist that all people have the freedom to reside wherever their economic means and their personal wishes permit. Therefore, we urge all who buy and sell property as individuals or through brokers to do so without discrimination as the law requires. Our churches should call upon their members to help provide the atmosphere for people of all races, religions, and social levels to live together in peace and harmony.

"We recognize that in these days of tension we need a deeper spiritual undergirding for the tasks that are ahead. We therefore call upon our people to pray for the guid-

ance of the Holy Spirit as we seek in penitence to implement what we believe to be the will of God. We humbly call upon our people to join with us in prayer, to the end that we may be able to do the full will of God in all human relations. We call upon our people to work and pray for the rule of justice in which voting rights and equal protection of the law will everywhere be enjoyed; public facilities and private clubs serving a public purpose will be accessible to all; equal education and cultural opportunities, hiring, and promotion, medical, dental, and hospital care, open occupancy in housing will be available to all. To implement this goal let us give our support and cooperation to such worthwhile agencies as share similar aims.

"In making this appeal we affirm our common religious commitment to the essential dignity and quality of all men under God. We dedicate ourselves to work together to make this commitment a vital factor in our total life. We call upon all peoples to work, to pray, and to act courageously in the cause of human equality and dignity, while there is still time, that past injustices will not be used as excuses for new ones; to eliminate racism and social inequalities permanently and decisively; to seize the historic opportunity the Lord has given us for healing these age-old evils in the human family and to do this for the glory of God. Let the churches cease from being followers and dare to lead.

"Committee:

"Rev. ROBERT RUBLE,
"Chairman.
"Rev. ELMER PARKS,
"Rev. FATHER ROEMELE,
"Rev. WILSON YOST."

The following North Hills clergymen signed the statement concerning racial prejudice:

ROSS TOWNSHIP

J. F. Mawhinney, Mellwood United Presbyterian; William G. Lewis, Christ Protestant Episcopal; Arthur C. Boll, North Hills Christian; Roy G. Getty, Donald J. Sotak, Richard Granday, St. Sebastian (Catholic); Herbert Hall, North Hills Community Baptist; Robert Blair Ruble, Berkeley Hills Lutheran; T. F. Henninger, Robert J. Boyle, Bernard Hrico, St. Teresa (Catholic); G. F. Hinkle, McKnight Village Methodist; William M. Aber, Hiland Presbyterian; A. W. Stremel, Christ Lutheran; Clifford Wood, St. John's Lutheran.

M'CANDLESS TOWNSHIP

James F. Donald, Stephen L. Polley, Northmount U.P.; Luther Fackler, LaVern D. Rasmussen, St. John's Lutheran; Fred Park, E. L. Parks, Jr., Ingomar Community Methodist; R. S. Bolt, Heritage U.P.

BELLEVUE

Richard A. Madsen, Northminster U.P.; John H. Piper, Bellevue Methodist; P. T. Pullen, Ben Avon Methodist; Howard I. Cooper, Forest Avenue U.P.; William D. Bradley, Emmanuel Lutheran; James M. Barnett, Belvue Presbyterian; Vincent Kmiecinski, Peter Gross, oJhn P. Skaj, Sacred Heart (Catholic); Clement A. Roach, James D. Sullivan, St. Ann's (Catholic); David C. Casto, Epiphany Protestant Episcopal; Zygmunt V. Szarnicki, Thomas J. Hanlon, Michael P. Hinnebusch, Assumption (Catholic); William D. Wolfe, Trinity Lutheran; William Smith, Ben Avon Presbyterian.

ETNA

F. K. Morris, Emmanuel Lutheran; David Phillips, Calvert Memorial U.P.

MILLVALE

Charles T. Behl, Sebastian J. Schiffgens, St. Anthony's (Catholic); Robert Gumbert, Millvale Methodist; Earl H. Miller, St. John's Lutheran.

ASPINWALL

Paul S. Montgomery, Aspinwall United Presbyterian Church; Joseph A. Rossenbach, St. Mary's (Sharpsburg) (Catholic); Raymond A. McCalligan, St. Joseph (O'Hara Township) (Catholic); William D. Savage, St. Scholastica (Catholic); Earl W. Lighthall, Aspinwall Methodist; Dominic J. Olivera, Ernest C. Paone, Madonna of Jerusalem (Catholic).

WEST VIEW

E. Charles Patterson, Albert C. Koser, George Chortos, St. Athanasius (Catholic); Dwight G. Townsend, West View Methodist; V. B. Vandersall, West View Presbyterian; Robert Deal, West View U.P.; Charles W. Rampp, St. Luke's Lutheran; Robert J. Wennerstrom, Mount Calvary Lutheran.

NORTHSIDE

Philip A. Campbell, Edward A. Heinrich, John P. Maloney, Nativity (Catholic).

GLENSHAW

G. Mason Cochran, James Marshall, Thomas J. Mori, Glenshaw Presbyterian; John M. Leggett, Church of our Savior Episcopal; Floyd P. Duff, Bethel Lutheran; Willis Hacker, Glenshaw Valley Presbyterian; Stephen N. Schneider, Francis Z. Jurewicz, St. Mary's (Catholic); Ralph E. Roos, Francis A. Glenn, St. Bonaventure (Catholic); J. Robert Henderson, John A. Simpson, Elfinwild U.P.; Walter C. Koehler, Bethlehem Lutheran.

WEXFORD

Carl M. Roemele, Francis M. Rodgers, St. Alexis (McCandless Township) (Catholic); William Gleditsch, Pleasant Hill U.P.; Fred Cassell, Wexford Community U.P.; Charles S. Loney, Salem Methodist; Clarence B. Daniels, Trinity Lutheran.

NATRONA

Leo R. Burchianti, Joseph P. Sullivan, St. Josephs (Catholic); Phillip E. Wilson, Natrona Methodist.

NATRONA HEIGHTS

Theodore F. Moehring, Calvary Lutheran; Benjamin Nevin, First Baptist; Francis Tennies, A. M. Deemer, Natrona Heights Presbyterian; Robert M. Friday, Michael F. Carmody, Warren W. Metzler, Blessed Sacrament (Catholic).

TARENTUM

E. J. Siess, First Methodist; Francis J. Haas, Sacred Heart (Catholic); John H. Elkins, First Congregational; Robert E. Andreen, First Presbyterian; Joseph G. Malinak, St. Clement (Catholic).

MARS

Sidney S. Robinson, Jr., St. Christopher's Episcopal; Charles P. Schafer, St. Kilian (Catholic).

SEWICKLEY

Raymond A. Must, Paul J. Savage, St. James (Catholic); David E. Martin, Fairmount Presbyterian; Philip M. Hastings, Shield Presbyterian; Harry T. Hutchinson, Sewickley Presbyterian; Kenneth H. White, Sewickley U. P.; R. W. Cartwright, Little Hill Evangelical United Brethren; E. Earl Anderson, St. Paul's Lutheran.

ALLISON PARK

Joseph R. Grosko, Herman J. Heilman, St. Ursula (Catholic); Charles G. Skuce, Keith Brown, Memorial Park Community U.P.; R. G. Krouse, Epworth Methodist; Thomas L. Hayes, St. Thomas-in-the-Field (Episcopal); Wilson H. Yost, Parkwood United Community Presbyterian.

CREIGHTON

J. F. Regis, Ragan, Holy Family (Catholic); W. T. Hill, Vermont Baptist.

FOX CHAPEL

James Curtis Roof, Fox Chapel U. P.; W. L. Jones, Fox Chapel Methodist; Bickford Lang, Fox Chapel Presbyterian; Donald McGarrah, Pine Creek Presbyterian.

BAKERSTOWN

Richard A. Morledge, Judson Wiley III, Bakerstown Presbyterian; Ward Elliott, Bakerstown Methodist.

GIBSONIA

Marvin D. Ackerman, Trinity Lutheran; Kenneth L. Duncan, Gibsonia Presbyterian; Howard E. Pusey, Hampton U. P.

CHESWICK

Richard K. Kennedy, East Union U. P.; Donald Power, Resurrection Lutheran.

LAUREL GARDENS

Walter Wist, Faith Lutheran.

ZELIENOPLE

James C. Biller, St. Ferdinand (Cranberry Township) (Catholic).

WILDWOOD

Francis R. Stifter, St. Catherine (Catholic).

ASPINWALL

Charles E. Miller, Aspinwall United Lutheran.

PERRYOPOLIS

Logan L. Kuhns, St. Paul's Lutheran.

LEETSDALE

E. K. Rumberger, St. Matthews United Lutheran.

GLENFIELD

R. E. DeLong, Glenfield Methodist.

SPRINGDALE

D. C. Robbins, Springdale Methodist.

HARWICK

John J. Scanlon, Our Lady of Victory (Catholic).

The statement also was signed by William E. Hankey, president, and Howard F. Riesz, assistant to the president of the Western Pennsylvania-West Virginia Synod, Lutheran Church of America.

Additional Expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities

SPEECH
OF
HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, on March 26, President Johnson indicated that the Federal Government was drafting legislation to regulate the activities of the Ku Klux Klan. He also indicated that a congressional investigation of the Klan would be appropriate.

In my view, any investigation of the Klan should be carried out by the legislative committee of the Congress concerned with civil rights and Federal criminal legislation—in this case, the House Judiciary Committee—to determine what changes are needed in existing laws. Investigation for investigation's sake serves no useful purpose. In any case, no additional money is needed by the House Un-American Activities Committee should they wish to make an independent inquiry into the activities of the Klan.

Resolutions of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Pennsylvania

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, recently I received from the secretary of the Senate of Pennsylvania and from the chief clerk of the house of representatives in Harrisburg copies of two resolutions which were introduced in those respective bodies.

These resolutions were of consequential interest to me, and I felt that they might be of interest to the other Members of this Congress as well.

They are as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE SENATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

The closing of the Olmsted Air Force Base at Middletown, Pa., will add to the unemployed of central Pennsylvania about one-fourth of the total to be made unemployed by the recent order of Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara, closing certain installations throughout the United States. About 12,000 families will be seriously affected by the order.

In addition to the economic suffering of the unemployed the Commonwealth and the political subdivisions of the area will be adversely affected by the resultant additions of poverty-stricken families to relief rolls, etc., and the economy of central Pennsylvania will grind to a low point in the years to come because of the loss of the annual $73 million payroll of the base.

National defense expenditures in Pennsylvania constitute only one-third of the amount spent in New York and only one-eighth of that spent in California. The phasing out of the Olmsted Base will lower the share of the Commonwealth to less than 3½ cents of each national defense dollar.

Olmsted Air Force Base is the only base operated by the Air Force in Pennsylvania. Its closing may result in inadequate protection for Pennsylvania and Northeastern United States: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara be urged to rescind the order directing the phasing out of the Olmsted Air Force Base at Middletown; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to each Senator and Representative from Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States.

Attest:

MARK GRUELL, Jr.,
Secretary, Senate of Pennsylvania.

HOUSE RESOLUTION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF PENNSYLVANIA

History, science, and the demonstrated individual worth of immigrants from all countries of the world establish that our immigration laws are obsolete. The discriminatory National Origins Act should be repealed and corrective legislation enacted by Congress. To exclude a skilled or gifted person because the country of his birth has a small quota is both undemocratic and wasteful.

This is a Nation of immigrants in which citizens of many cultures and ethnic origins live and work side by side to make the American ideal of equality for all men a reality.

Immigrants represent less than 0.25 percent of the total work force. Those entering the labor force have talents and skills which are in short supply in our economy: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to repeal the National Origins Act and that it pass corrective immigration legislation to demonstrate to the world that we believe all men to be equal under law; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Members of Congress from Pennsylvania, and the chairman of the Committee on Immigration.

No Appeaser—Johnson's Record of Firmness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's brilliant and courageous speech at Johns Hopkins University has once more underlined our Nation's desire for a just and lasting peace in Vietnam, southeast Asia, and throughout the world. At the same time his proposal for "unconditional discussions" is based on a strong, determined military policy to resist aggression from the Hanoi Government and to carry out U.S. commitments to the people of South Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, the noted columnist, Roscoe Drummond, has written of the effect of President Johnson's Johns Hopkins speech in an outstanding article in the Washington Post for April 12, 1965. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include this most timely and informative article in the RECORD and commend it to our colleagues of the Congress.

The article follows:

NO APPEASER—JOHNSON'S RECORD OF FIRMNESS
(By Roscoe Drummond)

It is reasonable that the Republican supporters of President Johnson's strong policy in Vietnam should show some worry that his proposal for "unconditional discussions" may lead into an appeasement trap.

This is a fair warning. It is an honest warning. There is such a potential danger.

But I see nothing in the President's talk-and-defend proposal which contains the merest flicker of appeasement. I see nothing in the mood or substance of his Johns Hopkins speech which suggests any naive softness in the administration's position.

If Mr. Johnson's willingness to talk rested on a record of weakness and indecision, it would be untenable and perilous.

Since it rests on a 2-month record of firmness and decisiveness in action, it is prudent and constructive.

It needs to be understood that while the President has put no conditions on our willingness to seek a settlement, there are conditions on the kind of settlement which we will accept.

The conditions to a settlement by negotiation are: (1) An end to Hanoi's aggression and (2) the independence of South Vietnam and its freedom from attack.

"We will never be second in the search for such a peaceful settlement," Mr. Johnson declared.

That is wise—and it is sound as long as it rests on the commitment that the defense will continue and the military pressure mount until the aggression ends, talks or no talks.

It does rest on that commitment. And it rests on a sequence of military actions which demonstrates firmness of purpose which will mount as much and as long as necessary. This is why willingness to talk and defend simultaneously is safe.

It is winning for the United States just about the maximum world support for the military course we are having to pursue to defend South Vietnam and which inevitably scares the timid.

It is also winning for the United States a tremendous increase in support from neutral countries because the President has succeeded in putting the onus for not being willing to talk on the aggressors.

The Johns Hopkins speech could not have been safely delivered 2 months ago, even a month ago. Then it would have caused Hanoi to conclude that it was an act of softness and evidence that they had the United States licked. It would have caused Saigon to fear the worst, to suspect that we were courting an excuse to scuttle and run.

Mounting military pressure—with every evidence that it will continue as long as needed—and a proposal to talk are the ingredients of constructive diplomacy.

Some are suggesting that the offer of a substantial American investment in a collective U.N. aid program for the southeast Asian nations is an idle and foolish bid to buy peace. That misses the point entirely.

The prospect of outside help in development, after so much internal and international strife, means, for example, that South Vietnamese will not only be fighting for freedom but for progress toward a better life. It also means that, as long as the Hanoi-Communist aggression continues, it will be increasingly clear to others that Hanoi is fighting against both freedom and progress.

Maurice Perlin: The Strange Case of the Judge Who Decided To Lead Instead of Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, one of America's outstanding labor journalist, Mr. Victor Riesel, recently wrote an excellent column about one of Chicago's most highly respected labor leaders, Maurice Perlin, president of Local No. 1031, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

I am taking the privilege of placing Mr. Riesel's column in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today so that those who are often too quick to criticize the American labor movement and its leaders can see what a high caliber of men labor's leadership includes in its ranks.

Mr. Perlin epitomizes the best in the American labor movement. I am proud that he is a Chicagoan.

Mr. Speaker, the article by Mr. Riesel is as follows:

STRANGE CASE OF JUDGE WHO DECIDED TO LEAD INSTEAD OF RULE

(By Victor Riesel)

CHICAGO.—If anyone is searching for the hero of a saga which could be titled the "Incorruptibles," the man can be found in this city of the untouchables.

Eight months ago this man, Maurice Perlin by name, was chief justice of the Illinois State Court of Claims. Today he is a labor leader. After almost 5 years on the bench he left voluntarily to become president of one of the Nation's biggest local unions.

Ministers and priests have led labor, as have lawyers and matinee idols—but never before anywhere in the world has a chief justice of an important court stepped down to become a union official.

Judge "Maury" Perlin did. Thus he is now among the handful of the new breed who will some day replace the elders, who wonder where they can find the men to meet the new unionism needed for the age of space and automation.

Now 51 years old, Perlin is president of the unique and huge 30,000-member local No. 1031, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

Perlin gave up the security and peace of the bench for the turbulence of the labor front because he has a touch of the missionary in him. For years he had worked closely with his late predecessor Frank (Flo Ziegfeld) Darling as legal counsel and mentor of the thousands of men and women whose skills sped much of the electronic equipment to America's defense forces during the big war and the Korean conflict.

Because of the union's strategic position in the electrical field, and because it is the largest local in the Midwest, and because it could play a powerful role if ever captured by mobster or subversive forces, Darling and Perlin always were on the alert for intruders and infiltrators.

Of course, the Communists attempted to move in. The party used its best operatives. They worked their way into membership. They would come to meetings and put on talkathons in an effort to weary the rank and file and to keep them away from future decisionmaking gatherings.

Darling and Perlin then hit on the stratagem of extravaganzas. They put on big-time musical shows. They got Jimmy Durante and Ethel Merman to cavort and sing at the meetings. The union soon became as newsy in Variety as in the labor press.

The membership poured out to the meetings in such numbers that sessions had to be run over 2 and 3 nights. The Communists were beaten.

But the musicals still run on. Even today local No. 1031 is the only union which runs meetings on Saturday nights.

In a city where thugs machinegunned their way into unions and would collect bribes in open umbrellas, local No. 1031 remained clean and progressive—concerned over the prosperity of its members' employers as well as with its members' welfare.

When the union's 46,000 followers fell to 30,000, Darling and his lawyer, Perlin, fought the trend by battling for the inflow of Government orders and against the inflow of foreign competition from Japan and West Germany.

The moment came when Perlin moved into other fields—and in 1960 he was named chief justice of the Court of Claims.

Last August Frank Darling died in a Houston hospital, after serious surgery. The union executive board called an emergency meeting. They elected Judge Perlin president and then went to him with their offer.

The leadership of labor was a challenge. He resigned from the bench. On March 9, he stood for office in the general election and was overwhelmingly chosen.

Today Perlin is training his staff in the new unionism. He has called in Government experts to teach labor law, psychology, and the techniques of peaceful collective bargaining. He has called on the industry to take the lead in working with labor on special projects.

He has called on his own labor colleagues to study the results of the latest electronic research in universities as well as Federal and private space laboratories—so that the union can help the industry prosper and create more jobs.

"Research and development of new products can be pushed forward by our people," he has said. "This could mean new profit for management and new jobs for our members. It is the most effective method of preventing further loss of business to foreign competition. If we can't meet their abysmal wage rates and low-cost production we can beat them with better products and new ones. We can work together."

Obviously Judge Perlin has remained undiscovered too long.

Landmark in Federal School Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the 88th Congress was hailed as the education Congress but historians some years hence may be hard pressed to decide whether it was the 88th or the current 89th that should be called the education Congress. Approval of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 marked an historic turning point for American education. I call the attention of Members of the House to a recent editorial on this act in the Philadelphia Inquirer:

[From the Philadelphia (Pa.) Inquirer, Apr. 12, 1965]

LANDMARK IN FEDERAL SCHOOL AID

President Johnson, alert to the historic importance of the occasion, made some history of his own when he signed the Federal school aid bill Sunday in the rural schoolhouse in Texas he attended as a boy. It was a fitting touch to a precedent-shattering chapter in the evolution of education in America.

The $1,300 million aid measure was approved 263 to 153 in the House of Representatives and 73 to 18 in the Senate—remarkable margins considering that every previous effort to pump Federal funds into the mainstream of public education at the elementary and secondary levels had failed on Capitol Hill.

Most of the money, more than a billion dollars of it, is to go to public school districts under a formula supposedly geared to the war on poverty. However, approximately 94 percent of the Nation's school districts, including many of the wealthiest, will share the loot. The amount of help to the really impoverished districts will be disappointingly meager in most cases.

Fortunately, the worst flaw in the original bill was corrected. As first written, the measure failed to include many families on relief in large cities of the North in computing the degree of poverty in a school district. All children from families on relief will be counted in the formula as finally enacted.

Other sections of the measure—providing aid, directly or indirectly, to nonpublic schools—are headed for certain challenges in the courts. The litigation may go a long way toward clarifying constitutional questions of church and state.

Pennsylvania stands to receive in excess of $60 million in all parts of the school aid package. Bear in mind, though, that the measure signed into law Sunday is only the authorization bill. School boards, eagerly calculating how much Federal funds they will get, are cautioned to remember that all figures are tentative until Congress actually appropriates the money.

Stanley I. Posner, a Great American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, March 31, Mr. Stanley I. Posner, of Washington, D.C., was laid to rest by his wife, relatives, and friends. It was my privilege to have known Stanley for 15 of the 20 years I have been in Washington, D.C., and rarely have I met such a man. He was truly a philanthropist in every meaning of the word, for his first great concern was for his fellow man. From this concern stemmed the founding of the organization known as FULSA—Friends of United States of Latin America—which carried on relief work in Central America, concentrated in Costa Rica.

At his funeral service, eulogies were delivered by the Ambassador from Costa Rica to the United States, the Honorable Gonzalo J. Facio and Dr. Gerstenfeld, of the Washington Hebrew Congregation. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include these two eulogies which bespeak of a truly great American, Stanley I. Posner:

EULOGY FOR STANLEY I. POSNER

(Remarks by Ambassador Gonzalo J. Facio at the funeral services for Mr. Posner, Washington Hebrew Congregation, Washington, D.C., March 31, 1965)

I speak on behalf of the Government of Costa Rica, and for the many who mourn Stanley Posner.

Stanley was my intimate friend for many years.

He was a devoted friend of my country. Today in Costa Rica and at our Embassy, by order of my Government, the national flag flies at half mast. For we join today with his beloved ones in sharing the grief for a great man whom we consider the dearest adoptive son of Costa Rica.

Of Stanley Posner it can be said truthfully that he gave of himself for his friends and for the causes to which he untiringly devoted his declining strength.

Though we associate the Alliance for Progress with the name of one of America's great Presidents, I would like to believe that Stanley Posner was its precursor. The society, which he established many years ago, known as Friends of the United States of Latin America, was the forerunner of many of the ideas that are now accepted throughout the hemisphere.

Rarely can it be said of another person what we now say of Stanley Posner: that his life was well spent, that his works were

fruitful, that his indomitable courage remains an inspiration to his friends.

My dear Lillian and children Elizabeth, Lawrence, and James and sister Minna and brother Harold and all who are tied to Stanley Posner with the bonds of the flesh or of the heart.

We have gathered around the earthly remains of your beloved to speak a word of homage and to find some vision of God's comfort.

In one of the psalms of sacred Scripture we read these noble lines: "Lord who shall sojourn in Thy tabernacle? Who shall dwell upon thy holy mountain? He that walketh uprightly and worketh righteousness and speaketh truth in his heart. * * * That hath no slander upon his tongue nor doeth evil to his fellow, nor taketh up a reproach against his neighbor. He shall never be moved."

The ancient psalmist was trying to define the ideal man: He must be a man who not only knows the truth but speaketh it in the privacy of his heart, a man whose sense of truth arises out of the very core of his being, a man who not only never stoops to slander but walks uprightly and works righteousness, a man whose sense of the truth of the heart is ever dedicated to the righteous service of his fellow man. That kind of man may move around in the worldly path and be doing many a task of life but beyond the overt deed there is the abiding stability of the sacred. He dwells in a holy mountain of noble meditation. He sojourns in a tabernacle of the divine.

One always sensed that about our beloved Stanley. He did not stoop to slander because he was too busy facing the truth of the moral challenge of the world. His brilliant mind was to achieve the highest of academic honors but it was a mind that grappled with the legal framework of human labor and human barter and human relations that makes for a free society. From the time when he attended a meeting of the bar at Lima, Peru, and he became inspired with the vision for the American continent of a common citizenship and common market that would go beyond the unity of ancient imperialism, that would achieve the higher unity of a new age of freedom; ever since that time he gave himself to many an act of simple goodness, from the reaching out with his friends to scholarships for some who sought to see deeper into the community we can share; to using many a device to bring new medical supplies to the healing of the sick.

Here was the goodness of man in all its purity. Here was the noblest truth of man in all its integrity and charity. Here was the man who ever walked uprightly in the sacred task of working righteousness, as befits the vision of the ancient psalmist. Here was the worthy man who sojourned in the tabernacle of the divine. Here was the noble soul who dwelt upon a holy mountain.

Let us all meditate in gratitude to God for the years he has shared with us, whereby he brought the witness of his noble heart to lift up the vision and to deepen all that makes for our fulfillment. All of you will in the quiet of your own prayers feel the truth of what he has meant for you. I will ever remember him for the dedicated family he symbolized to a rabbi; for his radiant goodness; for his warm and kindly encouragement for all he shared in the walls of this temple; for the words of praise and the deep sincerity of his prayer that transforms the walls of this building into a true sanctuary of the living God. For all of these each of us will ever be grateful.

The leaves have their time to fall, the flowers their time to fade, the stars their time to set. The time has come for the soul of our beloved to set into the great beyond. Let us now say of him as said our fathers through the ages: Boruch Dayan Ha-emes: Blessed is the good God who sent this soul to live in our midst and now has taken him to his eternal nest. Zecher Tsadick Livrocho: The memory of the righteous is an eternal benediction. Amen.

Achievements Inventory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 19, 1965

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, it pleases me to have included in the RECORD the splendid article by Joseph V. Machugh that appeared in the March issue of Association Management. The article reflects a creative and imaginative approach to the solution of significant problems. I believe the concepts he expresses are sound, meaningful, and realistic with potentially far-reaching repercussions in both government and industry.

The article is as follows:

ACHIEVEMENTS INVENTORY

(NOTE.—During World War II, the chairman of a Federal agency was asked to appear before a congressional committee to report on the agency's activities and achievements. It was not to be a hostile inquiry, but rather a fact-finding session. The chairman, believing he had built a commendable record of accomplishments, directed his supervisory staff to submit statements of their respective contributions to the overall record. Most of the resulting statements indicated (1) the staff did not know precisely what they had done; or (2) they did not know how to express themselves clearly; or (3) they had not done anything at all. After much emergency work, the chairman finally compiled a record of his agency's activities and was prepared to go before the committee.

(Afterward, having learned a lesson from the last-minute effort, the chairman instructed his staff to begin keeping a continual record of achievements. From this emerged the concept of a "constant inventory of achievements." Joseph Machugh, author of this article, believes so strongly in the merit of the concept that for the past several years he has made it his personal campaign to urge its adoption among Members of Congress, Government officials, and business leaders. Because of the nature of the association executive's position, Mr. Machugh feels that the idea has particular value in the field of association management.)

(By Joseph V. Machugh)

"Resting on oars" while a race is in progress is a luxury none can afford in today's fast-moving and keenly competitive society. All too often we strive valiantly to attain some goal and, on reaching a plateau along the way, we pause to bask in the reflection of what has been done.

Knute Rockne's fighting Irish, once unbeaten for several successive seasons, faced a relatively weak team just prior to meeting their most formidable challenger. Rockne thought his presence was unnecessary that Saturday. Instead, he scouted the next opposition. The result was the upset of the season: Notre Dame was defeated by a mediocre team. Returning to South Bend, the players were fearful of what their famous coach would say. The wily Swede made no reference to their inglorious defeat as he pushed them through a week of hard practice but, when the players' suitcases—submitted for inspection before leaving for the big game—were returned, on the inside of each was taped a copy of a local editorial: "Overconfidence Caused It."

UNIVERSAL APPLICATION

That lesson has universal application. Expressed in other words: Half-way to objectives is no success at all. Continued effort is imperative if success is to be genuine and permanent.

How does one measure success? Perhaps a most convenient measure: by achievements. And what is an achievement? My definition: a significant job, well-done.

Achievement is a continuing process—like polishing brass aboard ship. If you have worthwhile goals, and you move toward those goals, that effort constitutes major achievement. Goals, plus planning for their attainment, are part and parcel of your job as an association chief. Yet, what is the use of eminently desirable goals and superb planning if those objectives are neither reached nor substantially approached?

It might be wise for every association executive to consider building what I characterize an "achievements inventory" and tell that achievements story to his membership—constantly. Association executives should be able at all times to enumerate, clearly and succinctly, their own achievements. This is self-evident. Yet, in practice how many—without advance warning—could answer satisfactorily this question: Since assuming your present post, what have been your 10 most outstanding achievements?

If an achievements inventory is deemed desirable, there are two best times to initiate it: first, the day after you begin as chief executive, and second, now.

WHO SHOULD BUILD THE INVENTORY?

Lack of objectivity is the most likely handicap for the achiever who would tell his own story. There is inherent difficulty in self-appraisal; even mirrors do not reproduce accurately. They reflect persons or objects in reverse instead of as they are. So, ideally, compilation and narration of an achievements inventory is a dual task, calling for cooperation and teamwork by those who do and those who tell about it. If best results are to ensue, the achiever achieves and the narrator compiles and narrates—imaginatively. Direction of inventory-building logically falls squarely on the shoulders of the narrator, under usual circumstances.

Neither task exceeds the other in importance. One complements the other, although of course, doing must precede recounting.

LOCATION OF ACHIEVEMENTS PROJECT

This writer is convinced that the only location for the compiler/narrator of an achievements inventory is in the office of the achiever, reporting directly to him. In an association, this would be, of course, to its chief executive. If there are constructive achievements, they are his accomplishments. If a bad record exists, blame will be his. In most associations, there must necessarily be delegation of authority to subordinates; but the chief executive must inevitably accept final responsibility for success or failure.

HYPOTHESIS

Assume this hypothetical situation: an association executive is engrossed in a vast maze of emergency and routine activities, in the midst of which budget limitations require the dismissal of a longtime aid who has not carried his weight. The disgruntled aid is aware of a vulnerable spot in the association's public image and tips off the trade press, leading, at the most inopportune moment, to a smear charge that dam-

ages both the association and its chief executive. Answers to that charge may take weeks to prepare. We all know that answers to charges often appear on back pages to be read by few, while the original charge received wide circulation. The result is severe damage all around.

PURPOSE SERVED BY AN ACHIEVEMENTS INVENTORY

A fully operative and continuing achievements inventory would serve these purposes:

1. It would enable an association chief to answer promptly and adequately any inquiry, friendly or hostile, into significant aspects of association activity emanating from official, public, or private sources. This includes answering charges promptly in the next issue of the press, before hostile sentiment can crystallize.

2. Such self-examination and soul searching would enable association errors to be found and corrected quietly without undue publicity or recrimination.

3. Even if no major error were disclosed, economy and efficiency of association activities would improve, outweighing the relatively modest expense of inventory building and maintenance.

4. It would provide ready, abundant, and valuable source material for policy statements and speeches by the association chief or by members who need reliable, factual information around which to construct their speeches.

5. It would establish a more satisfactory relationship with the association membership, generating enthusiastic support and greater willingness to pay regular dues.

HOW TO DO IT

The mechanics of inventory building fall logically into two separate but related parts: (1) short range and (2) long range. The objective of the first is to ascertain as quickly as possible 20 or 25 outstanding achievements and to organize an account of them simply, briefly, clearly, and convincingly. The longer project would involve a similar compilation, along with a study of the functions, structure, purposes, problems, and future needs of the association.

The initial period might best be spent examining association charts, major breakdowns of functions and responsibilities, annual and other significant reports and in personal discussions with the more active staff subordinates. Only with the help of such persons could the compiler secure the information needed for the inventory. Without staff cooperation, efforts to build an effective achievements story are doomed to failure.

During both projects, care should be taken to analyze the nature and substance of every activity submitted for consideration as a major achievement. Is it an achievement? Why? Is it significant? Why? Where does it belong in order of significance? Why? Where is the documentation and proof of its significance? Is it challenge proof?

A vast part of most associations' activity is aimed at developing or maintaining a good public image. An achievements inventory aims straight at that same target. The whole concept is designed to improve the association's overall effectiveness, no matter how well the job has been done in the past. And remember, execution is the end product and by far the most important aspect of the inventorying process.

One warning: Do not search too assiduously for accomplishments where they don't exist or where their merit is slight. Get only the wheat and ignore the chaff.

A wise course to pursue is to conduct a pilot experiment to determine if a more lasting project should be adopted.

Almost any association, regardless of size, might find value in the general idea embodied in an achievements inventory project. Such an inventory might help you do a better job as an association executive, as well as provide that inner satisfaction stemming from recognition of having made an enduring contribution to the success of your association.

In summary, an achievements inventory is a means of maintaining a record of accomplishments. It is useful to both the association and its chief executive. The latter should always give credit to the association. For, if he is responsible for those results, his membership will know it (if he's kept them informed)—and modesty will strengthen his standing among members.

Yet, like that brass-polishing job aboard ship, the tasks of an association chief are endless, and there will always be still more to do tomorrow. Nonetheless, continual effort is the secret of lasting success, and it is measured in achievement.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C. January 28, 1965.

To Whom It May Concern:

Joe Machugh's "Achievements Inventory" deserves thoughtful consideration by the management community. It is the product of a lifetime of energetic pursuit of a goal—devising a system of orderly tabulation of man's achievements as a means of realizing man's fullest potential.

Joe Machugh has devoted the best years of his life to perfecting the "Inventory of Achievements," and it behooves all of us to spend sufficient time to realize its value to the business world.

Sincerely,

BOB WILSON,
Member of Congress.

Mr. JOSEPH V. MACHUGH,
Achievements Inventory,
Key to Success,
Washington, D.C.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 2, 1965.

JOSEPH V. MACHUGH, Esq.,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOE: For several years I have had keen interest in the concept of an "achievements inventory" which you have urged constantly be adopted and implemented in both the legislative and executive branches of the Federal Government.

I am delighted to record my commendation of your most recent adaptation of the foregoing concept in "Achievements—Key to Continuity of Success."

It is my reasoned conviction that the principles and underlying thoughts of your achievements approach would be invaluable for every Member of the Congress and executive in the Federal departments and agencies who desire to leave a lasting record of their official activities. I am also confident the concept has comparable application in every area of private industry activities.

The best of good wishes to you in this unremitting effort truly in the public interest.

Sincerely yours,

W. J. BRYAN DORN,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 1, 1695.

JOSEPH V. MACHUGH, Esq.,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JOE: For several years I have been familiar with your "achievements inventory" concept. I know that you have discussed this matter at length with innumerable Members of the Congress and at Cabinet level as well.

Your current article, "Achievements—Key to Continuity of Success" reflects a creative and imaginative approach to the solution of significant problems, I believe your basic concepts are sound, meaningful, and realistic, with potentially far-reaching repercussions in governmental activities and in privte industry. They are essential to orderly conduct of business which requires careful thought about details and the long-range record of what has been accomplished.

I feel confident that implementation of the achievements concept in either or both of the above areas of activity will blend into modern, managerial concepts—leading to most effective contributions to the success of any organization, executive or legislative, whether on the National, State, or local scene.

With every good wish.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. BLATNIK,
Member of Congress.

Presidential Inability and Vacancies in the Office of the Vice President

SPEECH
OF
HON. JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER
OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office.

Mr. SCHMIDHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to add my voice in support of House Joint Resolution 1. In my opinion, this proposal is the soundest means for providing for the orderly and democratic succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency of the United States in case of the death or disability of the President of the United States.

Further, this proposal would define within the framework of the Constitution, the powers and the duties of the Vice President upon the death or disability of a President. I also feel that this proposal adequately safeguards the return of the powers and duties of the Presidency to the President who has seen in his wisdom to relinquish these powers and duties due to a disability.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I feel that this proposal would maintain the fine and traditional concept of our American system of government by providing for the recommendation of the Vice President by the President, and the approval of both Houses of the Congress if a vacancy were to occur in the Vice-Presidency.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Senate met at 9 a.m. and, pursuant to order previously entered, immediately adjourned (without transaction of any business) until noon Wednesday, April 21.

Page 7939

Nominations: On April 14, pursuant to previous authorization, Senate received nominations of Vice Adm. William F. Raborn, Jr., USN (retired), of California, to be Director, and Richard Helms, of D.C., to be Deputy Director, both CIA. Page 7934

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: Five public bills, H.R. 7549–7553; three private bills, H.R. 7554–7556; and two resolutions, H. Res. 344 and 345, were introduced. Pages 7937–7938

Bill Reported: One report was filed as follows: S. 701, to carry out the obligations of the United States under the International Coffee Agreement of 1962 (H. Rept. 252). Page 7938

Speaker Pro Tempore: Heard the reading of a communication from the Speaker designating Representative Boggs to act as Speaker pro tempore on April 19. Page 7936

Condolence Resolution: Adopted H. Res. 344, providing for expressions of sympathy and condolences on the death of Senator Olin D. Johnston, of South Carolina. Representatives McMillan, Rivers of South Carolina, Dorn, Ashmore, and Gettys were subsequently appointed by the Speaker pro tempore to serve on the funeral committee. Page 7937

Program for Thursday: As a further mark of respect to the memory of Senator Johnston the House adjourned at 12:05 p.m. until Thursday, April 22, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

Appendix

Control Data Institute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK MacGREGOR
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 22, 1965

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, the computer industry of the United States is one of the most vital and fastest growing industries we have. The needs of present and future America are greatly tied in with this growth.

We also require a tremendous growth in educational opportunity in this country to meet the needs of our young people and the needs of a more technicalized era.

When these two needs—a growing and healthy computer industry and more trained technicians—are joined together it is a boon for educational opportunity.

Control Data Corp., headquartered in Bloomington, Minn., in the Third Congressional District, is about to embark on this vital educational venture through the establishment of the Control Data Institute. Mr. Speaker, this to me is an excellent example of industry not only seeking growth but also providing another channel of education for our young people.

At this point I insert in the RECORD a statement from Mr. William C. Norris, the president of Control Data, announcing this institute:

CONTROL DATA CORP. NEWS RELEASE

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.—William C. Norris, president of Control Data Corp., today announced the establishment of a computer training school known as Control Data Institute. He said that the institute will be an integral part of Control Data Corp. and will operate on a tuition basis. Site of the institute in the Minneapolis-St. Paul area will be announced in the near future.

The purpose of the Control Data Institute will be to train high school graduates to qualify for positions as electronic technicians in the computer industry. The institute will provide training in computer technology, and students will use control data computers in their course work.

Elaborating on the need for establishing Control Data Institute, Norris said that "the computer industry is the greatest growth industry yet, as nowhere in industrial history can one find a comparable one if a composite of size, rate of growth, and ultimate potential is considered. At the present time, the needs and projected new applications for computers make it impossible to predict a plateau for it, so employment in the industry will continue to grow for many years." Norris cited Control Data—today a worldwide enterprise with over 9,000 employees—as an example of such growth.

By way of illustrating Control Data's continued efforts to obtain talented people, Norris referred to the company's intensive recruiting program carried out on the campuses of the Nation's colleges and universities. He also cited the hundreds of courses taught by Control Data each year to keep its employees abreast of the latest developments in the computer industry. "In many cases," he said, "these courses for our employees are taught by key Control Data engineers, whose experience and creative imagination are today responsible for many advances in computer technology." Many of the engineers who design and build Control Data computers will also conduct classes in the institute.

Named to the post as director of Control Data Institute is Swen A. Larsen. Having long experience in the computer industry and in the education profession, Larsen was formerly president of the Institute of Computer Technology.

Larsen said that Control Data Institute will maintain a high quality of instruction in computer technology. He added that students of the institute will work with Control Data's computer systems and will use the latest instrumentation equipment in laboratory work. In addition, students will receive instruction in writing computer programs that tell the computer what to do.

Larsen pointed out that the course work will prepare graduates for positions as engineering-electronic technicians. Typical of these positions in the computer industry are: customer engineering technician, unit and system checkout technician, design and development technician, quality assurance technician, sales support technician, computer operator, and junior programer.

Larsen said that many part-time jobs in Control Data's Twin Cities operations will be made available to students who, upon making application, can qualify. He said these part-time jobs will enable qualified students to defray some of their expenses, and to work in an atmosphere and on the type of equipment which they will encounter after graduation.

Upon completion of the course work, graduates of Control Data Institute will exercise complete freedom to seek employment wherever they choose. However, Larsen indicated that Control Data would offer employment opportunities in the United States and overseas for many of the graduates.

Classes of Control Data Institute will begin in September 1965, with the length of the course being approximately 1 year in duration. Present plans call for other beginning classes to follow at 60- to 90-day intervals.

Admiral Raborn Member of South's Hall of Fame for the Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 22, 1965

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, each year the magazine Dixie Business, which is published by Hubert F. Lee, in Decatur, Ga., selects an outstanding American for the South's "Hall of Fame for the Living." It is of timely interest that in 1963 the magazine selected for this honor Adm. William F. Raborn, U.S. Navy, retired, who recently was named Director of the Central Intelligence Agency.

I ask unanimous consent that the announcement of this award, as printed in Dixie Business, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the announcement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTH'S HALL OF FAME FOR THE LIVING

(By Hubert F. Lee)

For distinguished service to the Nation and to the South, the editors of Dixie Business have named Vice Adm. William F. Raborn, Jr., USN, retired, to the South's Hall of Fame for the Living.

William Raborn is responsible, with his special Manhattan-type task force within the Navy, of 45 officers and 75 civilians that we have a Polaris missile.

Another member of the South's "Hall of Fame" honor group, Dr. James Killian, Jr., in 1955 headed a committee of scientists whose report to the National Security Council led to the Polaris project being undertaken.

Rear Adm. E. M. Eller, U.S. Navy, retired, in letter dated August 30, 1961:

"I notice with interest your Hall of Fame for the Living. If the ballot can be extended, I recommend you add Admiral Raborn, father of the Polaris ballistic missile submarine: one of the greatest steps forward in the security in history."

Adm. David L. McDonald, U.S. Navy, Chief of Naval Operations, in reply to letter re Admiral Raborn:

"There is no doubt that Admiral Raborn is a great American—one whose contributions to this country and to the preservation of its security will long be remembered.

"I am sure Admiral Raborn would be honored by his addition to the South's Hall of Fame for the Living honor group.

"I certainly would be proud to recommend him for any honor which citizens of our great country might desire to pay him."

Senator STUART SYMINGTON, Democrat, of Missouri (first Secretary of the Air Force and himself one of the leaders considered for the A Great American Award):

"There never was a better American or a more able one than Vice Admiral Raborn."

Dan Haughton, president, Lockheed Aircraft Corp., Burbank, Calif. (born in Alabama and on the South's Hall of Fame honor group):

"I was glad to see Admiral Raborn added to the 'Hall of Fame for the Living' and added to the list of nominees for 'Man of the South.' He is a wonderful person and his Navy career was certainly one of dedication and service to our country.

"Representative CARL VINSON is an outstanding choice as 'A Great American' for 1964. His lifetime of service to his State and country makes us all proud we are Americans. Mr. Baruch is a great American in any year also."

Representative MELVIN R. LAIRD, Republican, a master mason and ruling elder of the First Presbyterian Church of Marshfield, as well as a Purple Heart hero of World War II on June 27, 1961, told the House:

"Men like Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. Arleigh Burke, and Chief of the Polaris project, Rear Adm. William F. Raborn, Jr., faced and accomplished the possible in a little time and took a bit longer on the impossible. These men had the courage to make deci-

sions, to eliminate bureaucracy, to build a superior armed services—research—private enterprise team, and to keep in mind the big picture, the whole package."

Although Washington bureaucrats would have hired a big staff for 6 months to write job descriptions for a still bigger basic staff, Admiral Raborn was no such bureaucrat. Within 10 days after his arrival as head of special projects, he had twisted Parkinson's law into reverse, hired his basic staff of 50 people, and was slicing leadtime in two. His men did not dillydally with long unnecessary redtape memorandums for the office down the street, but instead they "hot handed" their question in person to the person who could give them a prompt satisfactory nswer.

"Red" Raborn built teamwork within his steering task group:

Lockheed solved the problem of shutting off thrust at the right moment so that the missile would hit the target.

General Electric produced the remarkable fire control and guidance system.

Aerojet-General Corp. tested large quantitfes of solid fuel which did have adequate thrust.

Westinghouse helped in solving the launching problem.

Electric Boat Division of General Dynamics, and other companies, busily constructed the submarine.

Sperry Gyroscope Co. took MIT research and put together a navigational system containing more than 1 million parts.

No wonder Admiral Raborn wrote this for the guidance of many working under him:

"I must be able to reach down to any level of special projects activity and find a plan and a performance report that logically and clearly can be related to the total job we have to do."

WORKING IN CLOSE TEAM HARMONY

In his reply, when informed of his selection, Admiral Raborn gave credit to his team of workers:

AEROJET-GENERAL CORP.
El Monte, Calif., October 15, 1963.

DEAR HUBERT: I was utterly flabbergasted at the high honor. Actually, I am quite humble * * * unexpected award.

It is not necessary for me to mention to you, I am sure, that no one does anything by themselves and I am mindful at this time of the tremendous number of men and women who have contributed so much to our country's well-being working in close team harmony.

In this connection I am pleased to see the name of Mr. Daniel J. Haughton, president of Lockheed Aircraft Corp. on this honored list. His contribution to our country is unexcelled in modern-day times.

Again, all good wishes and sincere appreciation.

Sincerely,

R. M. RABORN.

Lost Art of Hawaiian Tapamaking Rediscovered

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 22, 1965

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, like so many arts that have been lost in the onrush of civilization, the making of tapa cloth from the bark of wauke plants was all but forgotten.

However, through the perseverance and patience of Mrs. Malia Solomon, who devoted countless hours to research and experimentation, this great Hawaiian art has been rediscovered. The people of Hawaii and of the Nation and the entire human race can be thankful for having in their midst such inventive individuals as Mrs. Solomon.

The inspiring story of this ingenious person is told in an article appearing in the Honolulu Star-Bulletin of April 7, 1965, which article I now insert in the RECORD by unanimous consent:

AFTER 5 YEARS OF INTENSIVE RESEARCH: ISLAND WOMAN "TAPS" LONG-LOST ART OF TAPAMAKING

The old Hawaiian tapa makers' secret felting process, extinct for nearly half a century, has been tapped.

The victorious detective, Malia Solomon of Ulu Mau Village, gets the credit and the spoils.

Malia's spoils don't look like much. A skimpy, scroungy, colorless piece of barkcloth.

Her potential second and third feats look like even less two soppy balls bundled in banana leaves and fermenting in foul-smelling sea water contained in a tin can to keep the mice away.

Every morning she tenderly unwraps each ball's leaves to see if either one is ready for final beating on a basalt stone.

"Last week the second ball seemed ready," she said, "so I beat it half out. But it didn't feel like the first one. The seams wouldn't flatten. I had to put it back in to soak.

"The ball has to have enough adhesion," she said. "That's what makes Hawaiian tapa superior to other Polynesian tapas that you see in all the local souvenir shops. Theirs are just pasted together into big pieces instead of felted."

Though the results need refining, they represent success that Malia dreamed about during 5 years of intensive research.

Besides exuberance, the half-Hawaiian malia displays yards and yards of intricately patterned museum pieces of tapa, which made the worthiness of her quest to recreate her ancestors' art seem obvious.

"I'm so proud of the ingenuity of those old natives," she beamed.

And just as proudly Malia shares their secret process.

Her source, she said, was a manuscript written by Samuel M. Kamekau in early missionary days and retranslated recently by a linguist and scholar named Dorothy B. Barrere. She found the early description, which had been unsuccessfully translated before, in the Bishop Museum archives.

She said she also found about a half dozen other translations, including one 273-page book entitled "Ka Hana Kapa" (Kapa was the old Hawaiian word for tapa).

"It's too bad that none of these methods worked," she said. "I tried every one."

Kamekau said to first strip the inner bark of the young wauke, Hawaii's paper mulberry plant, and soak it in sea water.

"I found that the word 'young' was very important," Malia said. "The bark gets brittle and difficult to strip with age."

The soaking period was not specified by Kamekau, so Malia tried 6 days with her first tapa project.

Kamekau's next direction was to scrape the bark clean, but he did not specify how. Malia said turtle shells worked well for her.

She continued following the manuscript and placed her clean bark on basalt stone to "beat it to smithereens." Then she squeezed the bedraggled bark into the ball stage to await final beating.

"To make tapa, you need a love of work and great patience," Malia recalls an old Hawaiian gentleman saying when she asked him if he remembered how a couple of years ago.

She said the reason why no one bothered to try recreating the art during the past half century "was probably that it was so laborious. I guess they figured who wants to make tapa, when you can buy synthetic fabrics in the store."

Tapa was used by the old Hawaiians, Malia said, "for fabric, candlewicks, sandals, blankets, just about everything.

"Now anybody lucky enough to have a piece would probably use it mostly for ceremony."

Tapa can be sewed on a machine or washed, she said. But prescribed washing should be in running stream water rather than an automatic washer, she prudently added.

What will Malia do with the tapa made at Ulu Mau Village?

She won't manufacture it, she said. "Who would want to, I ask you?

"I'm going to make it for appreciation," she said, "as soon as I can get more wauke."

When tapa making became extinct, in Hawaii she explained, so did cultivated wauke.

Malia's own wauke patch of over 100 plants at the village was started with transplants she made after a field trip through the Polynesian islands in 1961. She brought her original slips back from Western Samoa.

"My babies are very prolific now," she said. "But I'm stifled by nature."

It takes 18 to 24 months for wauke to mature, and Malia's next plants will not be ready for stripping until a year from now, she said.

Malia is impatient to rediscover the art's finer aspects. So her immediate research project becomes finding out where all the wauke has gone—long time passing.

The Medicare Bill—Statement by Edward P. Morgan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER F. MONDALE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 22, 1965

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, a distinguished member of the fourth estate for whom I personally hold a high degree of respect, Edward P. Morgan, recently discussed on one of his nightly broadcasts the House-passed medicare bill. Mr. Morgan's incisive and informative commentary is timely and, therefore, deserving of careful study by Members of the Senate and the public.

Mr. Morgan's basic point is that the philosophy underlying this proposed legislation is one of the most reasonable expressions of pluralistic progress ever written into American law. Under this legislation, Government and business will be engaged in an undertaking which will substantially eliminate one of the costliest drains on family income—medical care for the elderly. Of even greater importance in the long run, however, is the fact that in so doing, Government and business will be engaged in a cooperative venture providing greater protection for the nonelderly, financed through private insurance agencies now able to offer better policies at reduced rates, because the great risk involved in insuring the aged has been eliminated.

I commend this statement to the attention of my distinguished colleagues, and request unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MEDICARE BILL

It may not be exactly what the doctor ordered, but the medicare bill now at long last plowing majestically through Congress is a far more progressive and meaningful measure than anybody would have thought possible a couple of years ago. Major credit for its improvement goes to a native of Kensett, Ark., who, until very recently, was accused by some proponents of blocking the legislation—Chairman WILBUR MILLS, of the House Ways and Means Committee.

What the wily MILLS did was to hold out for a separate, identifiable fund that could be financed under social security without weakening the fiscal integrity of that 30-year-old system. Then he borrowed a Republican proposal for coverage of doctor bills and came up with a broader, stronger bill. A widely accepted master of the mystery of insurance tables, MILLS is confident the measure is sound, particularly because its rates were deliberately set high to protect the elderly against rising hospital costs. Indeed, he says the hospital insurance may be overfinanced, but if so, it will be revised downward later.

If the measure goes into effect as now written, on July 1, 1966, some 19 million Americans then 65 or over could immediately qualify for hospital benefits. Roughly 80 percent of their physicians' and surgeons' fees would also be covered if they subscribed to a voluntary program not included in the original bill. They would pay $3 a month for this insurance, the Government's share of which would come out of the Treasury's general fund. Hospital insurance for the elderly will be financed by compulsory increases in the payments by employer and employee into social security.

This $6-billion package represents, as one reporter put it, the biggest bundle of social security benefits ever devised but the philosophy behind it may be more important than its size. Opponents, with the AMA, the American Medical Association, in the forefront, argue this is creeping socialism but one thoughtful, influential member of the Ways and Means Committee, Democrat AL ULLMAN, of Oregon, maintains the bill is the best guarantee against socialized medicine ever developed. His reasoning runs roughly as follows: Medical care for old people is one of the biggest drags on the American family budget. Private companies have not been able to provide adequate coverage at premiums within reach for the risks involved. But with that drag now largely lifted by medicare, the insurance industry will be able more adequately to expand group and other protection plans for the nonelderly, thus easing the pressure for more Federal legislation. As one social security expert puts it hopefully, this is the uniquely American pluralistic approach of Government and business moving in to solve a problem.

If this theory works in practice, and its potential seems plausible, one of its beneficial side effects could be to reorient the pathetic and muddled thinking of the AMA, which is already in dutch with many of the doctors for whom it pretends to speak. Recently no less a distinguished figure than Walter F. Perkins, past chairman of the Johns Hopkins Hospital board in Baltimore accused the AMA of wild talk and "distortions of the truth" in opposing medicare. Last month the Congressman who sponsored AMA's own so-called eldercare bill, Democrat A. S. HERLONG, Jr., of Florida, publicly accused the association of a misleading advertising campaign to push the measure. In what might be called ingrown cross-fertilization, the AMA among other things, managed, directly and/or indirectly, to plant "canned" editorials with an AMA slant in a number of newspapers across the country and then cited these, in effect, as spontaneous proof of wide "grassroots support" of the AMA stand.

In the March 22 issue of the fortnightly publication Medical Economics, Dr. Walter E. O'Donnell, of Gloucester, Mass., writes that the AMA is "given to bizarre public spasms of self-righteousness accompanied by pronouncements that consign to perdition all those who oppose." Now, Dr. O'Donnell notes, "the 200,000 members of the AMA will have to live with a far-reaching (medicare) program that their association played little or no role in shaping." He does not, however, single out the AMA as the scapegoat but asks, rather, "where are the medical moderates?" The real culprits, he adds, "are those physicians, like me, who have regarded the perennial contest of Big Government versus Big Medicine as a spectator sport."

It seems that moderates in medicine, like moderates in civil rights and other fields, have failed to be militant enough on behalf of reasonableness. Medicare, as it stands, is not an unreasonable bill. In an area of desperate need it can be one of the social boons of the century. But it is far from perfect. Its imperfections can be remedied by approaches of reason and good will, if the AMA and other groups and individuals involved will stride along with the times instead of being possessed of the creeps about socialism.

This is Edward P. Morgan saying goodnight from Washington.

United States To Hold Rein on Projects

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, many of us have seriously considered the influence which the Federal Government is going to exercise over State and local governments in the administration of the many welfare programs passed in this session of Congress.

I have found no better explanation of this concern than the article written by Richard Wilson and appearing in the Evening Star of Monday, April 19, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 19, 1965]

UNITED STATES TO HOLD REIN ON PROJECTS

(By Richard Wilson)

Nothing in this law, says the education enactment, shall be taken to mean that public support is being given to the teaching of religion or to teaching methods or curriculums in other fields.

No funds are to be expended under the hospital care program for paying ordinary doctor bills. No programs are to be developed under the antipoverty program without local cooperation. In the area and urban development programs a benevolent local-Federal partnership shall prevail.

The Johnson legislation and programs are filled with disclaimers, exceptions, and "caveats" unnumbered and all designed to quiet apprehension that a new breed of Federal administrators will swarm over the Nation setting standards and preempting local and State functions.

But they are coming by the thousands, the voting registrars, the education specialists, the poverty fighters, the urban experts and city planners, the beautifiers, the hospital administrators, the housing experts, the welfare specialists.

It will be a Great Society, a Great Society of new administrators, advisers and specialists probing into local and State practices, customs and institutions, setting standards, demanding conformity to Federal plans, stemming or releasing the new flood of cash that soon will be flowing out of Washington.

President Johnson has forecast a new era of local and Federal cooperation. He never misses an opportunity to tell new Government appointees that they are the people's servants and not their masters.

But discretion beyond measuring is being lodged in the hands of Washington administrators in the housing, education, welfare, and urban development fields to determine the nature and extent of local and State compliance with Federal standards.

Local officials are becoming eager and greedy. Mayors Wagner of New York City and Daley of Chicago moved fast to grasp control of the antipoverty programs in their respective cities. They recognized its patronage potential, and, with the sure instincts of big city politicians reared in the Tammany and Kelly-Nash tradition, took over programs to help the poor before somebody else got control of them.

Local officials who are mounting the tiger now with such eagerness will have to think later how to dismount. When they begin to think about it they know they will never dismount, that the degree and extent of Washington's intervention in local affairs will continue to expand and, in the end, the local officials will be inside the tiger.

This is a new chapter in an old story. The book had been closed and locked for a long time on social reform and national development directed from Washington but now it is open again. Once the book had been unlocked by President Johnson, Congress flung it open to gobble up as fast as possible the chapters that had lain unread since the New Deal.

The strangest part is that Johnson has been a restraining influence on a congressional majority which wished to move at a faster and wilder pace than he.

Restraint may also be his chief problem with the new crop of Federal administrators and enforcers lest they become a swarm of locusts upon the land.

As the new Federal squadrons form, perhaps they should be briefed on some events of the past: Harry L. Hopkins' use of the WPA for political purposes in Roosevelt's day, the scandals of the Truman administration, the Goldfine-Adams sensation, the Billie Sol Estes and Bobby Baker cases, the internal revenue scandals and other events which show the fallibility of small men handling great power.

In the end, much of the success and acceptance of the new programs will depend on the integrity and judgment of those who carry them out.

Teaneck Friendship Day II

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 22, 1965

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, on Sunday, April 25, the community of Teaneck,

N.J., will hold "Teaneck Friendship Day II." This interfaith home-visitation program brings neighbors of different races together for an afternoon or evening of conversation. The first visitation day was held last November.

Many of our problems in civil rights and human relations can be solved when we realize that those of other races are simply people, who share our own hopes, frustrations, and everyday problems. By bringing neighbors together informally, Teaneck Friendship Day is opening new avenues of communication, resulting in a new awareness of common interests and new aproaches to common problems.

I commend the committee of clergy and laymen and the residents who have made this program work in Teaneck. Father Henry Goodwin, pastor of St. Anastasia's Roman Catholic Church, and Frank E. Hall are cochairmen of the committee, and John Dunican is the coordinator.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a thoughtful editorial by Bill Caldwell, published in the Record, of Bergen County, and an article written by Fanny S. Mach, and published in the Teaneck Sunday Sun, describing the warm success of the first Teaneck Friendship Day.

There being no objection, the editorial and the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Bergen County (N.J.) Record, Nov. 31, 1964]

TURNING POINT: FRIENDSHIP DAY I

As long as we think of people as a problem, it can be laid down in the form of an iron rule that the problem will be unsolved and insoluble. The Negro problem can't be solved—not in that form, the form of a faceless abstraction walking around in a suit of clothes. Nor can the Russian problem or the Vietnamese problem or the problem of migrant workers—to declare it a problem is a way of holding it at arm's length.

As some 600 good neighbors will be demonstrating tomorrow in Teaneck's first observance of what will be an annual Friendship Day, when a problem is translated into people it's no problem at all. Some 200 white families will go visiting some 100 Negro families. The auspices are impressive. The committee sponsoring the visits is supported by 14 churches in the community. The families that go calling in the afternoon will meet at 2 p.m. in St. Anastasia's Roman Catholic Church. Those choosing the evening for their call will meet at 7:30 p.m. in the Jewish Community Center. Mayor Feldman has assisted in the planning. Clergymen of the faiths participating will take part in the modest orientation meetings preceding the visits.

One impressive aspect of the Friendship Day proceedings is even now of record, in such statement of support as comes from the Reverend Aloysius J. Welsh, archdiocesan coordinator of interracial justice programs, Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Newark:

"The heart of the question is moral and religious. The denial of fair housing, of equal employment opportunity in hiring or promotion, of the same quality of education because of race or color, is sinful. Millions of Americans know far more about foreign problems than they know about Negro conditions in their own country. I see in Teaneck Friendship Day a well planned effort to bridge the isolation of man from man because of race. * * * The open doors of the Negro home should find a response in the open hearts and open minds not only of those participating but of all of us. God bless the planners and participants."

"One of the great needs of our time is that of establishing communication across racial and ethnic lines," said the resident Methodist bishop of New Jersey, Prince A. Taylor, Jr., "and I feel that this is an excellent place to begin." The Reverend Henry D. Goodwin, O. Carm., pastor, of St. Anastasia's, observed correctly that when the scope of opportunity to know each other is narrowed so is the scope of concept and understanding and belief. The Teaneck program is an extension of last April's series of Home Visit Days in dozens of towns across the country. Ridgewood had a warm and fruitful series of visits a month or so ago. One of these days we shall perhaps come to comprehend with wonder and relief that in our town, any town, we have no problems—only people, only us.

[From the Teaneck (N.J.) Sun]

SUN SIDELIGHTS

(By Fanny S. Mach)

Teaneck had one of its shining days Sunday. The days have not been consistently bright for our town lately, and this was a welcome change. It was a day on which to be in the fullest sense neighbors.

They called it Friendship Day, and the clergy of all faiths united in this effort to "build bridges of understanding." Our Negro neighbors threw wide their doors to welcome their white neighbors, and hundreds of our residents sat together, talked—and listened. The good old-fashioned custom of the Sunday visit never was so well experienced by both guests and hosts.

The day was one of those late Indian summer days, bright and crisp. It suited the purpose and mood of Friendship Day perfectly. Heaps of red and orange leaves were piled on the streets. Chrysanthemums perked up many a flower bed, with their brilliant hues sharp against the background of evergreens. And, from all reports, there was much warmth exchanged by the people of good will who played both roles, hosts and guests.

It was a gay crowd that gathered in the cafeteria of St. Anastasia School in the afternoon to be given their hosts' names and addresses. So many of the faces were familiar. So many of the people who lend leadership to our community were taking part in this friendly new experience. Many had brought their children, all the way from one who was carried by a fond mamma to teenagers. Teaneck's AFS visitor from India was there with her Teaneck "parents" and "sister."

The crowd that gathered that night at the Jewish Community Center was smaller, but the smiles were just as warm, and the anticipation as high. Here and there we heard comments from some who had paid calls in the afternoon—all enthusiastic.

Mayor Matthew Feldman, who had visited one home that afternoon with his wife, described it as "one of the most exhilarating experiences I have had since I came to Teaneck.

"Our experience was a very pleasant one. We visited Mr. and Mrs. Jack Wright of Irvington Road, in their tastefully decorated home, and became so engrossed in our conversation that before we knew it it was past 6, and according to the original plan the visits were to last from 2 to 4. Friends of the Wrights dropped in—they seem to be the sort of people whose friends frequently drop in—and the talk continued apace.

"We felt privileged to meet such interesting neighbors, with whom we found so much in common. We hope to see them soon in our home, to return a truly enjoyable visit.

"Many others share our enthusiasm. All around us, we have heard talk of reciprocal visits, of invitations already extended. The ice has been broken. Let us continue."

How the Legislature Succeeded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1965

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, the Kansas Legislature has completed its work for this session and through harmonious and coordinated efforts a progressive record has been written. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include below an editorial from the Wichita, Kans., Eagle which lauds the impressive record of the legislature, the legislative leadership in the Kansas House and Senate, and the direction and leadership of the Governor.

I want to call attention to the legislative accomplishments of the Kansas Legislature for two reasons.

First, many of my colleagues are well acquainted with the Governor of Kansas, William H. Avery, who served with distinction in this House for 10 years. Second, I believe the Kansas Legislature continues to demonstrate the importance of a State facing up to its traditional responsibilities.

The Kansas Legislature this year has written a significant record in the field of education and it has met its responsibility of congressional reapportionment with fairness. In addition, it demonstrated courage and fiscal responsibility by providing for the financing of new and expanded programs.

Mr. Speaker, there are too many local and State governments over the Nation which wait for the Federal Government to solve their problems for them. They might take a lesson from my State of Kansas, and ease the burden on the Nation's taxpayers.

The editorial follows:

HOW THE LEGISLATURE SUCCEEDED

The progressive record of the 1965 legislature is a tribute to leadership. Without strong guidance and occasional pressure, both from the Governor and from legislative leaders, much of the most creditable of this session's legislation could not have been accomplished.

The legislative leadership in both houses was new, as was about a third of the membership. In the house, Speaker Clyde Hill, Republican, Yates Center, exerted a firmness and control that has not been equaled for some years. He listened willingly to proponents of all points of view, and the unaccustomed attention he gave to Democratic members was especially noticeable. But there never was any question of who was in charge. With the able assistance of the majority leader, Bill Fribley, Republican, Crestline, and some other veterans, Hill ordered the business of the house and kept it moving.

In the senate the change was of another kind. It is no reflection upon the acknowledged leadership ability of former Senator Paul Wunsch to say that as president pro tem he exercised absolute control. In this session, with the combined leadership of Senator Glee Smith, Republican, Larned, as president pro tem, and Senator Frank Hodge, Republican, Hutchinson, as majority floor leader, there was a new atmosphere of thought and ferment which undoubtedly accounts in large part for the willingness to

consider, and even to act upon, controversial and forward-looking bills.

Probably most important of all was the strong direction that came from the Governor's office. For the first time in the memory of many legislators the Governor not only proposed legislation, but he actively fought for it.

Governor Avery presented an ambitious program—one to which he had largely committed himself during the 1964 campaign. But he would have achieved little of it without the second step—he showed the legislature how it could be financed. And by accepting this responsibility for increased taxes instead of passing the buck to the legislators as so many previous Governors have done, Avery won their respect and gained many successes.

In addition he chose two experienced and knowledgeable men to serve as his liaison with the legislature—Odd Williams and Laurin Jones. Thus the Governor was aware at all times when one of his programs was in trouble, and he knew where the trouble lay. He spent many hours discussing differences with individual legislators, and he argued forcefully and well for the things he wanted. The result was that he got most of them.

Since education played so large a part in this session, much credit also must be given to the efforts and ability of the two men who headed the education committees—Senator Joe Harder, Republican, Moundridge, and Representative John Bower, Republican, McLouth. Both worked long and hard and were unyielding in their determination to insure legislation that would accomplish an improved system of schooling in Kansas on all levels.

Even the voters deserve some credit. For this legislature has an unusual number of able and responsible members, both new and old, and without them, of course, the best leadership in the world could have accomplished nothing.

The United Nations and Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 22, 1965

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The U.N. and Vietnam," published in the New York Times of April 4, 1965.

I shall not comment on it because it is an eloquent expression of approval of the speeches made by the majority leader, the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the distinguished senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN].

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE U.N. AND VIETNAM

The administrative's attitude toward United Nations action on Vietnam seems ambivalent, to say the least. A few days ago Assistant Secretary Harlan Cleveland spoke favorably of United Nations aid in opening Vietnam negotiations and in policing an ultimate settlement. The next day the State Department took pains once again to deny that it was encouraging Secretary General Thant to play any role.

Washington's strange course not only makes it difficult for the United Nations to help, but downgrades the world organization. It compounds the damage the State Department inflicted on the U.N. last winter by its tactics on the Soviet debt issue. Those tactics—as Senator AIKEN, dean of Senate Republicans, pointed out a few days ago—have weakened the United Nations just when its help is badly needed in southeast Asia.

"International events of recent weeks," the Vermont Senator said, "seem to have overwhelmed the capacity of this Government for affirmative action, except in the military field." His trenchant comments on the U.N.'s peacekeeping role—and on Washington's efforts to force Moscow and Paris to pay for operations of which they disapproved—received the immediate endorsement of Majority Leader MANSFIELD. They deserve serious attention.

The American attempt to force the Russians to pay up or lose their General Assembly vote under article 19 of the U.N. Charter "collapsed like a punctured balloon," Senator AIKEN said—and not simply because a majority of the member nations were reluctant to go along. The main reason, in his judgment, was that the United States, after taking a tough line, "backed away" from a winning vote. It did so not only for fear of a Soviet withdrawal, but because such a vote would have set a precedent contrary to American national interests.

"The United States now recognizes," Mr. AIKEN said, "that if it were in the position of the Russians or the French, it would probably react in the same way * * * (the United States) is unwilling and unable to force the United Nations to abide by article 19 * * * (because it) is not willing to have article 19 applied to itself when its vital interests are involved."

What both Senators AIKEN and MANSFIELD were getting at was the explosion of new nations that has more than doubled U.N. membership to a present 114. A decisive two-thirds vote in the Assembly could now be made up of countries which possess only 10 percent of the U.N.'s population and pay less than 5 percent of its budget. As a result the United States shares the Soviet desire to increase the role of the Security Council, where the major nations possess a veto.

The real issue behind the financing of peacekeeping operations, as Senator AIKEN points out, "involves the readjustment of power and influence between the greater powers and the lesser nations rather than a struggle between the Soviet bloc and the West."

There is a problem of U.N. solvency—$110 million is needed to save the world organization from bankruptcy. And there is a need to work out new methods of authorizing and financing future peacekeeping operations. There is also a need for a Soviet financial contribution, which Moscow has acknowledged. But there is no need to force the U.S.S.R. to comply with article 19 by paying the exact sum Washington says—and Moscow denies—it owes.

As Senator AIKEN observed, President Johnson now "has a magnificent opportunity to put the United States back into the lead in international diplomacy by putting the United Nations back into business." And his first move should be to "instruct his representative to the United Nations to reconcile our position with the Soviet and French position on the assessment of members for peacekeeping functions—a view which may shock some, but a position which would definitely be in our own national interest * * *. Article 19 is dead as a doornail anyway."

It is essential to move now not only in the long-term interests of the United Nations but precisely because a vigorous U.N. could play a vital role in extricating the United States and the two Vietnams from their present tragic predicament.

School Aid Bill Can Be Most Meaningful of Any

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM R. ANDERSON
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 22, 1965

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, one of our Nation's truly great newspapers, the Nashville Tennessean, has carried an editorial which describes the impact that the recently enacted Elementary and Secondary Education Act will have on my home State of Tennessee and the Nation. The President and the Congress are to be commended for the reasons so well described in this excellent editorial.

The editorial follows:

[From the Nashville Tennessean, Apr. 11, 1965]

SCHOOL AID BILL CAN BE MOST MEANINGFUL OF ANY

Congress has now passed and sent to the President a $1.3 billion blueprint for aiding the Nation's elementary and secondary schools. It was a major victory for President Johnson, and it could well be the most meaningful legislative action of this session.

Both Tennessee Senators ALBERT GORE and ROSS BASS voted for the legislation. Senator BASS was presiding officer for part of the session which produced approval of the measure.

In the House, Representatives MURRAY, BROCK, DUNCAN, and QUILLEN voted "no."

The measure passed is not perfect, and there are several areas in which refinements could doubtless be made. Neither is it a landmark in terms of policy, since the Federal Government has been aiding education since the Land Grant College Act. It is a milestone, however, since a general bill of this kind has been the subject of congressional wrangling for some 20 years.

The two major obstacles to previous legislation have been constitutional questions about providing aid to parochial schools and the issue of racial segregation in public schools. The latter issue has become all but moot. In this case the religious issue has been skirted by providing aid only through public channels. Parochial pupils may benefit by attending some classes in public institutions on a "shared time" basis and from use of school libraries, and teaching aids. But the books and aids remain public property.

The main emphasis of the school aid program is on helping students in economically burdened areas. One billion sixty million dollars will go to help school districts with projects to better educate children of poor families; $100 million will be used to ease the widespread need for more and better school libraries. Another $100 million will be earmarked to set up educational centers to provide specialized programs that individual schools cannot afford.

It is estimated that more than 90 percent of the Nation's 26,000 school districts would receive funds. Tennessee's share of this might well amount to $30 to $35 million.

The bill contains provisions throughout requiring States to submit their plans for using the new aid, but forbidding Federal officials from attempting to dictate local school policy. It also bars use of any funds for supporting religious instruction or worship.

The greatness of any nation must rest in large part on the education of its youth. Now, in the swift pace of technological

change, this Nation cannot afford to neglect any of its children in whose hands the future must be shaped.

There was a time in the development of this Nation when brawn could find its own place in the scheme of things. That day is passing. Now it is imperative that the new generation be given full opportunity to develop its skills, talents, and creativity that will not be just desirable, but mandatory in the years ahead.

President Johnson has every basis for being pleased at passage of the bill which can be a broad step toward the victory of enlightenment over darkness.

Address by Vice President Humphrey at the Azalea Festival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 22, 1965

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, one of the most spectacular festivals annually celebrated on the east coast is the International Azalea Festival, at Norfolk, Va. Norfolk, now the largest city in the Old Dominion, and one of its most progressive, has developed an Azalea Park which rivals, if it does not excel, the famed Azalea Gardens of the historic city of Charleston. Thousands of tourists are attracted to Norfolk at this season of the year, to witness that inspiring spectacle of the rebirth of nature; and added interest will be given to this festival this year through the participation of our distinguished Vice President, Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address which Vice President HUMPHREY delivered at the Azalea Festival luncheon today, in Norfolk.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AZALEA FESTIVAL

(Address by Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, International Azalea Festival luncheon, Norfolk, Va., Apr. 22, 1965)

My friends, it is my honor to be invited to address this International Azalea Festival luncheon. For this great festival celebrates not only the well-being and prosperity of Virginians and Americans, but celebrates also this country's commitment to interdependence among nations.

Today I would like primarily to discuss with you our well-being at home—and then to place that domestic well-being in the context of the role we Americans play in the world.

Today, our democratic society faces great challenges. We are being challenged both at home and abroad by great political, economic, and social forces.

Will we be able to meet these challenges:

Can democratic government provide for the general welfare:

Is freedom incompatible with responsibility?

Is democracy as a system able to provide rapid and just progress for the hungry and disaffected on our planet?

Must the fulfillment of the individual be subordinate to the welfare of the whole?

We will meet these challenges if we preserve, direct, and utilize all this country's vast human resources. We will meet these challenges if we realize the full potentialities of this country and each of its citizens.

This administration and this Congress, acting out the will of the American people, are providing to the world our answers to these challenges.

We are building a solid, lasting base for American health and growth.

Health and growth built on a strong and flourishing economy—and we have just celebrated our 50th consecutive month of uninterrupted prosperity, I might add.

Health and growth which can give us the means to provide a social system with justice at its heart.

Health and growth to provide sustained American leadership in the world.

President Johnson told this Congress, on the first day of its session, that: "Our Nation was created to help strike away the chains of ignorance and misery and tyranny wherever they keep man less than God means him to be."

We are not afraid to say it: We will work until every citizen of America has equal opportunity to make a better life for himself and his children. Only when this equality of opportunity is achieved can we truly find the freedom we seek.

Today in this country we are making great strides toward achieving that goal.

There are two basic forces at the heart of our progress:

First, the vigorous leadership of Lyndon Johnson.

Second, the unprecedented peacetime unity of our Nation which now exists.

There is another word for this unity. It is consensus.

Consensus is voluntary agreement based on constructive dialog, mutual respect, and understanding. In consensus, we Americans are breaking through.

United we stand. And united we gain.

We gain together as a great national consensus says all Americans shall have equal voting rights. And that consensus today is truly national, not regional.

We gain as our Nation agrees that all Americans shall have an education which can give them the opportunity to live themselves.

We gain in agreement that all Americans shall have adequate medical care;

That we should make our cities better places in which to live and work in safety and health;

That we should preserve this Nation's beauty, history, and natural resources;

That we should give the aging hope for life and work;

That we should open our doors again to immigrants who can enrich and lend new vitality to our national life;

That we should help our urban and rural Americans alike adjust to technological revolution and social change;

That we should not drop the torch of international leadership;

That we should make whatever investment is necessary to realize our American dream.

That investment will be great. But it will be less than the cost of illiteracy—of school dropouts—of poverty—of discrimination—of disillusion and bitterness—of isolation in the world. Far less.

For example: We spend $450 per year per child in our public schools, but we spend $1,800 a year to keep a delinquent in a detention home, $2,500 a year for a family on relief and $3,500 a year for an inmate in a State prison.

We must make the investment necessary so that all in our society may be productive. Poor and uneducated people are poor consumers. They are a drain on our economy. They are wasted resources.

With continuing support of the American people, we will continue now and in the years to come to make the basic investments necessary to answer "yes" to our future.

We will continue to forge a strong economy, unmarked by recessions. We will continue to search for and develop tools to overcome the so-called business cycle.

We will continue to explore outer space and inner mind in development of knowledge for use by all the world.

And we will continue to defend and preserve the precious peace with strength and perseverance.

We will maintain our strong and active faith in the ability of freemen—developed to their fullest—to build a better life for themselves and for others.

Now, before closing, would like to direct a few personal words to you about America and its role in the world.

For a long time we Americans have stood for the belief that the world need not destroy itself by war, and that we Americans can help others, too, find a better society.

We hear many voices these days saying that America is overextended in the world—that other people's problems needn't be our problems—that we ought to close up shop overseas and enjoy our blessings here in the good old United States of America.

My friends, when that time comes, this Nation is doomed. Who in the world will work for democracy if we do not? Who in the world can preserve the peace if we do not? Who in the world can set the example, can offer the needed hand, if we do not?

We live in a time when everything is complex, when there are no more rapid or easy answers. We live in a time when we must retain our patience as never before.

Have we the patience, for instance, to work and bleed 5,000 miles from home for months and years ahead—without any guarantee of final success? I can tell you that the forces of totalitarianism have that patience.

This is what the Great Society is all about. It is the recognition that vacations abroad, fur coats, and electric toothbrushes are not enough. It is the recognition that we stand for something not seen before in the world.

We stand for the dignity and fulfillment of individual man and woman.

We stand for the chance for each man to make something better of himself.

We stand for free speech and government of the people.

We stand for peace without conquest.

We stand for the belief that others in less fortunate places should have opportunity for the blessings of abundance and should be free of tyranny. We stand for the pledges made by men and women who left the old ways and fought a living out of the soil of a new continent.

As President Johnson expressed it in his historical speech at Johns Hopkins University:

"We will not be defeated.

"We will not grow tired.

"We will not withdraw."

We will stand, at home and abroad, for the pledges made and efforts expended by Americans who came before. We must love freedom and justice enough to practice them.

America is still the last, best hope on earth.

A New Offer on Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEAL SMITH
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 22, 1965

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the now famous speech by President Johnson

stating that we remain ready for "unconditional discussions" on the Vietnam situation was criticized by the Communist powers and by a few Americans prior to the time that it became apparent that it placed the United States on the diplomatic offensive; but, I have not seen many, in depth, interpretations of the situation by those who approved which weighed the various factors involved as well as did an editorial in the Des Moines Register on Friday, April 9, 1965. So that those who receive the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will have an opportunity to read it, I am inserting it in the RECORD. It is as follows:

A NEW OFFER ON VIETNAM

In one heartfelt outpouring Wednesday night, President Johnson put together the two contrasting sides of U.S. policy in the Vietnam war. One is the determination not to accept defeat, open or disguised, and the other is willingness to make peace, today or 10 years from now, on generous terms.

The President himself called his speech a review of a position stated "over and over again 50 times and more—to friend and foe alike." Yet in impact and emphasis, and in certain details, it was new.

New was the little phrase in connection with possible peace talks: "We remain ready—with this purpose—for unconditional discussions."

Previous statements usually have given the impression that the United States had a condition—that it was not willing to start discussions until North Vietnam had given some sign it was stopping its help to the Vietcong fighters in South Vietnam.

The U.S. "purpose" in any such discussions is "an independent South Vietnam"—not the reunited Vietnam called for in the 1954 Geneva agreements. The President defined this independent South Vietnam as one "securely guaranteed and able to shape its own relationships to all others—free from outside interference—tied to no alliance—a military base for no other country." This would mean an ultimate end to U.S. intervention no less than North Vietnamese.

Another new detail in President Johnson's talk Wednesday was the way he spelled out his hopes for peaceful cooperation in economic development for the whole of southeast Asia. He referred directly to the U.N. preliminary work already going on and said the first step would be for the southeast Asian countries to get together on a plan. He hoped Secretary General U Thant would work with them to initiate the plan.

New also was the figure of $1 billion which he said he would ask Congress to put up as the "American investment in this effort when it is underway."

Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, and South Vietnam have been working on the preliminaries of just such a plan for 7 years now, in spite of civil wars, diplomatic breaks, coups, and foreign interventions, under United Nations auspices. North Vietnam could be brought in to the benefit of all. It would be the logical place to use some of the power generated by a dam in Laos.

Late in March, when President Johnson first held out the olive branch of cooperative peaceful development as an alternative to war and mutual destruction in Vietnam, the proposal had the weakness of seeming a thing of words, without any U.S. planning to make it a reality.

On April 7, the President remedied this weakness by announcing that Eugene Black, former president of the World Bank, will head a team to get the U.S. part of the job started—not even waiting for peace. Black is a superb choice, a man of demonstrated ability in this very difficult field of developing the underdeveloped. His appointment is a convincing sign to other countries that the offer of economic aid is not mere propaganda.

President Johnson is sensitive to world opinion, to U.S. opinion. He knows how much alarm and disapproval has been stirred up by his bombing raids into North Vietnam. He remains convinced that the raids are a necessary part of keeping South Vietnam from collapsing.

But he understands also that war is hell—for the long-suffering Vietnamese people, the brave Vietcong fighters as well as the U.S.-backed South Vietnamese. Since February, North Vietnam, too, is suffering direct hits as well as the drain of blood and treasure from intervention in the South.

Neither side can win the way things are going. Both can win, if President Johnson's olive branch is grasped.

Proposed Reduction in Funds for Soil Conservation Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER F. MONDALE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 22, 1965

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, recently I received a thoughtful and thought-provoking letter from the President of the Minnesota Farmers Union, Edwin M. Christianson.

Mr. Christianson's remarks pointedly and powerfully define the irrational and unfounded basis upon which the proposed reduction in funds for the Soil Conservation Service and the agricultural cost-sharing program is predicated. Furthermore, Mr. Christianson's remarks eloquently dramatize the stake which each American has in the encouragement of sound conservation practices.

Of particular salience, I think, is Mr. Christianson's recommendation that the President direct the Secretary of Agriculture to prepare and publish annually a "soil fertility balance sheet."

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Christianson's letter be printed in its entirety in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINNESOTA FARMERS UNION,
St. Paul, Minn., March 30, 1965.

Hon. WALTER MONDALE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: The national inventory of soil conservation needs which was made public this week by the Department of Agriculture presents some very impelling reasons why the ACP and SCS funds should not be reduced, but why they ought to be increased.

The proposed budget reduction of $100 million for ACP would be false economy considering the vast amount of work needed. Similarly, the proposal to charge farmers for $20 million of the cost of SCS technical services would certainly hinder the program.

Without question, in the light of the low income prevailing on many farms, the need to absorb more of the cost of soil conserving projects would cause many farmers to delay work which is needed in the public interest. If the cuts are made, reliable estimates are that ACP and other farm conservation project starts may drop by as much as 50 percent.

Much of the work done under ACP and SCS does not result in immediate cash benefits to the owner of the land. It is done to retain and improve the land capability for the future. Therefore, the public has a stake in assuring that conservation measures be undertaken by individual farmers and they ought to provide a substantial incentive for doing so.

The soil and water conservation inventory shows that nearly two-thirds of the rural land, near to 900 million acres, is in immediate need of conservation treatment. In this USDA study, you will find a projection of the trend of cropland into nonfarm uses, which will, by 1975, amount to 2½ million acres in the Lake States and 20 million acres nationally. This will throw an additional burden on the remaining crop acreage.

The soil and water conservation inventory is a study of major importance in putting our conservation needs in perspective. In our opinion, however, it is not enough for such a study to be made and published once in every 5 or 10 years. We believe that the time has come for Congress to direct and authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to calculate and publish annually a national "soil fertility balance sheet" so that the people of the Nation will have the opportunity to know what progress is being made.

Soil and water conservation is vital to all of us.

Sincerely,

EDWIN CHRISTIANSON,
President.

The Republicans React in a Very Curious Way

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD FULTON
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 22, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, President Johnson's recent Baltimore speech on Vietnam held out the promise of economic assistance to southeast Asia as a means of settling that area's problems. There has been criticisms from responsible quarters and spokesmen of this possible approach.

In an editorial published Friday, April 9, 1965, the Nashville Tennessean raises a very basic question which those who find fault with the President's offer of economic assistance as an alternative to war must answer: Are we to put a greater value on American dollars than we do on American lives?

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert the editorial from the Nashville Tennessean at this point:

THE REPUBLICANS REACT IN A VERY CURIOUS WAY

Some of the Republican reaction to President Johnson's speech has been, to say the least, disappointing.

Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN said the President "offers a billion-dollar lure as a step toward peace in Vietnam." And he asked, "Do we actually buy peace with an American aid program?"

Aside from Mr. DIRKSEN's rather loose interpretation of the Johnson speech, can it be that the Republican Senate leader is putting a greater value on American dollars than he puts on American lives?

This Nation now is and has been expending its treasure and its blood in supporting South Vietnam. If that war should suddenly escalate into a major clash of land armies and the intervention of Red Chinese forces into Vietnam, Senator DIRKSEN can be assured that a billion dollars will be a small part of the eventual cost and that America will weep over the totals of dead.

It takes a very casual interpretation of Mr. Johnson's speech to come up with the idea that it was somehow a plea which was suing for peace, or an offer to buy peace from Hanoi at the price of a billion dollars. And it is even a stranger interpretation that glosses over the words of the President and finds a no-win policy or a trumpet sounding retreat.

For the President said: "We will not be defeated. We will not grow tired. We will not withdraw, either openly or under the cloak of meaningless agreement. We will use our power with restraint, and with all the wisdom we can command. But we will use it."

If Senator DIRKSEN hears this as an uncertain trumpet, he is tone deaf.

If it has suddenly become a sign of weakness to urge warlike leaders to beat their swords into plowshares; if the olive branch has all at once become a symbol of retreat, then this Nation and all humanity are riding the tumbrel cart downhill.

President Johnson said to all southeast Asia that there is another road to the future besides that of destruction, of bombs and bullets and blood. But Senators DIRKSEN and TOWER and Representative GERALD FORD leave the impression they would rather achieve peace the hard and bloody way.

Therein is illustrated the difference between the statesmanship of peace and the politics of opposition.

Castro's Real Coup in Cuba

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, a very perceptive and enlightening article on the methods Castro employed to entrench and solidify communism in Cuba is contained in the April 1965 issue of Report magazine. The article, "Castro's Real Coup in Cuba," was written by Alberto Martinez Piedra, a neighbor and friend. Mr. Piedra was formerly a professor of economics in Havana and currently teaches at Catholic University in Washington, D.C. Knowing that the analysis contained in this article would be of interest to my colleagues, I include it under unanimous consent at this point in the RECORD.

The article referred to follows:

CASTRO'S REAL COUP IN CUBA

(By Alberto Martinez Piedra)

When Fidel Castro came to power in January 1959, everybody thought his long struggle for victory had been achieved. Castro himself knew differently. For himself, and for the few others who knew he was a Communist, it was just the beginning.

Communism did not come to power when Castro emerged from the hills and seized the rule from Batista. It came to power afterward and right before everyone's eyes. The amazing story of Castro's real takeover is one of deception, division, and destruction played out in the midst of the Cubans themselves, and all too often with anti-Communists as the unwitting allies of Castro's clever game. It is a tactic which continues today in Castro's relations with the rest of the hemisphere.

According to classical Communist doctrine, a country goes over to socialism because of the inherent injustices of a capitalist society. Exploitation leads to class war; capitalism destroys itself; finally the people triumph.

In the same way that the Red Army disproved this theory in the Communist takeovers in East Europe after World War II, Castro himself demonstrated that communism triumphs because a few men who know how to play with power can deceive the people.

For over a year after gaining power the bearded hero of the hills talked about liberation, progress, truth, social justice, defense of democracy, religious freedom and the right to vote. For more than a year this rhetoric camouflaged his real objective and was made to serve his real aims: to destroy all existing values and institutions in order to achieve absolute control and build a new order, Communist style. Castro's greatest coup was not against the Batista regime; it was against the Cuban people themselves after Batista had fled.

What was the strategy? Deception coupled with the old maxim divide and conquer. Time and again, Castro would find some issue whereby he could divide various elements in the press, in industry, among business men, the church, landowners or the educational establishment, and then rally some to his side in order to undo the others in a process of undoing all.

In 1959, for instance, Castro brought a Spanish priest from Paraguay and put him on radio and TV to denounce the Franco regime in violent language. The Spanish Ambassador protested. But Castro was after bigger game. When representatives of many of the religious orders protested—some precisely on the grounds that a cleric should not mix in politics—Castro quickly labeled them opponents of his regime and subservient to a foreign Facist power.

The bait had been taken and the campaign of villification was one which ended in the expulsion of all Spanish priests and nuns. Castro knew that the church was his ultimate enemy: this was only the first of his many moves which has left only 120 priests on the island to take care of nearly 7 million inhabitants.

The same tactic was used to get rid of the newspaper El Mundo, owned by an Italian. The press was particularly vulnerable to this strategy that relied on the selfish idea that another man's troubles are not my troubles—and sometimes can even be to my profit.

Castro could not afford to have any group united against him and least of all in the press. When Batista's army was disbanded Castro had a force of only 1,500 men. Boy scouts were being used to direct traffic. Castro himself had to go on TV day in and day out, sometimes for hours at a time. But until he was strong enough he needed a deceived press to give him its support.

An exile, formerly connected with Bohemia magazine, says that Castro used to visit the magazine's offices three times a week, but the visits declined as the strength of the army increased. Castro knew how to play favorites so that as he moved against one publication after another, those that remained would always feel "safe."

But getting rid of the "bourgeois" press was always a piecemeal process, never a massive blow that would show his hand. And when the attack came it was rarely from Castro himself. Union toughs would smash the machinery of an afternoon paper over some minor grievance. The morning paper would find its position improved. When a foreign-owned paper would be accused of being anti-Cuban, the others would congratulate themselves on their illusory safety as nationals.

Castro's second thrust against the church was once again not on any religious issue; that would have rallied opposition. Distinguishing between good Christians and bad ones, he would praise the Sisters of Charity as good religious women following the true calling of Christ. They devoted their lives to healing the sick and helping the poor.

But by appearing religious himself in this way, he subtly advanced a purely social interpretation of religion and thus opened his attack on the Jesuits, the Augustinians, and others involved in the education of the "upper classes."

His target was the vital field of education and particularly the University of Santo Tomás de Villanueva. With Law 11, passed in January, 1959, Castro voided all degrees and credits of Villanueva granted since the University of Havana had shut down in 1956. The charge was that Villanueva had not supported Havana University's protest against Batista by closing its doors too.

With rumors that the administration of the university had considered declaring its grounds and buildings American property, Castro had new ammunition. With a charge of "anti-Cuban" in hand, he went on to develop antagonism between clergy and laity over the question of Villanueva, duping many into supporting the regime's attack on the main nonstate university and the Augustinians who ran it.

The closing of the university in 1961 constitutes one of the saddest episodes in the early days of Castroism. Those who had criticized the Augustinians soon found that they were following their brothers into exile, and the church's activity in higher education was stamped out.

Lay organizations were prey to manipulation by the regime in order to weaken the church. The JUC (Juventud Universitaria Catolica), for example, with prompting from the government, denied that there were any Communists in the University of Havana, actually a Communist stronghold. Their ill-considered statement only added to the confusion already felt by many Cubans.

Distinctions and divisions between "conservative" and "liberal" Catholics were pressed for all they were worth. "Progressives" were opposed to "reactionaries" and "antirevolutionaries." Those who supported the aims of the revolution were said to be in line with the true teachings of the Gospel.

Magazines like La Quincena were applauded, while any that criticized Government measures were denounced as counter-revolutionary. The distinction was only transitory, the purpose being to confuse and to divide the faithful into antagonistic groups.

All the while the regime pretended to be on the side of religion. But strange devotions were fostered in a Machiavellian manner to further confuse and mislead. The veneration of the spurious San Lazaro was encouraged and the road to his shrine was modernized, above all because he was a poor man in the Gospel parable who lived to see the condemnation of the heartless rich man. Propaganda, not religion, was the aim; but the religious spirit of the people could be used—and twisted in the process.

The final stroke was to try to create a Cuban National Church, independent from Rome and "faithful to the true teachings of Christ," which, according to the revolutionary government, the priests and religious

had forgotten to practice. The government got a few of the clergy to attend the conference for this purpose, but made the mistake of inviting Bishop Boza Masvidal, the new auxiliary bishop of Havana, a native. The bishop torpedoed the plan and so kept almost all of Cuba's priests loyal, an action that took him a step closer to exile.

Castro worked to create the same kind of divisions throughout the entire society. Since there was no "class war" in Cuba, he had to create it. Early in 1959 he passed two laws that completely disrupted real estate business and which were calculated to set the masses against the "easy living," "nonproductive" and "parasitic" rentiers. One decree simply cut all rents in half; another put an absurd ceiling price on the sale of land and then forced all owners (with a few technical exceptions) to sell on demand.

The move aroused hardly any opposition from intellectual or businessmen not directly affected. To many it appeared simply as a bungling and insane gesture by a new government of amateurs and destined soon to be repealed. The mess was indeed cleared up, but in a way they hardly expected: a year later Castro declared that rentiers were no longer owners, and all rents were to be paid to the government—toward a mythical "eventual" purchase.

In a similar way Castro made use of the agrarian reform law of May 1959, to destroy first the foreign landholders, then those who held large blocks of land and finally even small landholders. Again, he attacked one group at a time, so that others would not protest until it was too late. Now few "independent" farmers exist, and the state-owned, state-run farm has become the dominant agricultural unit.

What were the elements of Castro's success? The first and most important was deception. Castro knew what his goals were from the beginning. When he admitted in 1961 that he had been a Marxist-Leninist all along, he also declared that he deliberately avoided saying this in the beginning because he knew he wouldn't be able to generate support.

Castro knew what he intended to do; but by concealing his aims while working for them all the time, he perhaps more than any other successful Communist revolutionary—even the Red "agrarian reformers" of China—was able to take advantage of the combination of good will and selfishness that exists in every society.

A free society—and for that matter, even a Communist one—will always have a great variety of opinions, groups, divisions, and subdivisions and even antagonisms. Castro's second great tactic was to develop these into outright clashes. One by one, each of these groups could be isolated and then eliminated, while Castro was only apparently favoring the rest. The Communist doctrine of class war is pure myth, but it becomes a "reality" for purposes of destruction under the pressures of selective agitation and deception.

The tactic only works because there is enough good will in a liberal society to believe that piecemeal isolation of one "bad" element somehow marks progress. And there is always enough bad will to be found that can close its eyes to the destruction that ensues, the "good" always believing they are safe. What is not realized is that such distinctions between bad and good are not part of the Communist vocabulary. They are only means by which the Communist is able to divide and conquer.

And Castro is using these same tactics today. Now that he has secured absolute control in Cuba itself, he is sparing no effort to export the revolution to all of Latin America. Terrorism in Bolivia may seem merely destructive. But in the Communist strategy and propaganda it is aimed at pitting "the people" against their "detested fascist rulers," just as arson in Puerto Rico is aimed at "foreign domination of capitalist overlords in the United States."

And of all the deceptions and divisions that are created and encouraged—rich against poor, foreigner against native, owner against worker, big business against little, right against left—those involving the church are at once the saddest and most pernicious. Castro has added a new string to Lenin's lyre in pretending to speak in the name of the Gospel, playing upon the vast variety in the church's activities and organizations. By turning religion exclusively to social concerns, its heart is cut out, true charity and the unity that goes with it is smashed.

The state of the church in Cuba today stands as witness to what communism means both in its tactics and in its goals. There is no persecution, it is claimed—as long as religion is confined to the clouds "where it belongs."

But the church is forbidden to teach; the more than 300 Catholic schools have been seized by the government; all religious programs have been banned from radio and television; and even though churches are still open in Cuba, as the propaganda takes care to assert, the number of priests has been reduced to a handful that is far too few to minister to the needs of a population that is overwhelmingly Catholic. The church in Cuba today has joined the honorable ranks of the churches of silence behind the Iron Curtain.

But the cry of the church in Cuba is not merely a lament for itself; it is the cry of witness against what communism is trying to do everywhere. For the Cuban Church to cease to occupy its honorable position, declared Bishop Boza Masvidal, "communism would have to cease being atheistic and enslaving," and both are equally impossible.

"Research: Key to Tomorrow"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 12, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I include as part of my remarks another chapter in the story of Pittsburgh, "Research: Key to Tomorrow":

RESEARCH MANPOWER

More than 14,000 research scientists, engineers, and technicians are employed in the Pittsburgh area. Of this total, 7,600 are professional staff members. They represent all the disciplines, ranging from the design engineer to the theoretical physicist. Almost all perform or are available for contract research.

In addition to their R. & D. activities, Pittsburgh area scientists and engineers enjoy an active professional life through the local sections of more than 60 scientific and technical societies.

Among these organizations are the American Chemical Society with seven active subgroups, the largest local section of the American Nuclear Society, and the world headquarters of the Instrument Society of America.

The societies sponsor a multitude of professional programs, many of which are joint projects. Typical activities include short courses in solid-state devices and process control by the Institute of Electrical & Electronic Engineers, PERT seminars by the American Institute of Industrial Engineers, a lecture series on space sciences by the American Institute of Aeronautics & Astronautics, and a unique high school engineering physics course sponsored by six societies.

Pittsburgh also is the annual site of such highly regarded national and international conferences as the Pittsburgh Conference on Analytical Chemistry and Applied Spectroscopy, Pittsburgh Diffraction Conference, ISA Conference on Instrumentation in the Iron and Steel Industry, and the National Conference on Open Hearth and Basic Oxygen Steel.

Looking Back and Ahead in Wake of House Vote

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 22, 1965

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert in the appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent article appearing in the Washington Report on the Medical Sciences, published by WRMS, and edited by Mr. Gerald G. Gross.

I am sure this excellent commentary on the passage of the medicare bill, H.R. 6675, merits careful consideration.

The article follows:

LOOKING BACK AND AHEAD IN WAKE OF HOUSE VOTE

It really began a quarter century ago, when organized medicine's hostility to a small medical group formed to serve some government employees on a prepaid basis led to conviction of AMA and fellow defendants on charges of violating antitrust laws. The conviction stood up clear to the U.S. Supreme Court. But AMA was now on its way to save the country from socialized medicine. Today, millions of lobbying and propaganda dollars later, the Nation is at the brink. Credit those dollars, if you will, with delaying the day; but credit them, too, with the power of backfire.

The House has passed medical eldercare under social security. Senate passage this spring—possibly as a present for AMA on the eve of its annual meeting in New York City, June 20–24—is a virtual certainty. It will be a big climax, yet it will be but the first step. In time eldercare will give way to true medicare, with no ages barred. Only this time AMA persistence in its strange opposition strategy will be an accelerant, rather than an effective obstruction tactic.

In recent years particularly, AMA has enjoyed exquisite success in antagonizing the press, alienating those in Congress who would be its friends, and picking the wrong horses. Membership dues have gone from $0 to $45 a year to raise a war chest that would stave off Federal intervention in providing and financing medical care. But any gains that may have accrued were offset by Dearborn Street aloofness to legitimate inquiries, occasional arrogance, designation of a pat, patronizing, palaverous doctor to be spokesman—at least temporarily—and failure to recognize that AMA's refusal to take leadership on health legislation weakened its position as a pleader for the antieldercare cause.

Attempting to show that organized labor was not solidly behind social security medical care, AMA engaged the president of an international union to address its banquet in Atlantic City. He said he was against Wagner-Murray-Dingell. Not long afterward he was in the penitentiary (though not because of that declaration).

On May 25, 1960, your correspondent, delivering Alpha Omega Alpha lecture at University of Nebraska College of Medicine, predicted onset of Federal subsidization of health services. Based on events and circumstances in which organized medicine was anything but a disinterested bystander, he made this prediction before 1960 and he has made it since. In Omaha, as elsewhere, audience reaction was one of a sort of resentful, if not belligerent, silence, as though the utterance mothered a wish. This is another attitude that has hastened the day.

NEXT 90 DAYS COULD BE A TIME FOR INVENTORY

In the course of lengthy House debate Wednesday and Thursday on H.R. 6675, AMA was slammed around a bit for its negativism and yet not even its severest critics employed the invective that has been heaped on King-Anderson bill and its predecessors. No one tagged AMA's motives as "a fraud and a hoax," a label once applied to President Kennedy for his sponsorship of social security eldercare—a characterization that was an important addition to the backfire arsenal. Rather, the atmosphere seemed to be one that could be summed up in the words: Cooperation of America's doctors is a must if this huge $6 billion program is to work, so here's hoping they take a new look.

Passage of Medicare Bill Is a Legislative Milestone

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD FULTON
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 22, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on April 8 of this year the House of Representatives approved the historic bill to provide medical care for the elderly under social security.

On April 10, the Nashville Tennessean in an editorial, "Passage of Medicare Bill Is a Legislative Milestone," stated final approval of this bill by the Congress will signal a "historic point in social legislation."

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert the editorial from the Nashville Tennessean at this point:

PASSAGE OF MEDICARE BILL IS A LEGISLATIVE MILESTONE

House passage of the program for medical care for the elderly under social security is a legislative milestone. If the Senate approves this measure, it will mark a historic point in social legislation.

Medical care for the aged has been one of the top priority items on President Johnson's must list. It was one of the early goals of the Kennedy-Johnson administration.

For several years, the proposal has been the center of great controversy. The American Medical Association has spent millions to bring about its defeat.

But for all the furore and outcries raised, a central fact has been that both sides have agreed that the aged needed protection against the rising costs of being sick. Several factors have given the problem increasing concern.

The number of elderly in our population is large and it is growing. As a group, it is the most economically vulnerable, and it is the most likely to sustain long and serious illnesses. There are nearly 20 million people in the United States who are 65 years or older. Many are dependent on small pensions, social security, or inadequate life savings. To these older people, the costs of medical care for serious illness can be catastrophic, financially.

The measure passed by the House is a much broader one than was conceived originally. In brief, it would:

Increase social security payments to the aged by 7 percent; broaden medical assistance under existing welfare programs, and liberalize other social security benefits.

The key feature is the right of persons over 65 to a maximum of 60 days hospitalization and 20 days nursing home care. The patient would pay the first $40, the rest would be paid for him.

Available to the elderly who want it is a supplementary and entirely voluntary program of insurance, which would defray expenses of doctors' bills and other expenses not covered by the basic plan. This supplementary insurance plan would apply only to those who want it and would be financed by a $3 a month premium from those joining the program and by matching funds from Federal general revenue.

The bill includes a general liberalizing of other old-age, survivors, and disability benefits. Pensioners would be able to earn more and still collect a retirement check; widows could retire at an earlier age; children would be given survivors benefits until age 22 instead of the present 18.

All in all, it is a major package which is a big step forward in behalf of the older citizens of this Nation. House action by a 236-to-191 vote adds optimism that Senate passage will come by June at least.

Warsaw Ghetto Uprising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 22, 1965

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, although the history of mankind is unfortunately liberally sprinkled with dictatorships of the right and the left, as human beings we may still take pride in the fact that there have always been men who have been willing to risk all in order to counter them.

One of the most recent tyrannies was that which existed in Germany from 1933 to 1945, when the Nazis under Adolf Hitler attempted to establish their "thousand year Reich." April 19, 1965, was the anniversary of one of the most tragic uprisings against that dictatorship: The revolt of the Warsaw ghetto in 1943, when 40,000 Jews decided to confront the German war machine. Inadequately equipped, almost completely untrained, and overwhelmingly outnumbered, their defiance of the SS and the Gestapo was in the true sense of the word a tragedy, because despite the knowledge of certain defeat, they never hesitated.

The Warsaw ghetto was officially established in November of 1940: 100 city blocks were surrounded by brick walls 10 feet high and barbed wire fences, and the Jewish population was completely cut off from the rest of the city—indeed, the world. Despite the starvation, misery and death which followed, Jewish community life continued: soup kitchens, child care centers, schools, lectures, musical events, and a host of other activities were carried out. Perhaps most important for posterity, daily reports on activities, scientific papers, and complete archives were maintained. It is from these that we have our information on life in the ghetto; they provide a moving and memorable record of the courage and determination of the unfortunate people to preserve and maintain their Jewish traditions and way of life against the Nazi holocaust.

But, their actions provide us at the same time with a more meaningful and wider lesson: that no tyranny, no matter how ruthless and inhuman, is ever able to extinguish the desire of man to live in freedom. The Warsaw ghetto will forever live as an example of how guns, barbed wire, starvation, and torture are, in the long run, unable to compete with dedication and determination to the cause of liberty.

Republican Task Force on Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ODIN LANGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 22, 1965

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, the members of the House Republican Task Force on Agriculture have expressed grave concern over the rapid increase in U.S. farm debt. It is our feeling that the American farmer is literally being crushed under this enormous burden of debt. With farm mortgage and short-term debt increasing far out of proportion to income, the farmer's economic situation is rapidly deteriorating.

We on the task force are continuing our research into the agricultural situation for the purpose of arriving at a better understanding of what is wrong with present and past programs which have not served the best interests of the American farmer, taxpayer or consumer. Such a thorough understanding is most essential as a background for any and all considerations of the farmer's economic problems. Preliminary research into the farm debt situation has revealed some alarming facts.

Unfortunately, administration farm programs have accomplished the exact opposite of their stated objectives. Since 1961, net farm income has remained virtually at the same level, while total farm debt has increased nearly 50 percent. Total farm debt today is actually greater than the entire Federal budget in 1948.

U.S. farmers in 1961 were indebted $1.97 for every dollar of realized net income. This year, after 4 years of current farm programs, the farmer will owe a whopping $2.86 for every income dollar. To further illustrate what this means, in 1929, on the eve of the great depression, the farmer owed only about $2.30 for each income dollar. The farmer's best postwar year was 1947, when the ratio

was 49 cents debt for every dollar of income.

USDA STATISTICS JUGGLING

Statistics juggling by official agencies of the Federal Government clouds the issues, and hides the real problems of agriculture. USDA attempts to show an improvement in farm income prove to be a complete fallacy when we review all of the factors involved.

Our task force took a look at a USDA report on farm income which states that:

With a continuing decline in farm numbers * * * realized net income per farm from farming was at a record high of $3,642 in 1964, compared with $3,504 in 1963.

Using the same method of comparison for farm debt, the task force came up with a far more dramatic figure: "Total debt per farm from farming was at a record high of $9,502.30 in 1964, compared with $8,301.15 in 1963." Thus, while income per farm went up 3.9 percent, debt per farm went up 14.4 percent. But, unlike USDA, we do not use this method of comparison, for it is neither accurate nor valid, and is definitely misleading.

This is pointed out in an article by a USDA Economic Research Service specialist who criticized USDA's use of this method by noting that:

The very rapid decline in the number of farms has boosted the arithmetic means of a variety of farm * * * statistics, but it does not necessarily follow that farm incomes of persons remaining in agriculture have improved.

It is easy to see what is realy happening to farm income. USDA figures show that last year production expenses increased $200 million, while cash receipts from marketings went down by the same amount. At the same time, prices received by farmers declined 2½ percent. These are the results of rising farm costs, including larger interest payments, and a further weakening of the marketplace.

Less than 6 percent of U.S. farmers today actually receive a parity of income. Internal Revenue Service statistics for 1962 tax returns show that profits of operators in agriculture, forestry and fisheries whose annual receipts totaled less than $10,000 averaged one-third less than operators in service activities. Profits of the few with receipts of $100,000 or more averaged less than one-half of the profits realized by operators of service activities in the same economic class.

DEBT GROWS FASTER THAN REAL ESTATE VALUES

While some have argued that increases in farm real estate values have offset mounting farm debt, an examination of the facts proves otherwise. During the last 2 years alone, total farm debt grew 23.1 percent while the value of farm real estate grew 9.8 percent. Obviously, farm debt is increasing at a much faster pace.

The comparative balance sheet of agriculture clearly reveals that rising real estate values have not offset losses in the farm economy. Total farm liabilities in relation to total farm assets have almost doubled in the past 10 years. This means that the proportion of the farmer's equity in his land, livestock, and equipment is getting less and less. From 1961 to 1964, this rate of decline was one-third greater than from 1958 to 1961.

LITTLE HOPE IN FARM BILL

This all adds up to a rather disturbing picture. The farmer is being forced more and more to use credit as a substitute for income. When there are no more assets left upon which to borrow, what will he do? It is no wonder that tax returns show the number of farmers reporting a net loss went up from 29.8 percent in 1962 to 34 percent in 1963.

Many looked hopefully toward the President's farm bill, but in its present form it offers little hope for increasing farm income.

The amount of research required in this area is enormous, and it will be some time before our Republican Task Force on Agriculture studies progress to the point where they can be used as a basis for any legislative recommendations.

If there is no objection, we would like to submit tables that illustrate the statistics presented to you today.

The tables follow:

Approximate total farm debt

[In billions]

Year:	
1947	$8
1950	12
1953	14
1956	17
1959	21
1962	26
1965	36

Approximate total realized net farm income

[In billions]

Year:	
1947	$18.0
1950	14.0
1953	13.5
1956	12.5
1959	12.0
1962	13.0
1965	13.0

Waste of Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VERNON W. THOMSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1965

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Platteville Journal, Platteville, Wis., dated April 15, 1965:

WASTE OF MONEY

If Postmaster General Gronouski wants to know why his department is running in the red, he should take a look at what's going through the mail for one of the reasons.

A few days ago the Journal received a heavy cardboard carton 26 inches long, by 20 inches wide, by 1 inch thick. Inside were two thin U.S. Government advertising mats. We get mats like this from private concerns, but not in big heavy cartons.

These mats were sent by the Federal Government to the Journal, and, no doubt, to all the other papers in the United States giving us the privilege of running their bond advertising for nothing.

This material comes regularly, and we know of only one editor who doesn't know where to file it.

The mats and the big cartons are paid for by the Federal Government—and you know who that is.

The postage? Well, that came with the compliments of Gronouski and his Department. Had it been paid, it would have cost 46 cents coming from Chicago to Platteville. There are about 285 weekly papers in Wisconsin and quite a bunch of them in the United States.

As we said in the beginning: "If Postmaster General Gronouski wants to know why his Department is running in the red * * *."

Guns, Laws, Rights, and You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1965

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted, I insert in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent article appearing in the National Wildlife magazine published by the National Wildlife Federation entitled "Guns, Laws, Rights, and You." This fine article points out in a calm and reasoned fashion the simple ineffectiveness of unworkable gun laws in preventing crimes of violence. It gives statistical basis upon which this type of legislation can be shown to be without effectiveness and without basis in logic and reason.

It is fortunate that the publication of one of the largest sportsmen's and conservationists' organization should present such an article on this type of furor by a group of unwise fanatics who seek to deprive law-abiding citizens of their ancient right to use and enjoy firearms for lawful and legitimate sporting purposes.

The article follows:

GUNS, LAWS, RIGHTS, AND YOU

For more than 300 years, a man with a gun has been an heroic symbol of America: A Pilgrim hunting for meat and defending his family with a flintlock. A Minuteman turning from his plow to pick up a long rifle. A buckskin-clad mountain man leading the way west with a Kentucky rifle. The pictures come instantly to mind.

These vignettes have a deep meaning for all Americans, for our hardy pioneer forefathers used their trusted firearms to win our hostile continent, gain our precious freedom, and defend both from enemies on all sides.

But a much less heroic image of a man with a gun is also a symbol of America: Frontier bandits and gunslingers terrorizing honest pioneers. Prohibition-era gangsters striking fear with machine guns. Contemporary criminals using guns to rob, assault, and kill.

These vignettes are also a part of America—a blot further blackened by the nightmare of a president senselessly murdered—by a man with a gun.

These two widely contrasting American images have become the battle standards of a furious conflict now being waged over the American citizen's right to own and use guns.

On the one side are the gun owners. It is estimated that every other American household owns at least one firearm. The Nation's total is 80 million—perhaps as many as 100 million guns of all types. Gun owners are hunters, sport shooters, and collectors, as well as the many who keep a gun in their home or place of business for protection. And of course both law officers and many criminals have guns. But, to the vast majority of gun owners, guns are normal, useful, desirable things.

On the other side are those who dislike and fear guns. What they really fear, of course, and quite reasonably, is not the gun but the person who may use it to harm them or to force his will on them. So they seek to protect themselves by making guns harder to get. And they want to make crimes easier to solve through laws requiring registration of guns and gun owners. These people are mostly law enforcement officials and other well-meaning people, although there is a sprinkling of subversives, disarmament crackpots, and super-protectionists among them.

The enthusiasm and effectiveness of the antigun group waxes and wanes, and every well-publicized firearms death, by accident or intent, adds to their dosier of arguments and to their public support. More than 300 gun control bills have been proposed to State legislatures and Congress since President Kennedy's assassination. Most ignore a little known fact: We already have on the books many laws regulating possession and sale of firearms. Have they deterred crime?

The progun and antigun groups disagree violently on this, and on many other points. Unfortunately, extremism on one side breeds extremism on the other until the private citizen in the middle can hardly hear the facts for the slogans.

The progun and antigun debaters use everything from statistics to philosophy in their attempts to prove their points: The progun debaters argue that the armed citizen is a deterrent to crimes like burglary and robbery. But antigun debaters point to crime statistics to dispute that argument: In South Carolina, where it is illegal to manufacture or sell handguns, few residents own them at least in theory. Yet California, where it is legal to buy and own handguns, has a burglary rate twice as high as South Carolina.

One valid-sounding antigun argument is that the homeowner and businessman should leave protection to the police. Commonsense says no. It takes minutes at best for the police to reach the scene of a distress call—if there's a chance to call at all.

A popular progun argument is that the armed citizen is important to national defense. Many military men do insist that, despite our awesome nuclear capabilities, the object of warfare is still to win ground and hold it, and that is done by men with guns. Therefore, training and ability with small arms is, and will be, a basic requirement for military preparedness.

The use of weapons, whether pistols or ballistic missiles, must be given thought. To fight, men must be dedicated to principles like freedom, or to the defense of their homes or countries. Hungarian Freedom Fighters threw rocks at tanks; but if firepower had been the only determining factor, the American colonists could never have mounted a revolution.

The antigun people scoff at such arguments. They claim the rifleman, especially the citizen soldier, is about as important in modern warfare as a mule on the modern farm.

The progun element gets in another lick by reminding us that in 1940—not so long ago at that—when Britain graced for the expected Nazi invasion, hundreds of thousands volunteered for home guard duty. But years of tight firearms controls and restricted hunting opportunity had disarmed the population. Cheers and church bells greeted the timely arrival of a convoy of ships from the United States, hastily loaded with small arms, including many rifles, shotguns and handguns donated by sportsmen.

And so the arguments rage. Big emphasis of the anti-gun group is on crime. We do have a serious crime problem, and guns do play a role.

There were 8,500 willful killings in 1963, 54 percent committed with firearms. There were over 100,000 robberies, 59 percent of them by armed persons, although not all were armed with guns. There were almost 150,000 aggravated assaults—with intent to kill or commit serious injury—but only 12 percent with guns, and 88 percent with other weapons.

To sum up: A shocking 4,590 persons met death by willful gunshot in 1963, and 18,000 were injured.

Of course, we should not overlook the fact that automobiles killed 43,000 persons that year—almost 10 times more victims than guns. Home accidents killed 25,000; 20,000 died in falls. Drowning and fire killed more people than guns. This has nothing whatever to do with guns, but helps keep this whole picture in perspective.

FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover flatly states that "the easy accessibility of firearms is a significant factor in murders committed in the United States today."

Guns are certainly the deadliest weapons readily available to the public. They kill quickly, efficiently, and from a distance, while killing with a knife or a club or bare hands is difficult and dangerous. In the 12 percent of aggravated assaults where guns were used, 21 percent of the victims died, compared with only 3 percent in all other assaults.

We take for granted that most willful killers are criminals. Indeed, they shot and killed 108 law officers alone in the past 3 years. But only 12 percent, or 1,100, of our killings last year were "felony murders," committed in the course of other crimes like burglary and robbery.

A staggering 31 percent of our killings are committed within family groups, and another 51 percent during altercations outside the family but largely between persons who were at least acquainted. The majority of these two types of killings were acts of impulsive rage.

"A readily accessible gun enables the perpetrator to kill on impulse," notes Hoover. "With no such weapon available, the killer's rage may subside and better judgment prevail. And too, if the assault is made with another weapon, it may not be fatal, since the victim has a better chance to escape or defend himself. * * *"

What kinds of guns are used to kill people? About 70 percent are what police call concealable firearms, pistols and revolvers that can be carried to and from the scene of the crime unobserved.

Can we then reduce firearms crimes by controlling handguns? The antigun group cite statistics that would lead you to believe we can.

Nationally, guns account for 54 percent of our willful killings. In the 18 States where there are few or no restrictions on handgun purchases, 65 percent are with guns.

But in the seven States which require some form of permit to buy a handgun, only 42 percent are with firearms.

In New York and South Carolina, which have the toughest handgun controls, only 32 percent of killings are with firearms. In New York City, only 27 percent.

And that brings up New York's famed Sullivan Law, which since 1911 has provided the strictest control over handguns in the United States. The Sullivan law is a bureaucrat's dream—and a nightmare to any New Yorker who wants to own a handgun for any purpose. The purchaser must file a 4-page application for a permit to own the handgun; he is fingerprinted and photographed; he provides three character references; he is interviewed by a police official; he pays a $3 to $5 fee. He must go through a renewal routine every year to keep his license. He must meet stringent rules for safekeeping of the gun, which must remain in a specified location at all times.

The law, amended every year since its proposal, has become so complicated that many sportsmen have sold their handguns—too much bother to own them. The law has certainly kept down the number of legal handguns in New York City; there are only 17,000 licensed owners among the 8 million residents, mostly guards, watchmen, and others who use guns in their work.

After 54 years, the Sullivan law's effectiveness is still being debated. We do know that the State has a murder rate of 3.8 per 100,000 population, slightly below the national average of 4.5, but only half of Alabama's 10.2. The State robbery rate is 45.9 per 100,000—7.2 below the national average of 53.1, but less than one-third that of top-ranked Illinois, 188.5 The State aggravated assault rate is 85 per 100,000, above the average, but still only half that of leading North Carolina with 174.3.

New York City, when compared with our other nine largest cities, has the lowest robbery rate, third lowest murder rate, and fifth lowest aggravated assault rate. Handgun control sounds like the answer.

But statistics do not always tell the whole truth. Milwaukee, the Nation's 11th largest city is lowest in murder, robbery, aggravated assault, and burglary, yet the city has neither a license or permit system nor a handgun registration law, and no compulsory record is kept of handgun owners by any police authority.

It is reasonable to conclude that firearms restrictions have little effect on crime rates in general, but do seem to reduce gun crime. But this is achieved at a high price, pro-gun enthusiasts point out: Violation of the rights of law-abiding citizens; hindering legitimate sports; injuring an arms industry vital to the national economy; and reducing the capacity of the individual to defend himself.

Most New York sportsmen, businessmen, and homeowners will tell you that the cure is not worth the medicine.

The unpleasant truth, too, is that blanket restrictions on gun ownership have little effect on criminal gun ownership, because the professional criminals steal their guns or get them through underworld channels. Even if they buy them illegally in sporting goods stores, ordinary penalties for gun law violations are no deterrent to robbers and killers. Laws should be aimed at illegal firearms use, not at the guns themselves. They must be strengthened to impose tough penalties on felons, narcotics addicts, drunkards, juveniles, and other irresponsible persons who own or use guns illegally.

Is firearms control the answer to our crime problem? Or does the real answer lie in stricter law enforcement with formidable penalties for armed crimes? Here are two votes for the latter course:

Surprisingly, one is the much condemned British Firearms Acts. In addition to limiting gun ownership, the acts specify harsh and certain punishment for crimes committed while armed. And these laws are enforced by able police, backed up by nononsense courts and juries. As a result, the criminal leaves his gun home, the police go unarmed, and the citizen thinks twice before trying to settle his arguments with a gun. There is every indication that the British criminal has been more surely disarmed by his own hand, out of fear of punishment, than by any law controlling the availability of firearms.

Another example: In an experiment called Operation 25, New York City police selected the tough 25th precinct in Manhattan, and raised the strength of its force from 244 to

613 for a 4-month period, with all the additional policemen on foot patrol. By the end of the test period, felonies were down 55 percent; robberies down 70 percent; burglaries down 65 percent; street "muggings" down 90 percent. At the same time, case clearance improved by 75 percent. The heat went on, and the bottom fell out of the crime rate.

The big trump card of the progun debators is that the second amendment to the Constitution flatly states, "the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed." At least 35 State constitutions have similar guarantees.

Actually, our rights predate the Constitution. Ancient common law holds that a man may arm himself and fight to defend his castle and its inhabitants and contents.

Students of human rights insist that there is another, still more important, right involved. It is the "right to revolution." Before you flinch at that harsh term, remember that every democratic government on earth was born of armed revolution after tyranny. Revolution is the last resort of an oppressed people, and firearms are primary tools of revolution. If our Government turned tyrannical tomorrow, armed Americans would surely try to do something about it. But not if they had no guns because a registration system had permitted the tyrant to find and confiscate them. Every modern dictator has disarmed his subjects that way.

This fear of confiscation, and the knowledge that a bureaucrat with the power to issue a permit will also have the power to deny one, are the big progun arguments against permits and registration, and legitimate ones. (It is ironic that, in the absence of a national registration system, a hypothetical tyrant—or invader—would probably use the membership files of the organizations most opposed to gun registration.)

Should we have a strong Federal law controlling the sale and registration of all firearms?

J. Edgar Hoover, though a leader in the fight to reduce availability of firearms, especially handguns, says no. He flatly asserts: "The numerous ramifications of gun control are so varied and complex that regulatory measures must be at State and local levels."

But Mr. Hoover goes on to say that "the public has a right to expect that the distributor and the purchaser of weapons, so deadly and easily concealed as handguns, meet certain regulations and qualifications."

So the argument finally boils down to one of handgun control. Few, if any, of the responsible antigun people have any intention of taking away your deer rifle or duck gun, or of making you register it. Even New York has no restrictions on shoulder guns, which is why the Sullivan law has withstood hundreds of attacks on constitutional grounds.

Unfortunately, not all of the antigun people are either responsible or well informed. One well-meaning sociologist proposed that all guns should be kept in a public repository, and checked out like library books for specific purposes and periods. He also suggests that the gun owner be required to wear some distinctive article of clothing while going armed.

Some subversives work quietly with the antigun people toward their ideal—a disarmed or disarmable population unable to oppose their kind of revolution. They are most dangerous in that they are unidentified infiltrators in more well-meaning groups.

A few protectionists have taken the antigun side in the hope that closer gun control will reduce the hunting that they do not believe in. However, most informed protectionists are beginning to understand that legal, controlled hunting is not only desirable, but necessary, to the management of our wildlife community today.

Finally, this must be said: It is doubtful that a single one of the 300 new bills for gun control could have prevented the assassination of President Kennedy. Secret Service agents agree privately, and reluctantly, that there is no sure way to stop a killer who will use a long gun or who is willing to trade his life for the life of his victim. The only way to keep the President safe would be to keep him constantly in a bulletproof, bombproof shelter. President Kennedy would have scoffed at such a suggestion, and President Johnson already has. Mental defectives, of course, should be given treatment, kept under surveillance, and denied firearms of any kind. But again, it is a case of regulating the person, not the gun.

Out of all these arguments on firearms problems and rights, these truths appear to us, and are our policy:

We believe laws should prohibit sale of firearms to felons, drug addicts, habitual drunkards, juveniles, and mental incompetents. We believe laws should invoke strict penalties against the possession of firearms by criminals and irresponsible persons. We believe laws should permit responsible, law-abiding adults to own and use firearms for legal purposes. We believe laws should not require law-abiding adult citizens to register shotguns and rifles (Federal statutes already require manufacturers and dealers to keep records on the sale of handguns, rifles, and shotguns). We believe laws should not grant authority to any jurisdiction, police or otherwise, at any government level, to prohibit the purchase or ownership of firearms by law-abiding and responsible citizens.

Statement by Meany on Vietnam Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the following statement by George Meany, which appeared in the AFL–CIO News of April 17, 1965, reiterates organized labor's firm stand in opposition to aggression and effectively refutes those who call for peace at any price:

STATEMENT BY MEANY ON VIETNAM POLICY

In his address of April 7, President Johnson offered to open the door to unconditional discussions on the crisis in Vietnam. Those who have been urging our Government to appease the Communist aggressors against the Vietnamese people have seized upon the word "unconditional" to conclude that our country's policy toward the conflict in Vietnam is now being basically changed. They would interpret the President's address to mean that we are now ready to appease the aggressors.

Organized labor in our country has steadfastly opposed appeasement of all aggressors—Mussolini, Hitler, Stalin, Mao Tse-tung, and Khrushchev alike. In continuation of this policy we have time and again supported President Johnson's firm rejection of all proposals to appease the aggressors against the people of South Vietnam.

Fortunately, the course outlined by the President, the national aims spelled out in his address, his determination to help the South Vietnam people maintain their independence—all these clearly add up to anything but appeasement, anything but wavering or weakening in America's commitment to freedom for South Vietnam.

Those who strive and struggle for peace will be greatly encouraged by President Johnson once again making it clear to all Communist aggressors that "we will not be defeated. We will not grow tired. We will not withdraw, either openly or under the cloak of meaningless agreement."

American labor welcomes President Johnson's reaffirmation of America's determination to achieve through diplomatic and economic as well as military measures "an independent South Vietnam securely guaranteed and able to shape its own relationship to all others, free from outside interference."

This forceful reiteration of the basic aim of our Nation's policy in southeast Asia should eliminate all doubts as to American military action having any other objective than to provide a firm foundation for the peace, freedom, and economic development of this war-torn region.

We are confident that the people of North Vietnam, if permitted, would gladly accept President Johnson's proposal that they join with their neighbors in a great effort to improve their conditions of life and work rather than continue to suffer and sacrifice in a terrible military conflict which can never be of any advantage to them. Any rejection of this generous American offer can only aggravate their misery and suffering. This is the cruel fate which befell the people of the captive nations of Europe when their masters in Moscow prevented their benefiting from the Marshall plan aid.

The people of South Vietnam, Berlin, and every other area in the shadow or terror of Communist aggression can draw encouragement and strength from the President's timely assurance that the United States " will always oppose the effort of one nation to conquer another nation." We share the President's realization that this course must be pursued "because our own security is at stake."

We also welcome the President's emphasizing that "the central lesson of our time is that the appetite of aggression is never satisfied" and that, in Vietnam or in any other part of the world where our country bears an international responsibility, " we fight because we must fight, if we are to live in a world where every country can shape its own destiny. And only in such a world will our own freedom be finally secure."

Wisconsin Senate Passed Resolution on Western District Judgeship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include Wisconsin Senate Resolution 18, relating to the vacancy in the Federal judgeship for the western district of Wisconsin, in the appendix of the RECORD at this point:

SENATE RESOLUTION 18

Resolution relating to the vacancy in the Federal judgeship for the western district of Wisconsin

Whereas except for a brief interim appointment, the Federal court for the western district of Wisconsin has been without a judge since January 13, 1963; and

Whereas this unreasonable delay deprives the citizens of the western district of Wisconsin of due process of law in the Federal courts; and

Whereas there are any number of qualified candidates for the position: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate, That President Lyndon B. Johnson is hereby advised of the concern of the citizens of Wisconsin over the vacancy in the western district of Wisconsin; and, be it further

Resolved, That the citizens of Wisconsin speaking through their elected representatives, the Wisconsin State Senate, urge President Johnson to fill the vacancy without further delay.

PATRICK GLUY,
President of the Senate.
WILLIAM P. NUGENT,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

Historic School Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 19, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the historic Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 will benefit all Americans. It will also benefit our children and our children's children. I call to the attention of Members of the House the following editorial on this landmark legislation from a recent issue of the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette:

HISTORIC SCHOOL BILL

Of all the legislation that has been enacted by Congress since Lyndon Johnson became President—and there has been a considerable body of it—none more plainly bears his personal imprint than the Federal aid-to-education bill which cleared the final legislative hurdle in the Senate last Friday.

As the first successful product of nearly 20 years of effort in Congress to provide broad Federal support for public schools, the new measure is a testimonial to the remarkable political generalship of Mr. Johnson. While passage of the bill was undoubtedly aided by the heavy Democratic majorities in both Houses, skilled leadership from the White House was clearly helpful in enabling the measure to weather House floor debate with only a minor revision and Senate floor debate with not a comma changed.

This demonstration of political virtuosity does not mean, however, that the legislation is without fault. Its various provisions for public aid to parochial school students raise important questions among sincere people as to whether the constitutional barrier between church and state is being breached. And the bill contains no clearcut method of getting these questions squarely before the Supreme Court. In order to avoid a paralyzing battle among proponents of various views, the language of the measure was intentionally made fuzzy—a technique which may give rise to additional problems, although the hope is that these may be met by amendments next year.

Whatever its shortcomings, the aid to education measure is of momentous social significance. Though it is aimed primarily at upgrading the education of children of low-income families, funds from the act will be channeled into an estimated 94 percent of the Nation's 26,000 school districts. Though the first year's $1.3 billion authorization for building construction, teacher salaries, instructional materials, special education, and other projects, will amount to a fairly small fraction of the total annual outlay for public education, future Federal allocations are expected to rise, reaching $2.4 billion a year by 1968. This infusion of Federal support can hardly fail to have an uplifting effect on overcrowded and underequipped public educational facilities, not only directly raising their quality but hopefully also generating new support at local and State levels, from which the bulk of financing will still have to come.

Some inferences as to the role of Federal aid in Pennsylvania may be drawn by comparing the anticipated allocations under the new statute with present State and local school expenditures. Total public spend- for elementary and secondary education in Pennsylvania now runs to more than $900 million a year. About $62 million in Federal aid statewide will be added to this. The Pittsburgh school district's annual budget is some $40 million. Pittsburgh's share of Federal aid will be a roughly estimated $3 million.

Since regulations for the distribution of funds under the new law have not yet been drawn, no one can yet say whether Federal dollars for schools in poverty-stricken areas will enable the Pittsburgh School District and others to readjust their budgets so as to spend more for other needs. But Pittsburgh Superintendent Sidney P. Marland hopes there will be an across-the-board gain for education. Pittsburgh schools need whatever help they can get to achieve their long-term objectives of (1) building 20 new schools under a 5-year $50 million construction program, (2) hiring 600 new teachers to help reduce class sizes eventually to a desirable 26 or 27 pupils, (3) improving vocational and counseling services.

To the extent that the historic Federal aid statute can help Pittsburgh and other hard-pressed districts to achieve such goals, it will indeed be contributing to what President Johnson has visualized as the Great Society.

Opinion in the Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 22, 1965

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, the night of Sunday, March 28, 1965, was a most noteworthy occasion.

On that night, the Honorable MARGARET CHASE SMITH gave a dinner party to a dear friend and colleague, Congresswoman FRANCES BOLTON.

I was so proud to have been included in this intimate group of family and friends. FRANCES is a most remarkable person and a valiant woman and I am happy to be privileged to insert in the RECORD the transcript of an interview between these two great public servants.

The interview follows:

OPINION IN THE CAPITAL

(Produced by Florence Lowe)

(A Metropolitan Television Broadcasting Production (WTTG, Washington, D.C.) March 28, 1965)

Guests: Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Republican, of Maine, and Representative FRANCES BOLTON, Republican, of Ohio.

Reporter: Mark Evans, vice president in charge of public affairs for Metromedia, Inc.

This program will also be broadcast on:

TV: WNEW, New York, N.Y.; WTVP, Decatur, Ill.; WTVH, Peoria, Ill.; WTTG, Washington, D.C.; KTTV, Los Angeles, Calif.; KMBC, Kansas City, Mo.; Eastern Educational Network (13 stations).

Radio: WIP, Philadelphia, Pa.; WHK, Cleveland, Ohio; KMBC, Kansas City, Mo.; WNEW, New York, N.Y.; Armed Forces Radio Network.

Mr. EVANS. In the 87th Congress, there were 20 women, 2 in the Senate and 18 in the House of Representatives. Now, in the 89th Congress, there are still 2 lady Senators, but only 10 women in the House of Representatives. Representative BOLTON, how do you account for this?

Mrs. BOLTON. Oh, the men.

Mr. EVANS. What's your opinion, Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH?

Mrs. SMITH. Oh, I think one reason is, that there aren't enough qualified women who run for office.

Mr. EVANS. Metromedia's "Opinion in the Capital" is honoring Representative FRANCES BOLTON on her silver anniversary in the Congress of the United States. Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH is our special guest to pay tribute to her long-time friend.

Representative BOLTON, I detected a little bit of sarcasm in there when you said the men are responsible for the lack of women.

Mrs. BOLTON. Well, you see what the men did. They gerrymandered various districts on the Democratic side. They didn't do that on our side.

Mr. EVANS. Did they gerrymander women out?

Mrs. BOLTON. They gerrymandered women out, which I thought was too bad * * * they were fine women.

Mrs. SMITH. But, where were the women while they were doing this?

Mrs. BOLTON. Well, they were only Democrats mind you, I wouldn't know just where they were.

Mr. EVANS. I think there should be a very fine distinction drawn here. There is a very great difference between politicians who are women and women in politics.

Mrs. BOLTON. Oh, that's interesting.

Mr. EVANS. I certainly think you are both women in politics. You're women first but I wonder why neither of you have ever married again.

Mrs. BOLTON. I thought one marriage was enough.

Mr. EVANS. Well, you had a very good one then?

Mrs. BOLTON. I had a very good one.

Mr. EVANS. Margaret, have you ever thought of this?

Mrs. SMITH. Yes, indeed, I thought of it very seriously, back along—I haven't lately, I've been too busy. I haven't had many offers.

Mr. EVANS. Well, I'm sure this may provoke some. Are there problems in this? Being in politics and leading this kind of life that would lead to another marriage?

Mrs. SMITH. I don't think there are too many problems. I don't know any reason why a woman couldn't be married and serve in public office as well as a man in public office being married. I think men and women work together, whichever way it is.

Mr. EVANS. Both of you came in, and this is probably a very cruel thing to say, but you both came in the back door of politics. Your husbands were in politics and you inherited the kingdom and have held them admirably since.

Mrs. BOLTON. But remember, we had to be elected to it.

Mr. EVANS. I know that, subsequently.

Mrs. BOLTON. That's not just inheriting it.

Mr. EVANS. No, I agree, but originally you inherited it.

Mrs. BOLTON. Yes. No, oh no. We had to be elected.

Mr. EVANS. I thought you had to be appointed.

Mrs. BOLTON. No, no. No appointments in Ohio.

Mrs. SMITH. The Senate vacancies are filled by appointments in some States. But, the House is always by election, and we were both elected. I must say I think FRANCES had a tough election and campaign the first time. I'm sure that I did.

Mr. EVANS. Would you have agreed with your husbands politically?

Mrs. BOLTON. I never agreed with him.

Mr. EVANS. Did you like politics?

Mrs. BOLTON. No, I didn't like it at all. You see, the difficulty was that we had a son who had just broken his neck and was desperately ill for many years. Every time there was an emergency, my husband wasn't there. He was up at the House, or he was off somewhere. So, politics to me, wasn't a very appealing thing.

Mr. EVANS. What convinced you to get into politics?

Mrs. BOLTON. Well, when he died, all the Ohio men thought I knew everything he knew and thought he'd brought all his troubles back home, which, of course, he never did, and they suggested that I finish out his term. Then, I learned that they were saying amongst themselves, "Of course, she won't stay long." So, being a woman, I decided I'd stay.

Mrs. SMITH. You've certainly done a job at it.

Mr. EVANS. Recently, a woman in the Congress, and I won't mention her name because she's from the opposition party, made a comment to the effect that more women didn't get into politics because they cannot make decisions.

Mrs. SMITH. I think that's a rather ridiculous attitude. I know of few women who don't make decisions. Women have to make the decisions. They have to make the decisions all the way through life. They certainly have to make the decisions as far as the budget is concerned in the family.

Mr. EVANS. How about the decisions you have to make, Senator SMITH and you Congressman BOLTON, you are now dealing in monumental things, the figures that deal in the millions and billions. Mrs. BOLTON, you're a 24-year veteran of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mrs. BOLTON. Yes, I'm ranking now. I began at the bottom.

Mr. EVANS. All these monumental problems resting on your shoulders. Are they? Is a woman up to all this?

Mrs. BOLTON. Why, we're more than up to it. I think we take it more simply, more fundamentally than the men, so we don't get quite so excited. I don't. I find the men around me, on the committee, get terribly upset by this and that. I may be upset, yes, because some things I don't agree with at all, and one is troubled. But I don't feel all excited about that trouble.

Mr. EVANS. Well, let's take a specific example. There has been a recommendation from the Senate committee that's the counterpart of your committee, and he has recommended that there be a separation of the funds that are used for economic aid.

Mrs. BOLTON. I had the pleasure of dining the other evening, across the table from Senator FULBRIGHT, and it was a very interesting dinner, of men, and we were there to listen to their opinions and of course, the Senator spoke first. He made it very clear that he thought it was ridiculous to have the two together, that they should be separated immediately. When it came to my turn, I said, "I'm so sorry, I don't agree with the Senator at all," and we had it out a little bit across the table. It was delightful.

Mr. EVANS. You thought they should not be lumped? Can you tell me why?

Mrs. BOLTON. Because I think that the billion dollars that goes from our committee, our authorization, to the Department. I don't think it would be feasible in the $50 billion that defense has. It would be lost. Who would care about it? Who would know where it went? It's terribly important where it goes.

Mr. EVANS. Do you feel the same way about it, Senator?

Mrs. SMITH. No, but I would be prejudiced. I've majored in defense affairs through the years and I have a pretty high respect for the defense of the country.

Mrs. BOLTON. So have I.

Mrs. SMITH. And the way that this money is used. I don't know what I would do if I were placed in the position of having to decide.

Mr. EVANS. I'm glad to find that there is some friction between you two.

Mrs. BOLTON. Not friction, just a difference of opinion.

Mr. EVANS. Are there many things on which you differ?

Mrs. SMITH. This particular one—of course, FRANCES BOLTON has majored in foreign affairs through the years, and I've majored in defense affairs. So, there is a reason for our differing on this. I don't know that we differ on many things, we don't very often have arguments.

Mrs. BOLTON. On fundamental things, I don't think we disagree at all.

Mr. EVANS. One of the great moments for women everywhere in my estimation, is when a woman from Ohio stood before a great convention, and nominated her friend——

Mrs. BOLTON. Seconded it——

Mr. EVANS. Seconded the nomination for the lady from Maine.

Mrs. BOLTON. I tell you Mark, that was the high point of my life.

Mr. EVANS. First woman ever to be nominated for President.

Mrs. BOLTON. Yes, and to have the privilege of seconding MARGARET's nomination for the Presidency was the highlight of my life.

Mrs. SMITH. If it was, FRANCES, you must know what it meant to me, because it was one of the finest things that could have happened to me, a woman who was a serious candidate for President, to have another woman in this world, where they say women don't get along and don't support each other.

Mr. EVANS. It would be normal for you to be envious of her.

Mrs. BOLTON. That's right.

Mr. EVANS. And you weren't a bit?

Mrs. BOLTON. Not a bit. Proud of her.

Mr. EVANS. Senator SMITH, have you had any afterthoughts, have you changed your thinking? Have you come up with any suggestions along political lines as a result of your running for the Presidency?

Mrs. SMITH. Yes, I think it was a wonderful effort. I wouldn't do it any differently if I were to do it again. I'm very pleased that I did. If not for any other reason than historical purposes, it was good. I've come up with a good many ideas and I don't think this is the time to go into them. I'd like to discuss them someday with you. For several years, I have introduced legislation for a direct presidential primary, a national primary with a runoff. That, too, I'd like to talk about some day.

Mr. EVANS. I'd be happy to do it. Mrs. BOLTON, you are in the House of Representatives on the Foreign Affairs Committee and there is now a suggestion by Representative LINDSAY to invite the Secretary of State to appear before the entire House to be cross-examined on foreign affairs. Do you like it or don't you?

Mrs. BOLTON. I don't like it particularly because I don't see that we'd get anywhere with it. After all, that's a British institution. It may be good but I'm not at all sure that it fits into our way of doing things.

Mr. EVANS. What do you hear from your respective constituencies on what's going on in the South, now. You come from the great State of Ohio which I'm sure has many problems of its own. Are you getting much mail regarding this?

Mrs. BOLTON. Very little. Almost none.

Mr. EVANS. Do you think people are apathetic about the whole situation?

Mrs. BOLTON. No, I don't think they are exactly apathetic. I think they are very fearful about it. They don't understand it. Because, up with us, we've never had any problem. We've had integrated schools, always. We're very troubled.

Mr. EVANS. How about you, Mrs. SMITH?

Mrs. SMITH. I've had very little mail. I think that, what I do hear, back in the State, is that they thought the last time we acted on civil righs legislation, that everything was ready to go and could be administered through the administration. This is a great surprise to them and I think they haven't quite decided what it means. I personally thought that we gave this administration what it asked for and I was a little surprised that it needed another——

Mrs. BOLTON. I agree with you on that, MARGARET.

Mr. EVANS. How about the marches? Do they understand the reason for the marches in your State?

Mrs. BOLTON. I don't think so. I don't think they think enough about them. Of course, we had one man killed under a bulldozer, which was very tragic. I think they are very enthusiastic over doing everything they can—I think everybody feels they should do something. Perhaps that's the only way they can express it.

Mr. EVANS. What the they concerned with? What does your mail indicate?

Mrs. BOLTON. They are concerned with Vietnam.

Mrs. SMITH. Medicare, some on education.

Mrs. BOLTON. Yes, some on education. They do not want Federal control of education.

Mr. EVANS. How about Vietnam? What's their major question.

Mrs. BOLTON. They don't see why the President doesn't tell us frankly, what's really going on; what does he propose; what do we have to do? Now, we've sent Marines over—what does that mean? Is it going to be followed?

Mr. EVANS. Are these your words?

Mrs. BOLTON. No, that's my mail.

Mr. EVANS. Is that your attitude, too?

Mrs. BOLTON. Not entirely.

Mr. EVANS. What's your attitude?

Mrs. BOLTON. I don't think I should discuss it. I really don't tonight, Mark.

Mr. EVANS. How about you, Senator?

Mrs. SMITH. Well, I think it's very encouraging to see the administration be more firm on their actions in Vietnam. I think there is quite a noticeable difference between the days of the campaign last year and today. It seems changed about the time of the election. I think this is encouraging. I wish it weren't there, but it is there and we can't forget it and I have great admiration for the people who stay firm and give the people the true facts.

Mr. EVANS. Mrs. BOLTON, how do you maintain the vigor in your life. I'm not going to ask how old you are, but it's printed.

Mrs. BOLTON. Oh, I am 150.

Mr. EVANS. You don't look a day over 90, no, this sweet lady, she defies the calendar.

Mrs. BOLTON. That's good.

Mr. EVANS. I just think you ought to share it with other people.

Mrs. BOLTON. You share it. You sit on your head. Everybody tells me that's why I'm so young. I stand on my head.

Mr. EVANS. Is this coincidental—that you stand on your head—or have you always this joie de vivre?

Mrs. BOLTON. I didn't have it years ago. I'm so terribly healthy, Mark.

Mr. EVANS. Well, I've been reading part of a book and so has Senator SMITH about you, "The Long Way Forward."

Mrs. BOLTON. Yes, but that book stops at the most exciting moment of my life. What David Loth did I think is wonderful, but I went to Africa and there's not a bit of it in there, he stopped just before that.

Mrs. SMITH. I shall always remember when you returned from that trip.

Mr. EVANS. Let's get back to politics before you two embrace each other.

Mrs. SMITH. I'd like to get back to another question and ask FRANCES BOLTON if she doesn't think that the exercise she's had through the years, not only standing on her head, but exercise generally, had a great deal to do with your stamina.

Mrs. BOLTON. I think it's absolutely imperative if one wants to really live. Physical fitness is tops.

Mr. EVANS. You don't want to tell us how old you are?

Mrs. BOLTON. I'd just as soon. I've got my 80th birthday coming up.

Mr. EVANS. I'm proud of you.

Mrs. BOLTON. Why, that's nothing.

Mr. EVANS I know it's nothing, but I think its real noteworthy when you can do what you do. What kind of day do you put in?

Mrs. BOLTON. I've been going since 6 this morning. But, why not?

Mrs. SMITH. The remarkable thing, Mark, is that Frances Bolton is so modest in all of this. FRANCES BOLTON did a life's work before she went into Congress. She brought up a family, she had a home, and she did so much and then at 55 years old, to go into Congress, to run the election, the campaigns that she's had.

Mr. EVANS. She's had some tough ones too, hasn't she?

Mrs. SMITH. She certainly has.

Mrs. BOLTON. They've been wonderful, though. If you loved people as much as I do. It gives me my chance every 2 years, to have an excuse to go down to have suppers and things in the playrooms and the basements and everywhere, it's wonderful.

Mr. EVANS. One of the things that impresses me though, and I hope it doesn't embarrass you, you are well-to-do. You don't have to do this.

Mrs. BOLTON. I couldn't help that.

Mr. EVANS. I know, it was thrust upon you, but you've got to be brave. You don't have to do this.

Mrs. BOLTON. Yes I do. There's a compulsion about it. I couldn't sit around and do nothing. I come from a line of people who have always served their country. I couldn't possibly stay home and do nothing.

Mrs. SMITH. Yes, but you don't have to work at the rate you do.

Mrs. BOLTON. Oh but, that's just me. I have to.

Mr. EVANS. The theme of your biography dwells pretty much on the fact that you were kind of ignored, kind of left out, I'm not sure whether that's true. In spite of all of this, you'd think the kind of life you led would be enough to keep you from this. Did you burst when you were finally free?

Mrs. BOLTON. I think there was a certain amount of bursting in it. It takes you a long while to come from a deep sense of inferiority and I'm really a timid person * * * nobody believes that, but it's true.

Mr. EVANS. I'm sure Senator FULBRIGHT doesn't.

Mrs. BOLTON. Of course, he doesn't, but BILL and I are old friends. It's taken me a long while where I can be relaxed with people and just kind of be myself.

Mr. EVANS. Let's get on to party politics here. You are both members of the loyal opposition. Are you pleased or displeased with the way things are going? Do you think they are headed upward? Would you classify yourselves in the same ranks? You're both moderates; is that a fair statement?

Mrs. SMITH. I coined that word in my 1948 campaign, you may remember.

Mr. EVANS. I know you did. Will you buy that label?

Mrs. BOLTON. Yes, I think so.

Mr. EVANS. Let me get a consensus, here, on where the Republican Party is headed?

Mrs. BOLTON. May I speak on it from a different angle? I think it's terribly important for the continuance of freedom in this country that we have a two-party government.

Mr. EVANS. I don't think even the Democrats will disagree with you. They just want to win.

Mrs. BOLTON. I think that it's very important that we realize how much it will mean when we once get together. Of course, I find the Democrats fighting too, but I think we haven't learned how to have a big battle, disagree, and then stick together and punch through something.

Mr. EVANS. Even if you get together, you're a minority party.

Mrs. BOLTON. Yes, 140. But back in 1936 there were only 89 left after the Roosevelt sweep.

Mr. EVANS. I mean registrationwise in the country. Now where do you go in your estimation?

Mrs. SMITH. I think, in my direct-primary proposal, it would help. I think it would get more people interested and I think that's very, very important. I think Frances has hit upon something that's most vital and that is that the Republicans, as I've seen them through the years, think that they have to agree on all issues and basically, we should have a statement of principles and agree on perhaps, four or five issues, and then let the people go their own ways on other issues. Perfection is not to be expected in a party. We have great minds, we have issues. I'm not at all discouraged. It does look rather hopeless but I think that if we would start now. We've just had the inauguration and we can't do anything to destroy the administration as long as they're in but I think that doesn't prevent us from getting ready for 1968. This is the time—not to wait 3 months before the convention and come out with a candidate.

Mr. EVANS. Are you telling me that they should concentrate on a man? Several men?

Mrs. SMITH. Yes. I think it would be well, and I think we have many—men and women in the country who are qualified—who have personalities. I think it's very important for a man or a woman to have a partner who likes the game—who is willing to get into it. It's going to take a great deal of energy—a great deal of courage—a great deal of time.

Mrs. BOLTON. And a great deal of wisdom.

Mr. EVANS. In the State of Maine, there's has been a real reverse—an about-face in politics. Maine used to set the pattern in republicanism. You now have a Democratic Senator and a Democratic Governor.

Mrs. SMITH. No, we have a Republican Governor.

Mr. EVANS. Oh. That's right. But, there has been a substantial change in Maine politics. Is this fearsome to you?

Mrs. SMITH. No. If you look at the registration figures, there has been quite a change. There have been large numbers of people registering as Democrats in Maine, and a large number of Independents. I think that, but there were many thousands of people in this last campaign that stayed at home. One hundred and fifty thousand registered people who stayed at home from the polls. How it's divided, I don't know.

Mr. EVANS. You write a completely new book in politics in honoring this lovely lady but I think it's significant that we point out that she turns all her political contributions down. She will not accept a nickel from people for her political campaigns. (Mrs. Smith.)

Mrs. BOLTON. But isn't that the way it should be?

Mr. EVANS. I'm sure it is but I'm not sure it's very practical for most people.

Mrs. BOLTON. I've always loved the way she would go into a town and say, "Well, here I am." "Look me over." With no money attached, at all.

Mr. EVANS. Have you two ever jointly sponsored any legislation?

Mrs. SMITH. I don't know.

Mrs. BOLTON. The only thing we ever did together was the rose.

Mrs. SMITH. Yes, that was a very worthy one.

Mrs. BOLTON. It was your rose.

Mrs. SMITH. We didn't get very far because about the time we were suggesting the rose we found that almost every State in the Union has a flower and each State thought that that flower should be the national flower.

Mr. EVANS. You ran into a man named DIRKSEN in favor of a flower.

Mrs. SMITH. Oh yes, marigolds, and his colleague in Illinois wants the corn tassel.

Mr. EVANS. The corn tassel?

Mrs. BOLTON. Imagine. Of course, with goldenrod, everyone would have hayfever.

Mrs. SMITH. I think, FRANCES, why don't you tell Mr. EVANS about your contribution along the line of nurses and hospitals and health, because we did do something together there.

Mrs. BOLTON. Well, we did work together there, we worked very hard. I've always worked with the nurses. During the first war we established the Army School of Nursing, with Mr. Baker, who is a great friend of mine.

Mr. EVANS. Were you a sponsor of that?

Mrs. BOLTON. No, but I worked behind the scenes and bumped everybody off who was in my way. We finally got our school established which lasted quite a long while. Then when the second war came along, two or three of the nurses and I went to see the Surgeon General and we said we were quite ready to staff the school again. "Over my dead body the Army will do any nursing," he said. Oh, we were crushed. We now have nurses very well established in the services.

Wisconsin Legislature Passes Joint Resolution on Voting Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the text of the Wisconsin Assembly Joint Resolution 56 memorializing the Congress to adopt legislation assuring all U.S. citizens their constitutional right to vote without discrimination on account of race or color in the RECORD at this point:

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 56

Joint resolution relating to the recent denial of voting rights and police brutality in Alabama

Whereas the right of all Americans, regardless of race, color or creed, to participate in the election process is basic to the democratic process; and

Whereas it is urgent that all Americans be able to vote in all elections; and

Wheras recent denial of Negro voting rights and the shameful police brutality in Alabama against those protesting the denial of such rights has aroused the conscience and produced a sense of outrage among all Americans; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the legislature urges the Congress of the United States to speedily adopt legislation to assure to all citizens of the United States their constitutional right to vote without discrimination on account of race or color; and, be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Secretary of the U.S. Senate, to the Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives, and to each member of the Wisconsin delegation to Congress.

ROBERT T. HUBER,
Speaker of the Assembly.
JAMES P. BUCKLEY,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
PATRICK J. GLUY,
President of the Senate.
WILLIAM P. NUGENT,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided*, That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey

Aiken, George D., *Vt*
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.* — 6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*
Bayh, Birch E., *Ind*
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*
Bible, Alan, *Nev*
Boggs, J. Caleb, *Del*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md* — 1327 33d St.
Burdick, Quentin N., *N. Dak.*
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va* — The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*
Carlson, Frank, *Kans* — Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N.J*
Church, Frank, *Idaho*
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*
Cotton, Norris, *N.H*
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*
Dominick, Peter H., *Colo*
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*
Eastland, James O., *Miss* — 5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*
Ervin, Sam J., Jr., *N.C*
Fannin, Paul J., *Ariz*
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii* — 5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Fulbright, J. W., *Ark*
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*
Harris, Fred R., *Okla*
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.* — 5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla* — Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*
Javits, Jacob K., *N.Y*
Jordan, B. Everett, *N.C*
Jordan, Len B., *Idaho*
Kennedy, Edward M., *Mass*
Kennedy, Robert F., *N.Y*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*
Long, Edward V., *Mo*
Long, Russell B., *La*
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.* — 5916 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*
McGovern, George, *S. Dak*
McIntyre, Thomas J., *N.H*
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.* — The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont* — 453 First St. SE.
Miller, Jack R., *Iowa* — 5417 Kirkwood Dr., Bethesda, Md.
Mondale, Walter F., *Minn*
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg* — 4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak* — 122 Schotts Court NE.
Murphy, George, *Calif*
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*
Nelson, Gaylord, *Wis*
Neuberger, Maurine B., *Oreg.*
Pastore, John O., *R.I*
Pearson, James B., *Kans*
Pell, Claiborne, *R.I* — 3425 Prospect St.
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*
Proxmire, William, *Wis*
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va* — 4608 Reservoir Rd.
Ribicoff, Abraham A., *Conn*
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass* — 2320 Tracy Pl.
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*
Simpson, Milward L., *Wyo*
Smathers, George A., *Fla*
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John, *Ala* — 4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*
Thurmond, Strom, *S.C*
Tower, John G., *Tex*
Tydings, Joseph D., *Md*
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N.J.*
Williams, John J., *Del*
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex*
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak* — Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Secretary for the Majority—Francis R. Valeo.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Anderson (chairman), Russell, Magnuson, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Holland, Mondale, Tydings, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Hickenlooper, Curtis, Jordan of Idaho, and Aiken.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Holland, Eastland, Talmadge, Jordan of North Carolina, McCarthy, McGovern, Bass, Montoya, ———, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Cooper, Boggs, and Miller.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Pastore, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, McGee, Mansfield, Bartlett, Proxmire, Yarborough, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Kuchel, Hruska, Allott, Cotton, and Case.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell (chairman), Stennis, Byrd of Virginia, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Cannon, Byrd of West Virginia, Young of Ohio, Inouye, McIntyre, Brewster, Saltonstall, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Thurmond, Miller, and Tower.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Sparkman, Douglas, Proxmire, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Long of Missouri, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. McIntyre, Mondale, Bennett, Tower, Thurmond, and Hickenlooper.

Committee on Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Lausche, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Hart, Cannon, Brewster, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. Bass, Cotton, Morton, Scott, Prouty, Pearson, and Dominick.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, McIntyre, Kennedy of New York, Tydings, Prouty, and Dominick.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Long of Louisiana, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Fulbright, Ribicoff, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Curtis, Morton, and Dirksen.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Sparkman, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Gore, Lausche, Church, Symington, Dodd, Smathers, Clark, Pell, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Carlson, Williams of Delaware, Mundt, and Case.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Gruening, Muskie, Ribicoff, Harris, Kennedy of New York, Metcalf, Montoya, Mundt, Curtis, Javits, and Simpson.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Jackson (chairman), Anderson, Bible, Church, Gruening, Moss, Burdick, Hayden, McGovern, Nelson, Metcalf, Kuchel, Allott, Jordan of Idaho, Simpson, and Fannin.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), McClellan, Ervin, Dodd, Hart, Long of Missouri, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Bayh, Burdick, Tydings, ———, Dirksen, Hruska, Fong, Scott, and Javits.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Pell, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Nelson, Kennedy of New York, Javits, Prouty, Dominick, Murphy, and Fannin.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Monroney (chairman), Yarborough, Randolph, McGee, Brewster, Hartke, Burdick, ———, Carlson, Fong, Boggs, and Simpson.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. McNamara (chairman), Randolph, Young of Ohio, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Metcalf, Jordan of North Carolina, Inouye, Bayh, Montoya, Harris, Cooper, Fong, Boggs, Pearson, and Murphy.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Jordan of North Carolina (chairman), Hayden, Cannon, Pell, Clark, Byrd of West Virginia, Curtis, Cooper, and Scott.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D.C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 5136 Palisade Lane.
Mr. Justice White, of Colorado, 2209 Hampshire Rd., McLean, Va.
Mr. Justice Goldberg, of Illinois, 2811 Albemarle St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John F. Davis, 4704 River Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Henry Putzel, Jr., 3703 33d St.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Goldberg. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

The Armenian Massacres in Turkey in 1915

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the tragedy of Armenians in Turkey in 1915 marks the saddest event in the long and turbulent history of the Armenian people. That event, unprecedented in the annals of modern history, in one fell swoop did away in a most cruel manner with nearly all of the 2 million Armenians in Turkey, and it remains the blackest page in Armenian history.

For centuries Armenians had suffered under alien yokes in their historic homeland, and since the early 16th century endured the heavy yoke of Ottoman sultans. While making the best of a very bad situation, under almost unbearable conditions, they had hopes of improving their second-class citizen status through some reforms. In the latter part of the last century, and especially in the years after the turn of the 20th, they did their best to have such reforms instituted in areas where they constituted a large part of the population, especially in the old Armenian provinces in eastern Asia Minor. They naturally hoped that through such reform measures their life, liberty, and property would be guaranteed against the brigandage of wild Kurds and unscrupulous government officials. But the Turkish authorities did not welcome and would not institute such reforms; and the more the Armenians petitioned, insisted, and pressed for such reforms, the more the Turks opposed any such measures. In 1913, however, the Turks agreed, upon the insistence of certain European governments, to make certain improvements. But they felt that this was imposed upon them at the instigation of Armenian leaders, and therefore they felt they had to teach the Armenians a lesson. The First World War gave them the opportunity to do this.

Soon after the outbreak of that war, the Turkish authorities proceeded to carry out their hideous plan of exterminating the Armenian population of Turkey through deportation, starvation, and wholesale massacres. In less than a year they succeeded in their ghastly task while European friends of the Armenian people were involved in the war and therefore unable to help. It is the 50th anniversary of that tragedy that is being observed this year, with sadness and solemnity, in all Armenian communities throughout the world, commemorating the martyrdom of more than 1 million Armenians.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

Friday, April 23, 1965

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate committee approved second supplemental appropriations.

See Congressional Program Ahead.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages 8045–8074

Bills Introduced: Four bills were introduced, as follows: S. 1808–1811. Page 8047

Senator Sworn In: Senator Donald Russell, of South Carolina, was sworn in to fill the vacancy created by death of Senator Johnston (until special election to fill such vacancy in term ending January 3, 1969). Page 8045

World Health Organization: Vice President appointed Senator Williams of New Jersey to the 18th Assembly of the World Health Organization to be held May 4–21 at Geneva. Page 8046

Flood Aid: Senate passed with committee amendments (motion to reconsider tabled) S. 327, providing assistance to Oregon, Washington, California, and Idaho for the reconstruction of areas damaged by recent floods. Pages 8057–8060

Voting Rights: Senate continued to debate S. 1564, to enforce the 15th amendment of the Constitution of the U.S. (right to vote). Pages 8074–8086

Nominations: Senate received the following nominations: One judicial, two Navy in the rank of admiral, numerous Air Force, and numerous Coast Guard. Pages 8086–8088

Program for Monday: Senate met at noon and adjourned at 2:42 p.m. until noon Monday, April 26, when it will continue consideration of S. 1564, voting rights. Pages 8045, 8086

Committee Meetings

(*Committees not listed did not meet*)

APPROPRIATIONS—SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL 1965

Committee on Appropriations: Committee, in executive session, ordered favorably reported with amendments H.R. 7091, second supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1965. As approved by the committee, the bill would provide a total of $2,257,869,415, an increase of $139,536,332 over the House-passed figure of $2,118,333,083.

RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES

Committee on Commerce: Committee continues hearings on S. 457 and S. 1459, to prohibit the Federal Power Commission from taking jurisdiction over any nonprofit cooperative, with testimony from Alex Radin, American Public Power Association; Charles A. Robinson, Jr., National Rural Electric Cooperative Association; Harry Nelson, Minnkota Power Cooperative, Grand Forks, N. Dak.; Floyd Wheeler, Dairyland Power Cooperative, LaCrosse, Wis.; Henry Templeton, Harmon Electric Association, Hollis, Okla.; A. D. Mueller, Indiana Statewide Rural Electric Cooperative; E. A. Geesen, Colorado Rural Electric Association, Denver; Harry H. Nuttle, representing Choptank Rural Electric Co-op and Delmarva Generating Cooperative, Denton, Md.; and William C. Wise, Midwest Electric Consumers Association.

Hearings were adjourned subject to call.

WILD RIVERS, AND ST. CROIX WATERWAY

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: Committee continued its hearings on S. 1446, to reserve certain public lands for the creation of a National Wild Rivers System, with testimony from Eugene W. Weber, Deputy Director of Civil Works for Policy, Corps of Army Engineers; William Prime, member of 1963 U.S. Kayak Team, New York; Tom Kimball, National Wildlife Federation; Donald Brightman, Adirondack-Hudson River Association; B. L. Orell, Forest Industries Council; Robert G. Field, American Whitewater Affiliation; Stewart Brandborg, the Wilderness Society; Spencer Smith, Citizens Committee on Natural Resources; Dr. Jackson M. Anderson, American Association for Health, Physical Education & Recreation; Larry Hobart, American Public Power Association; Anthony W. Smith, National Parks Association; and W. P. Simons, of Yellow Spring, W. Va.

Committee also held hearings on S. 897, providing for the establishment of the St. Croix National Scenic Waterway in Minnesota and Wisconsin, with testimony from Senators Mondale and Nelson; Lt. Gov. Patrick Lucey, who was accompanied by other officials of the State of Wisconsin; Paul Thuet and Mrs. Geraldine Thomssen, both representing "Save the St. Croix Committee, Inc.," and Robert Collins, all of South St. Paul; John A. Beale, State Forester of Minnesota; Lester Brower, City Administrator, Stillwater, Minn.; Lyle Eckberg, Oak Park Heights, Minn.; J. W. Hoffmann, Northern States Power Co., Minneapolis; and Edward C. Crafts, Director, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, Department of the Interior.

Appendix

Falcon Foundation Scholarships to the Air Force Academy—Presentation of Portrait of General Spaatz

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the Falcon Foundation has been established to lend prep-school support in the form of scholarships for those seeking appointment to the Air Force Academy, in Colorado.

One of these scholarships is not quite a year old, and it is a matter of some pride to those of us in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania that it was named for one born a Pennsylvanian who went on to become a key figure in the aerospace power of the United States. This scholarship bears the name of Gen. Carl A. "Tooey" Spaatz, whose birth was in Boyertown, and he became the first Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force at the end of his long and distinguished career.

In the case of the Gen. Carl A. Spaatz Scholarship, the Falcon Foundation is given by Litton Industries $1,000 annually, on which the award is based. The first winner is Cadet Gerald Raymond Johnston, 17, of Willow Grove, Pa., who will graduate from Marion Institute, in Marion, Ala., this spring, and will enter the Air Force Academy this June. He will be the first of a long line to participate in the heritage of General Spaatz.

On the night of April 19, at the Air Force Academy, Litton Industries' President Roy L. Ash made a presentation to Maj. Gen. Robert Warren, the Academy Superintendent, of an original sketch of General Spaatz, for permanent hanging at that institution.

I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of Mr. Ash be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF ROY L. ASH, PRESIDENT, LITTON INDUSTRIES, BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF., BEFORE THE FALCON FOUNDATION, AT THE AIR FORCE ACADEMY, APRIL 19, 1965

Mr. President, General Warren, distinguished guests, while General Spaatz and I were separated by so many levels of rank during World War II and I did not get to know him personally then, I have come to know him well as a comember of the board of directors of Litton Industries, a responsibility he has held since 1955.

His lifetime has been one of "firsts."

Well before World War I—and after a brief time in the infantry—General Spaatz, then a second lieutenant, decided that the way to go for him was up. He put wings to his heels by going to the early aviation school at San Diego, Calif. To many laymen, and even to the military of that day, this was an obviously foolish decision which would lead to nowhere.

Not even the foolishest of the foolish then would have predicted that, in that same city, two generations later, our first astronauts would view the awesome powerplants which would make their flights possible right through the atmosphere into outer space itself.

Immediately following this San Diego air training, General Spaatz served with Brig. Gen. John J. "Black Jack" Pershing in his punitive expedition into Mexico as a member of this country's first aero squadron. Next, the Pershing parlay took him into France as a flying member of the American Expeditionary Forces.

General Spaatz' three aerial kills against the Germans earned him the Distinguished Service Cross, and more than that, gave him the conviction of the tremendous potential in the reach and scope of airpower—a lasting conviction to which he was to dedicate his capabilities for the benefit of all America.

In his step-by-step pursuit of his goals, he commanded the "question mark" endurance flight during the first week of January 1929. He kept that flimsy aircraft up for 150 hours, 50 minutes and 15 seconds. It would make slapstick comedy today to witness the Rube Goldberg arrangement of barrels, funnels, and hose used in the awkward refueling operations necessary to bring this record-setting experiment off successfully.

But, from this "first," like the 12 seconds of powered flight at Kitty Hawk 25 years earlier, airpower has achieved a recognizable milestone. Aerial refueling was a means of lengthening the legs of airpower, and it was also proved that man could function effectively for sustained periods in the most confining of environments. In just these few years later we are not only extending these legs many times farther—for both worldwide flying operations and then off into space—but now are sealing our astronauts into even more confining spaces. The Spaatz' "first" was truly a first.

In World War II, General Spaatz helped prove for all time the validity of the role of airpower. He was a leader in the development of allied airpower and, in Europe, came to command the whole of the U.S. Strategic Air Forces there. After cessation of the war in Europe, he assumed command of the U.S. Strategic Air Forces in the Pacific, which carried out those missions directly responsible for the ending of the war there.

When it came time for the surrender of the enemy in the various theaters of the world, it was General Spaatz who ranged the globe to participate in the acceptance of the separate surrenders.

But, in the character of the man, it is even easier to understand how he would help mold the potential of airpower to peacekeeping in the era that ensued. The strategic air strength that we know was to be built in the aftermath and apathy which followed the end of a great conflict, when the political pressures were for reduction of costs and of strength. When the Air Force became a separate service, he became its first Chief of Staff.

Then, in 1948, as he stepped down from the highest responsibility the Air Force can give, he could still sight down the gun barrel a long way ahead. In his valedictory to the uniform he had served so long and so well, and to the cockpit in which he had lived, experimented, and fought so many hours, he said there was no priority higher than to get on with building for America an intercontinental ballistic missile.

We feel at Litton Industries that the man we know who had been so many times a first is—one way or another—bound to last forever, and in fact, the Falcon Foundation does allow General Spaatz to last forever. In 1964, just 50 years after General Spaatz was graduated from West Point, we, at Litton Industries, established a Falcon Foundation scholarship in his name. It lends preparatory school support to applicants for the Air Force Academy. We think it will never fail to be an inspiration to the young men who receive it.

The first recipient—Gerald Raymond Johnston, of Willow Grove, Pa., now in the Marion Institute, in Marion, Ala.—will enter the Air Force Academy in June 1965.

Litton Industries commissioned another notable from World War II—the great combat artist of Yank magazine, Howard Brodie—to do an impression of General Spaatz which could be hung here at the Air Force Academy. He did this impression, and I now present it for your inspection—and to Maj. Gen. Robert Warren, the Superintendent of the Air Force Academy.

Through him, I commit it to the permanent possession of this fine institution—which is dedicated to furthering and exploiting the aerospace goals for which men like Gen. Carl A. Spaatz paved the way.

Polish Girl Leaves With Warm Aloha for Isles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, recently our fair State of Hawaii had as a guest, a 16-year-old Polish girl. She was not on an ordinary vacation or visit, but was in Hawaii for an operation which saved her life.

I mention this not only because it demonstrates the ability and prowess of Hawaii's doctors, but also because this young lady's association with Hawaii and its people exemplifies the experience of many with the aloha spirit of which we are so proud.

An article, which appeared in the Hawaii Tribune-Herald of March 29 tells of the great aloha spirit which was experienced by this young lady and of her reaction to it.

The news item follows:

POLISH GIRL LEAVES WITH WARM ALOHA FOR ISLES

HONOLULU.—"As long as I live, I will always remember with warmest feelings the act of kindness that saved my life."

This was the message Malgorzata Downarowicz, 16-year-old girl from Poland, con-

veyed to the people of Hawaii when she left for home.

The high school sophomore gained a new lease on life when she successfully underwent a delicate operation for removal of a nonmalignant tumor from her neck in Queen's Hospital.

It was performed by Dr. Ralph B. Cloward, the Honolulu neurosurgeon who lectured on this surgical technique in Warsaw, Poland, a few years ago.

Many groups here extended their helping hands to bring the girl to Honolulu for the lifesaving operation. Doctors said without the operation she eventually would have died.

Honolulu Rotary Club members raised $2,200 to pay for the plane trips of Malgorzata and her mother, Dr. Maria Downarowicz.

Dr. Cloward performed the operation free; Queen's provided hospital care at no charge, and the two stayed at a Waikiki hotel as guests of the management.

They left via Pan American to San Francisco and expected to be home in 10 days after stops at New York, London, Paris, and Warsaw. They live in Meichow, a town several miles from Warsaw.

Ernest W. Albrecht, mid-Pacific manager of Pan American, said that about 20 people including local Polish people were at the airport to bid the pair farewell.

At the airport, Malgorzata received a red, white, and blue lei (the colors of the American flag) to express the love of the people of America who made her trip possible.

Her mother was given a red and white lei, the colors of the Polish flag, to symbolize the friendship that exists between the Polish and American people.

In an interview, Malgorzata said she feels fine now and suffers no pain.

She recalled that before the operation she suffered from severe pain. "My whole body ached. I had to take pills every day to deaden the pain.

"But, I feel great now."

She added that she knew everything would come out all right following the operation because "I had great confidence in Dr. Cloward."

Malgorzata said she was a bit sad in leaving Hawaii, but was very excited about returning home in good health again.

Considering herself very fortunate, she said she was greatly overwhelmed by the help offered by complete strangers.

"The Poles are known for their gentleness and hospitality," she said, "but you can't compare this Hawaiian spirit with that of anything else in the world."

Indiana Man Earns Praise in Tornado Relief Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VANCE HARTKE
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, Charles A. Howell, of Hagerstown, Ind., is a township trustee, Wayne County Democratic chairman, and a personal friend. It was therefore, with great interest that I read a release, from the U.S. Department of Agriculture, recounting the extraordinary service rendered by Charlie Howell to the stricken individuals and communities of Indiana. As director of school lunch and commodity distribution, Mr. Howell set out with a truckload of foods from the USDA warehouse in Indiana; and, by long hours and hard work, in the 3 days following the disaster, he had supplied some 25,000 pounds of USDA-contributed foods to an estimated 5,000 people in need of help.

The tornado disaster of Palm Sunday was a great blow to the State of Indiana. But courageous people are beginning to plan, to rebuild, to pick up the pieces. To Charlie Howell, I extend my congratulations on behalf of those whom he has helped. I ask unanimous consent that the Department of Agriculture account be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECRETARY FREEMEN PRAISES INDIANA WORKER FOR TORNADO AREA FOOD DISTRIBUTION

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman today commended the Indiana school lunch and commodity distribution State director for personally bringing practical food help to several thousand victims of the Palm Sunday tornadoes.

The Secretary said the actions of Charles A. Howell, who in the 3 days following the disaster brought several large truckloads of U.S. Department of Agriculture donated foods to communities and farmhouses in the swath of the killer wind that devasted parts of northern Indiana, "typifies the selfless dedication demonstrated by hundreds of local, State, and Federal workers during this widespread disaster."

In a letter of commendation to Mr. Howell, Secretary Freeman said, "Your actions during this emergency are a vivid example of what the Federal-State partnership in this distribution of our Nation's agricultural abundance means. I know that the several thousand people whom you and your small crew so capably served during your 3 days of dawn-to-midnight expeditions join me in this sincere commendation and expression of heartfelt thanks."

Mr. Howell, who resides on a farm near Hagerstown, Ind., has been director of school lunch and food distribution activities in the Hoosier State for 6 years. Married and the father of three children, he is also a grandfather. For the past 12 years, he has been a township trustee in Wayne County. Mr. Howell is an ex-serviceman, having served in Europe.

Following is an account of Charles A. Howell's 3-day accomplishments in getting USDA-donated foods to victims of Indiana tornadoes, pieced together from reports of Consumer and Marketing Service food distribution fieldworkers and telephone contact with Mr. Howell:

With communications lacking and without knowledge of what he might encounter, brawny Charlie Howell, an employee of the State with the formal title of school lunch and commodity distribution director, early Monday started off with a truckload of assorted USDA foods picked up from storage in Indianapolis. Following the tragic path of the tornado, he drove to Lebanon, one of the first towns hit. Here he left donated foods at the National Guard Armory, where Guard cooks had set up mass feeding operations for about 200 persons.

On the road again, Charlie Howell stopped in small communities and even single farmhouses, to leave food wherever he found need. One stop was in the small rural community of Elizaville, where he left food at the town hall with Red Cross volunteers who were struggling to provide help for shocked and dazed tornado victims.

Then on to Russiaville, where more than one-third of the 1,300 population was homeless. The Salvation Army needed so much food that Charlie Howell dropped the remainder of his load and returned immediately to the Indianapolis warehouse to reload his truck. His second foray through tornado-hit communities ended at midnight Monday near Kokomo.

Early Tuesday morning, Charlie Howell was off again with another truckload of USDA food, loaded on at a warehouse in Kokomo. Tuesday and Wednesday followed the same pattern as the previous day, through tornado-hit communities of Greentown, Marion, Lynn Grove, Wyatt and Elkhart, among others. By midweek, Mr. Howell and his crew had brought foods to all stricken communities.

In all, Charlie Howell and his truck brought something like 25,000 pounds of USDA-donated commodities to some 5,000 people who needed this help.

Other foods in school lunchrooms and in distribution centers in those townships participating in the needy family donation program were made available to disaster agencies to help relieve human suffering.

Some 300 people are receiving USDA foods at Lynn Grove in the Fort Wayne area, where the National Guard has set up mass feeding facilities, and at least another 300 are being fed at Wyatt where the Salvation Army is using both a stationary and a traveling kitchen.

About 1,000 at Dunlap, 800 at Mulberry, over 400 at Marion, 350 at Greentown, 300 at the Jefferson school near Goshen also are receiving USDA foods. From Crawfordsville to Berne, and from Koontz Lake to Elkhart, USDA foods are helping to feed the thousands of victims left homeless and destitute by the twisters that whipped through the peaceful Hoosier countryside on Palm Sunday, 1965.

In Perpetual Childhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. ARTHUR YOUNGER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, on April 21 an article appeared in the Wall Street Journal, entitled "In Perpetual Childhood," which very forcefully presents the results of the welfare legislation which is being railroaded through the Congress by the President, who seems to be serving as well as majority leader in both the House and the Senate.

The article follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 21, 1965]

IN PERPETUAL CHILDHOOD

Although not all parents practice it, most would readily acknowledge their duty to prepare their children for the hardships as well as the rewards of life; in a word, to guide them to maturity. It is instructive to observe how the prevailing theory of Government stands this fundamental obligation on its head.

Governments everywhere, and not least in these United States, increasingly assume the parental role but are inherently incapable of providing parental wisdom. Call it the welfare state or the Great Society or what you will, it is almost as if the whole idea were to ward off maturity, or, as Tocqueville foresaw more than a century ago, to keep men "in perpetual childhood," with minimal need to act and think on their own.

The more obvious purpose, to be sure, lies in the lower reaches of politics: To garner

votes by sowing money in every possible field, to build power by promising solutions to all problems. But that process of Government aggrandizement cannot go unaccompained by some weakening of individual will. It is necessary only to note how placidly many Americans today accept Federal intrusions that would have been unthinkable a generation or two ago.

Federal largess, moreover, is by no means the sole agent of the alteration, even at a time when the subsidies are proliferating at a remarkable rate. There is also a pervasive pseudo-philosophy preached both in and out of Government, a creed of irresponsibility.

In this dark dogma security becomes the paramount value, overriding thrift, prudence, self-reliance, self-respect, intelligent accommodation to the complexities of existence and often indeed simple morality and honesty. People are not merely to be helped when in need; they are to be supported no matter what they do or do not do.

It could hardly be more symptomatic of the attitude that in our era serious discussion is granted to the proposition that income should be divorced from work, which means everyone should have a guaranteed and comfortable income regardless of whether he chooses to work. That, if anything could be, is a headlong flight from adult responsibility and straight into the arms of the all-mothering State.

To look askance at the trend is not necessarily to bewail an impending despotism, at least in the usual sense. As Tocqueville also perceived, the dangers confronting democracies are more subtle. In a degenerated democracy, the central authority is not wholly exploitative but wishes the people to be happy, so long as they don't think, and it actually tries to supply their wants and necessities.

To function at all the "tutelary power" must nonetheless cover the surface of society with a network of small, complicated rules, minute and uniform, through which the more original minds and the most energetic characters cannot penetrate, to rise above the crowd.

Thus, in Tocqueville's view of the danger, "the will of man is not shattered, but softened, bent and guided. * * * Such a power does not destroy but, * * * it compresses, enervates, extinguishes, and stupefies a people, till each nation is reduced to nothing better than a flock of timid and industrious animals, of which the Government is the shepherd."

How near or far the American democracy is today from that denouement, and what could realistically be done to prevent its materializing—these are questions without answers. What is clear is that we have already moved some considerable distance toward that society of sheep and that the pressure of much public policy and preachment seeks to push us further toward it.

Apart from diminishing the dignity of man, one of the unhappy aspects of the flight from responsibility is that it is a delusion. In our world no one and nothing can guarantee security or wash away all sorrows and difficulties. Time and again, the Federal Government has proved its incompetence to solve the myriad problems it takes on.

But no matter what a government attempts, it cannot forever shelter a people from the abrasive realities of personal, economic, and moral imperatives. To the extent a State succeeds in keeping a citizenry in perpetual childhood, it can only assure them a more painful awakening to manhood.

Dereliction in Debate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS B. CURTIS
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, individual editorial writers around the Nation are beginning to realize and to speak out publicly about the lack of discussion in this House on some of the most important and complicated issues before us. Unfortunately, it comes too late at this time but perhaps the fact that individual voices are being raised will help convince some that fair and full discussion is far preferable to steamroller tactics.

The thing which is most puzzling to me is that in view of the huge and workable majorities which the Democratic Party has in this and the other body, that they are compelled by some force to prevent scholarship and full and fair discussion. One wonders why, in view of their large numbers, they cannot allow the minority time and other opportunities to try to explore complicated legislation, the results of which many of us do not know. Generosity on the part of the majority would seem to be politically wise as well as legislatively sound. Their unwillingness to play fair is both disappointing and not able to be understood. Hopefully columnists, editorial writers, commentators and scholars of the legislative process will do some interviews in the weeks and months ahead to find out why the majority party Members feel so insecure that they have to rush their legislation through without adequate discussion and debate. This is one concrete recommendation that I have to make today in view of what has been happening here during recent weeks and what we are told will happen in the weeks and months ahead.

Following is an editorial from the Wall Street Journal of April 6, 1965, which I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues:

DERELICTION IN DEBATE

It's tempting merely to chuckle about partisan politics when Republicans complain, as one of them did other day, that "the Great Society has turned into the great steamroller." But when a northern liberal Democrat supports the substance of that complaint, perhaps it's time to listen.

To wit, Representative EDITH GREEN's searing commentary on both the administration's primary education bill and the tactics used to speed House approval of that measure. The lady from Oregon noted that while her fellow Democrats brag of guarding minority rights, their benevolence evidently doesn't extend to congressional minorities which question official infallibility. She observed, "It seems to me we have in the House a determined effort to silence those who are in disagreement."

The debate did seem curiously restricted for a proposal with such far-reaching implications. Also, the bill is such a Rube Goldberg contraption that, as Mrs. GREEN said, more debate was needed simply "to let the House know what is actually in the bill." The measure is so confusing that at one point even its sponsors couldn't agree on what its language allowed. Still, its backers seemed intent on passing it without change, and treated most amendments peremptorily, without record votes and often without discussion.

Such arrogance might be understandable if the amendments were merely political or trifling. Instead, may of them dealt conscientiously with the bill's fundamentals, such as the fact that while its ostensible purpose is helping the disadvantaged, its systems of allocating Federal funds heavily favors already wealthy States.

The majority even brushed aside bipartisan attempts to facilitate judicial tests of the bill's constitutionality. The proposal intentionally walks close to the constitutional line on church-state questions, and Federal courts often evade jurisdiction on this issue by finding that no one is directly enough affected to bring suit. One proposed amendment might have helped simply by encouraging judicial review; another definitely specified who would be eligible to start constitutional tests.

Since the bill fosters a multiplicity of approaches to aiding children in church schools, it has endless opportunity for chaos unless the constitutional questions are resolved quickly. Not surprisingly, the judicial review provision was backed by the National School Board Association, which represent boards covering 95 percent of the Nation's pupils. The House majority chose to avoid the whole constitutional issue.

Simple by closing its ears to serious questions, the Democratic majority achieved the victory of having its measure passed practically untouched. This bit of vanity means, among other things, that some disadvantaged children will get shortchanged, and the Nation's school boards will have to struggle with the tough questions the House was afraid to face. As with so many past Federal programs, the price for dereliction in congressional debate will be paid by those the program purports to help.

Duties and Responsibilities of Trial Judges—Essay by Hon. Gordon W. Chambers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the Honorable Gordon W. Chambers, judge of the city court, Richmond County, Ga., has written an excellent essay on the great duties and responsibilities of trial judges. I ask unanimous consent that his essay be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUDICATURE

(By Gordon W. Chambers)

"Judici Satis Poena est Quod Deum Habet Ultorem."—1 Leon, 295.

A thousand defendants are tried by an active criminal court judge in a relatively

short space of time and each of them only once, but they in turn try civilization, the law, justice, and the judge a thousand times. Prisoner and judge pass judgment on each other.

Society must be protected, and with certainty, for its own preservation and more thought should solidify itself in behalf of the law abiding rather than sentimentalizing in behalf of the law violator.

It would be trite to emphasize in detail the terrific responsibility of a judge issuing orders, warrants and commitments, holding hearings at chambers, to say nothing of extrajudicial conferences, trying civil issues, making rulings and adjudicating subject matters of contract or tort involving immense sums of the "root of all evil," money, and even more so on the criminal side involving "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." It almost staggers the imagination, one defendant's emotional life and social history with its ramification of heredity and environment, status, health, economics, character, and personality, all indicative of the record of the cause. The effect is being tried. Yet, we all know the victimized individual's right and the public interest must also be protected by the exercise of a certain and equal justice tailored to history, status, record, and offense; just as we know in spite of our sympathies a mad dog must be destroyed, a contagion must be quarantined and that we must give some of our property (taxes) to preserve the rest of it and withal continue to civilized order of government and society. Multiply this a thousand times and you have some idea of a year in the life of a jurist.

A judge doesn't forget what he knew as a man. His conscience is not concerned with its own approval or persuaded by its disapproval of a statute. He applies the law, construes and interprets, in all cases to the end that in truth justice will ensue in accordance with legislative intent. The jury establishes the facts under rules of evidence enacted in search of the truth and to make sure as human experience can make certain that the jury's final verdict reflects the truth as they found it to be. From the filing of civil petition, warrant or indictment in criminal accusation, through demurrer, plea and answer, every ruling "His Honor" makes, every construction and interpretation, every judgment rendered or sentence pronounced places the judge on trial.

Still, these judges are more powerful than President or potentate within the limits of their court's jurisdiction geographically and the subject matter. Therefore, they should be thrice more humble and lose themselves completely in applying the power of their office to the law of the land which is the last defense of democratic institutions and the rights of society.

Treating life as it is, the great Greek lawgiver, Solon, said, "No, I have not given the people the best laws; I have given them the best laws that they will stand for." There is a practical equation measured by our own enlightened progress with civilization. Always growing apace and trying to make things better and as they should be.

Elected judges must have something more than mental attainment and judicial temperament. They have to possess political sagacity, character, and personality to capture the public imagination or interest the same as any candidate aspiring to be mayor or alderman. Necessarily they have to meet and know all classes of people making up the electorate and it is essential that they be friendly if they hope to serve these people an equal and fearless universal justice. This can be done regardless and heedless of human perversity without compromise of soul, heart, mind or conscience.

The judge being a human being, he can feel friendly toward every living creature and this includes sinners as well as saints, denizens, and also, citizens of the ecclesiastical clergy. It is entirely a matter of personality and strength of character. A minister and a judge, certainly those of the Christian faith, can be friendly to sinner and saint without granting immunity to any citizen for reaping what he has sown. Hate the sin if we will, but never the sinner. Before independent courts of justice there are no such things as friends or foe. "His Honor," is very dear to a judge.

Politically there are diverse views as to electing a judge for a limited tenure or appointment by leigislative, executive or other committee for a rather lengthy period or life. Much can be said pro and con, but with all its imperfections the popular vote can terminate incompetence, which is very hard to do under life tenure by impeachment. The idealistic theory of unlimited tenure has proved impractical in State governments and from time to time it is censured in the Federal system.

The duties of a judge invokes, if not imposes, a cruel responsibility touching as it does the quick of a dedicated conscience, which challenges a brave indifference to any personal effect, ambition or status. God must bless with some mystical gift those judges defiant of the political demagog or boss, deaf to the cries of the mob and immune to subtle influence or treacherous flattery such as press slanted propaganda or half truth vocally. These mystically endowed wearers of the robe can look into the mirror and see nothing there but duty. They have God as their avenger and this is enough for them. They face their responsibility without tremor or fear. Socrates and his hemlock come to mind and the cross transfixes the heart.

Taxes and College Tuition

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, as one of many Members who has introduced legislation during the past 5 years to obtain tax relief for parents sending children to college, I was encouraged by an editorial in Forbes magazine, April 15, in behalf of tax credits for college expenses.

The article follows:

TAXES AND COLLEGE TUITION

Why not?

Who would, could sensibly oppose a reasonable program for some degree of tax credit for college tuition?

Presidents Kennedy, Eisenhower, and Truman all advocated various Federal programs to encourage and finance higher education. President Johnson is even more all-out in his enthusiasm for substantially stepping up our investment in learning. Every State university has been growing enormously, straining State exchequers to meet the cost of educating more eligible millions of young people.

Fortunately, most Americans agree that putting money into schooling and scholarship is the wisest, soundest type of investment. Much has been done by many governmental agencies, foundations, corporations and other private groups to provide scholarships for those with college ability but not family means.

In point of fact, those who now have it the toughest are the family breadwinners who are earning too much to qualify on a poverty basis for scholarship aid, but too little to meet the heavy burden of their youngster's college costs. Tuition, board, lodging, books, clothes and assorted sundries for a college year are figured to average over $2,000. If there is more than 1 child in college—and the average American family now has 2.39 children—the strain on the family income, even if it is well over $10,000 a year before taxes, is frequently prohibitive.

A number of proposals to permit a tax credit are in the congressional hopper, some of them having been introduced for many years. It is high time the advocates got together on one measure and put it through. The postwar baby crop is now of college age and the squeeze between rising costs and larger numbers is really on and really hurting.

With a President and a Congress and a people all sympathetic to the family financial problem and all warmly committed to the value of higher education, it surely should be possible this year to enact a meaningful college tuition tax-credit measure.

Our Position in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT GORE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The World Now Knows Precisely How It Can Have Asian Peace," published in the Atlanta Constitution of April 8, 1965; also an article entitled "U.S. Concept Is All Wrong," written by Walter Lippmann and recently published. Both the editorial and the article deal generally with the same subject.

There being no objection, the editorial and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Atlanta Constitution, Apr. 11, 1965]

THE WORLD NOW KNOWS PRECISELY HOW IT CAN HAVE ASIAN PEACE

President Johnson greatly enlarged the possibility of peace in Vietnam Wednesday night by spelling out what the United States will not do, and what it will do.

If the war must continue, then "We will not be defeated. We will not grow tired. We will not withdraw * * * Armed hostility is futile * * * our resources are equal to any challenge * * * our patience and determination are unending * * * We will use our power with restraint * * * But we will use it."

That much needed stating once and for all, and it was so stated.

What the United States will do, if North Vietnam is ready to call off its war; and permit "an independent South Vietnam" to live as it wishes, "securely guaranteed" and "free from outside interference" by anybody, was spelled out with a clarity, in advance of any negotiations, that may be unprecedented in modern diplomacy.

The United States for its part will accept a South Vietnam "tied to no alliance," and serving as "a military base for no other country." That would mean withdrawal of American troops, which North Vietnam has been demanding as a precondition to negotiations.

And when North Vietnam is ready to talk over these essentials, then the United States is ready "for unconditional discussions."

It was that clear.

What if North Vietnam isn't ready to talk? The President's threat was unmistakable: "We have no desire to devastate that which the people of North Vietnam have built with toil and sacrifice * * * But we will use our power."

And what if North Vietnam does wish to make peace? For the first time President Johnson specifically included North Vietnam as a prospective beneficiary of massive development aid for southeast Asia, which could secure its independence from China, among other things. He asked U Thant to organize the development effort among all southeast Asians. He specifically mentioned harnessing of the Mekong which serves all of southeast Asia. He put a billion U.S. dollars on the barrelhead to start the underwriting, and he invited the rest of the world to join in—specifically including Russia—lest anybody think this was an oily American effort to buy southeast Asia away from communism per se.

In a very shrewd way, though, it did represent an effort to buy southeast Asia away from China. Russia can afford to join us hugely in the development financing. China lacks the resources. Russia doesn't want to see China take southeast Asia. Neither does North Vietnam want to be taken by China. The President figures they can all add.

So there it it. It couldn't be clearer. With extraordinary candor, the President has opened a way to a peace desirable to everyone but China—and closed the way to any further doubt about American will if North Vietnam chooses war.

U.S. CONCEPT IS ALL WRONG

(By Walter Lippmann)

WASHINGTON.—Why is it, it is time to ask, that our position in Asia has declined so sharply though we are widening and intensifying the war in Vietnam?

According to the so-called domino theory, the United States would lose the respect and support of the peoples of Asia if, in confronting Chinese communism, it showed itself to be a paper tiger and refrained from military action. For 3 months, since February, we have applied this theory ever more vigorously. And what are the results? Quite contrary to what was predicted: today the United States is not only isolated but increasingly opposed by every major power in Asia.

With the exception of Japan, which has a government but not a people who support our policy, all the Asian powers are against us on this issue—not only China and Indonesia, but the Soviet Union, India, and Pakistan. The crucial fact is that, although the Asian powers are by no means at peace with one another, what they do have in common is an increasingly vociferous opposition to the escalated war we have been waging since February. India and Pakistan, India and China, China and the Soviet Union are quarreling to the point of war with one another. But they are united in condemning our February war.

GENERAL OPPOSITION

The administration should put this fact in its pipe and smoke it. It should ponder the fact that there exists such general Asian opposition to our war in Asia. The President's advisers can take some comfort, but mighty little, from the fact that alined with us is the Thailand Government in Bangkok, which is independent though weak; the government in Seoul, which we subsidize; the government in Taipei, which we protect; the government in Saigon, which governs something less than half of South Vietnam. Pondering the matter, we must, alas, put into the other scale the ominous, rising anti-Americanism in the Philippines.

The dominoes are indeed falling, and they are falling away from us.

What is the root of all this swelling anti-Americanism among the Asians? It is that they regard our war in Vietnam as a war by a rich, powerful, white, Western nation against a weak and poor Asian nation, a war by white men from the West against nonwhite men in Asia. We can talk until the cows come home about how we are fighting for the freedom of the South Vietnamese. But to the Asian peoples it is obviously and primarily an American war against an Asian people.

In my view the President is in grave trouble. He is in grave trouble because he has not taken to heart the historic fact that the role of the Western white man as a ruler in Asia was ended forever in the Second World War. Against the Japanese the Western white powers were unable to defend their colonies and protectorates in Asia. That put an end to the white man's domination in Asia which had begun in the 15th century.

ULTIMATE VICTORY

Since then, despite our ultimate victory over the Japanese Empire, the paramount rule has been that Asians will have to be ruled by Asians and that the Western white powers can never work out a new relationship with the Asian peoples except as they find a basis of political equality and nonintervention on which economic and cultural exchanges can develop.

This great historic fact is an exceedingly difficult one for many westerners to digest and accept. It is as hard for them to accept this new relationship with Asia as it is for many a southerner in this country to accept the desegregation of schools and public accommodations. The Asia lands who still instinctively think of Asia in prewar terms are haunted by Rudyard Kipling and the white man's burden and the assumption that east of Suez are the lesser breeds without the law.

Until we purge ourselves of these old preconceptions and prejudices, we shall not be able to deal with Asian problems, and we shall find ourselves, as we are today in Vietnam, in what the German poet described as the unending pursuit of the ever-fleeting object of desire.

Armenian Martyr's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STANLEY R. TUPPER

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. TUPPER. Mr. Speaker, on the 50th anniversary of the Turkish massacre of the Armenian nation, the Governor of the State of Maine, His Excellency John H. Reed, issued a proclamation setting Saturday, April 24, 1965, as Armenian Martyr's Day. I think it is appropriate that Members of the 89th Congress be informed of the action by the State of Maine.

The proclamation follows:

ARMENIAN MARTYR'S DAY PROCLAMATION

STATE OF MAINE

Whereas 50 years ago, on April 24, 1915, the Government of Turkey ordered the massacre of the Armenian nation which before its termination was to take the toll of 1 million lives, with an additional 1 million displaced, ill, and in want; and

Whereas the beginning of the Armenian martyrdom marked at the same time the opening of the many important contributions to the Allied war effort in World War I by the Armenian nation, affectionately termed "The Little Ally" by Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States of America; and

Whereas the sacrifice of the Armenian nation in the cause of virtuous government, freedom, justice, and human rights serves to remind us that mankind is ready to perish in the interest of noble causes; and

Whereas in this anniversary year of the 1915 genocide of the Armenian nation it is significant to remember those men, women, and children who perished in violence, to honor their memory and pay tribute to their self-sacrifice:

Now, therefore, I, John H. Reed, Governor of the State of Maine, do hereby proclaim Saturday, April 24, 1965, as Armenian Martyr's Day, and urge that proper recognition be accorded to this solemn occasion.

Given at the office of the Governor at Augusta and sealed with the great seal of the State of Maine, this 15th day of April 1965, and of the independence of the United States of America, the 189th.

By the Governor:

JOHN H. REED.

Indianapolis Times Praises Secretary Fowler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, Secretary of the Treasury Henry H. Fowler made an address before the recent meeting of the American Society of Newspaper Editors. It was his first major speech since assuming the post of Secretary, and it received a warm reception by the newspapermen who were there.

The Indianapolis Times was among the newspapers which commented favorably in its editorial pages on this address. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial of April 21, which was published in that newspaper under the title "Fowler's Economics Lecture," may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Indianapolis Times, Apr. 21, 1965]

FOWLER'S ECONOMICS LECTURE

In his first major speech as the new Secretary of the Treasury, Henry H. Fowler last weekend delivered a lecture on economics to a meeting of the American Society of Newspaper Editors. The lecture made unusually good commonsense.

Here are some of the points Fowler made:

There is no one theory on which economic progress can rest. We gain by a host of practical policies which are "pragmatic rather than dogmatic, balanced rather than extreme, resilient rather than rigid."

The Government by itself cannot fashion any cure-alls or solutions for economic problems; the prime mover has to be the private economy.

The Government's responsibility lies in sound tax policies which stimulate business rather than hamper it, in a "rigorous" control of Government spending, and in monetary practices which permit suitable long-term credit and make for price stability.

There is such a thing as "excessive" growth in the economy, which can promote inflation. This is to be avoided.

Fowler's statements were in contrast to some of the high-flown ideas we so often hear from Government officials, or even private economists, who talk as though a single pet theory of their own could provide instant prosperity, who never are influenced by the failure of these theories, who complain our national growth has been lagging, who think the Government, merely by spending, can solve everything.

The Treasury Secretary thinks the reductions in sale or excise taxes President Johnson is about to propose will provide an incentive for price reductions and at the same time bolster private purchasing power. But he warned against anything but "prudent" tax cuts—which, for one thing, simply would further the perennial round of Government deficits. Fowler, almost uniquely for a Washington official, seems to think these are bad business.

If the policies Fowler outlined are to be Government policies the next 4 years, then the country can indeed look forward to a burgeoning economy. We hope the spenders and theorists in Congress and elsewhere in the Government will refrain from meddling.

Additional U.S. Aid to Nasser's Egypt?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, on April 21, there appeared in the Los Angeles Times an editorial entitled "Additional U.S. Aid to Nasser's Egypt?" the full text of which follows:

ADDITIONAL U.S. AID TO NASSER'S EGYPT?

Can Gamal Abdel Nasser be serious in his reported request for $500 million in U.S. aid to Egypt over the next 3 years? Ah, indeed he can. Like the patricide who seeks mercy from the court because he is now an orphan, Nasser has always shown an incredible impudence in his dealings with the United States.

Being slow to anger and quick to forgive may well be a commendable virtue, but it is one that has definite limits in international relations. The House recognized this in January when it voted to halt further surplus food shipments to Egypt. Under executive prodding this stand was abandoned.

But the House vote reflected a widespread feeling that in Egypt's case the United States has run out of cheeks to turn, just as it has run out of libraries for Egyptians to burn down.

Most of the $1.2 billion in U.S. aid to Egypt since 1952 has consisted of surplus food, mostly grain. The United States doesn't want to take this food out of the mouths of hungry fellahin. But an end to U.S. wheat sales, which Nasser has said he expects and has planned for, wouldn't have to do this.

The serious shortages of food and other consumer necessities in Egypt haven't occurred simply because Egypt is a poor country with a too rapidly growing population. The shortages exist because the Egyptian Government has squandered countless millions on needless, unproductive, and largely malicious enterprises of no value at all to the Egyptian people.

Nasser has had no trouble finding the money to sustain a 50,000-man army in Yemen, or to supply Congo rebels, or to subvert other governments, or to pay off on $1 billion worth of Soviet arms. With limited resources, he has chosen which courses to follow.

The State Department argues about the need to maintain a U.S. influence in Egypt. What influence? Nasser daily grows chummier with the Communists and meddles more openly in the business of other nations. He has worked, independently or as a Soviet agent, against free world interests at a score of points.

It is impossible to see why the United States, through aid of any kind, should contribute to the furtherance of these policies. The answer to any Egyptian aid request is written in Nasser's own record.

The opinion expressed is precisely that which I hold on this subject, and it is shared by my constituents, as indicated in their many letters to me over the past months.

In view of Nasser's past performances, and particularly his grossly insulting actions and speeches during this last year, I simply cannot see how the U.S. Government can possibly give favorable consideration to any further request for U.S. aid to the United Arab Republic without a strong, positive indication of a sincere and definite about-face in position and policy.

So far as I can determine, the continued discretion granted to the President early in this congressional session has had absolutely no effect in what appears to be our continually deteriorating relations with the United Arab Republic. A firmer approach to the problem through the executive branch might serve some useful purpose. There can be no question, however, that it appears more advisable to exert pressure for a policy change through provision for prohibition of further assistance in the foreign aid authorization bill now under consideration by the Foreign Affairs Committee.

I earnestly caution my colleagues to watch this development closely, and unless some more effective presentation evinces a promise of improved relations, I urge them—on both sides of the aisle—to stand resolute to the position originally adopted by the House in its vote on January 26 of this year, and to do what we can to convince the other body that such position has proved to be correct.

Wisconsin: Mother of Circuses

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VERNON W. THOMSON
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include the attached article.

Wisconsin is best known as "America's Dairyland," but it is also the "Mother of Circuses." The greatest of all, Ringling Bros. Circus, was spawned in Baraboo, Sauk County, hometown of the Ringlings. In this circus city is the Circus World Museum, operated by the State Historical Society of Wisconsin. It is a tremendous tourist attraction, luring increasing numbers every year to see this authentic circus of yesteryear.

It is so aptly described in the Northern Natural Gas Co.'s Transmission magazine, that I submit it herewith in the hope it will prove of interest to those who read this RECORD:

BARABOO'S CIRCUS WORLD MUSEUM

Often, when one thinks of a museum, he is vulnerable to thoughts of a cavernous hall, musty and dusty.

Most museums are not like that, but none shatters this image more than the Circus World Museum in Baraboo, Wis., some 30 miles northwest of Madison.

Cloaked in bright colors and noisily alive, the museum is owned and operated by the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, and annually it attracts more than 125,000 persons during a mid-May to mid-September season.

Director C. P. "Chappie" Fox, author of five books dealing with the circus life, describes the hubub of activity simply:

"This is the way it's supposed to be. The circuses of yesteryear were like this. Everything has to be authentic. Sure, there are easier ways to do many of the things we perform and construct here, such as the rehabilitation of circus wagons, but if it isn't authentic the public resents it and we're in trouble."

To do the museum justice, it takes a minimum of 4 hours to see and do everything. A thorough inspection would fill an entire day.

Before the features of the museum are described, it is probably best to answer the following question at this time: Why in Baraboo, anyway?

Wisconsin is probably best known as America's dairyland. It also is the "Mother of the Circuses." Of 100 circuses which emerged from various communities in Wisconsin, the greatest of all, Ringling Bros. World's Greatest Shows, was spawned in Baraboo, hometown of the brothers.

The famed Ringling Bros. Circus was born on May 19, 1884, under meager circumstances—in terms of both finance and talent. After a small parade through Baraboo, the customers were treated to acts of juggling and tumbling and the antics of a clown, all under a tent 40 by 95 feet.

Sympathetic and apparently footloose farmers used their wagons and horses to transport the circus to the next town. In a matter of 20 years Ringling Bros. was challenging Barnum & Bailey for circus supremacy.

Ringling Bros. wintered in Baraboo from 1884 to 1919, but when Barnum & Bailey was acquired, off-season headquarters were moved to Bridgeport, Conn.

Once the circus left town, lore was left to the oldtimers. In the 1940's John M. Kelley, for many years legal adviser for Ringling Bros., retired to Baraboo.

He talked up the idea for a circus museum, and tried long in vain to sell it to the citizens. Finally, after much preaching, the spark ignited in the mid-1950's and Baraboo's businessmen got behind the plan. Circus World Museum, Inc., was organized and a successful fund drive was culminated in 1958.

That same year the city of Baraboo bought one of the nine Ringling Bros. buildings which lined Water Street a couple of blocks from the downtown section. The building was turned over to the museum, and several businessmen banded together to construct two more for concessions. Word began to spread. Soon circus memorabilia began filtering in—circus wagons, costumes, vintage posters, and many others.

On July 2, 1959, the museum opened, complete with parade. Forty thousand saw the

parade; 10,000 crowded past the exhibits. Among celebrities on hand was Actress Rhonda Fleming, star of the movie, "Big Circus," which premiered at the Al Ringing Theater in Baraboo that day.

With the museum on sound financial footing, the State Historical Society of Wisconsin took over the operation. During the past 6 years, 3 additional buildings have been purchased, and the size of the grounds has been increased to where it now totals 15 acres.

The museum has a fantastic wealth of articles on display. There are authentic circus wardrobes, photographs, and art work of performing horses, intricate wood carvings, photographs of current circus acts and personalities, flamboyant examples of circus advertising and lithographs, colorful circus wagon wheels, photos of famous sideshows, and a history of the circus in Wisconsin.

Perhaps the most fascinating display is a miniature circus built by John Zweifel. It is an exact replica of the Ringling circus of 1956 containing 25,000 individual pieces, most of which are animated. The Circus World Museum also owns 40 colorful circus wagons, the largest collection in the world.

Supplying real flavor is a steam calliope which blasts out in concert every half hour. Twice a day, under a smaller size version of the "big top," trained animal acts take to the ring, including three elephants, 12 ponies, dogs, clowns, and acrobats. Twice a day a seven-car circus train on 800 feet of track is unloaded by eight Percheron horses and a chain-driven truck just as it was done in the old days.

Roaming the premises are a goat pulling a wagon in which children can ride and an even-tempered, nonspitting llama named Lloyd.

Another of the top attractions is a 25-minute tour of Baraboo in an open carriage pulled by a jeep where points of historic interest related to the circus are described.

New at the museum in 1965 will be an 85-foot railroad advertising car used by the advance men to beat the drums for the coming circus. The car is the last one actually used by Ringling Bros. & Barnum & Bailey. In the car will be a graphic history of circus printing and design including a pastemaking boiler. The car will even be outfitted with bunks used by the advance men.

Another innovation this year will be a newly acquired side show of memorable circus freaks of the late 1800's, all molded of Fiberglas and housed under a 20- by 40-foot tent.

The Circus World Museum relies entirely on its admissions and donations to stay in the black, and museum officials are quick to point out that the admission price takes care of the entire tour with no hidden fees within the gates.

Of course, not all donations come in the form of cash, but they are equally if not more valuable. "Chappie" Fox explains: "As the fame of the museum has spread, we have received articles and collections from all over the country. We try to work most of them into displays, but one of the greatest values is that it provides an important research function, a key area of our operation."

The Circus World Museum makes a significant economic contribution to Baraboo, a city of 7,500.

First of all, it has an annual payroll of over $40,000, employing 15 persons during the summer and 9 during the winter.

Of more importance is the tide of visitors each year. After this season they will number close to a million since the opening in 1959.

Fox describes the impact: "Bankers in Baraboo have told me that the average visitor to the museum spends anywhere from $3 to $5 in town in addition to our admission. Multiply that by a million, and you have a pretty impressive figure."

Peace and Promise in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD M. FRASER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the military events in South Vietnam have thus far overshadowed what could be the most significant international cooperative project yet undertaken in the world.

The Mekong River plan has been in the planning stage for some time. This exciting and challenging idea could become reality if a peaceful settlement can be reached in the war in Vietnam. President Johnson has pledged a billion dollars for this cooperative project, and I am certain that the United States stands ready to do even more if called upon for assistance.

In a Washington Star editorial of April 21, 1965, the promise and potential of this enterprise were eloquently described. I take this opportunity to bring the editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

THE PROMISE OF THE MEKONG

Although nothing much can come of it until there is a peaceful and guaranteed settlement of the war in Vietnam, there is great promise in President Johnson's offer of large-scale American aid to improve the lot of all the peoples of southeast Asia, including the North Vietnamese. He will ask Congress, he says, to approve "a billion-dollar American investment in this effort" as soon as it gets underway as an international cooperative enterprise. The investment should prove to be good.

The enterprise, as a matter of fact, has been in the planning stage for some years past. Under the leadership of the United Nations, no fewer than 21 countries, a dozen specialized U.N. agencies, and several private business organizations and foundations have been contributing millions of dollars and invaluable brainpower to it. The first objective is to begin translating the plans into action, with a view to developing the immense potentialities of the 2,600-mile-long Mekong River, which is one of the world's greatest.

This river, which has it source in Tibet and empties into the South China Sea, has a basin that covers 381,000 square miles, which is much larger than France. The riparian states directly affected are Cambodia, Laos, Thailand and South Vietnam, and it is noteworthy that these four—despite their bitter political antagonisms—have long been working together in support of efforts to harness the Mekong for their mutual enrichment. The economic and social betterment of 50 million human beings is involved, and at least another 50 million will be helped if the basin's potentials are effectively exploited.

In President Johnson's words, "The task is nothing less than to enrich the hopes and existence of more than 100 million people. * * * The vast Mekong River can provide food and water and power on a scale to dwarf even our own TVA." Experts have estimated, for example, that the Mekong's waters can be used for irrigation effective enough to increase rice production 500 to 600 percent. Clearly, in terms of agriculture, industry and things like rural electrification, the river's harnessing promises to be beneficently revolutionary.

The Asians are well aware of all this, and great numbers of them—assuming that they hear the Voice of America—must be encouraged by what the President has pledged. Actually, of course, the $1 billion he has mentioned seems conservative. It probably would be but the start of a much larger American contribution in the event of a genuine international cooperative effort—more or less like the Marshall Plan that saved Western Europe—to stem the Red tide and keep southeast Asia free.

Great Society Question Marks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Times has performed a noteworthy service in bringing to public attention some of the serious questions which exist in connection with the administration legislative program.

In an editorial entitled, "Great Society Question Marks" the Times poses questions that must be faced about the far-reaching role the Federal Government would assume at the National, State, and local levels of government under various programs enacted by the Congress and proposals under consideration.

I believe the editorial will be of interest to Members of Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks I submit the editorial for inclusion in the RECORD:

GREAT SOCIETY QUESTION MARKS

As the 89th Congress completes its first 100 days, President Johnson is getting high marks for the impressive volume of Great Society measures which are becoming law.

Whether it is sound legislation, taking Americans along a route they actually want to travel, is another question.

One thing is clear: Under Mr. Johnson's leadership the Federal Government is assuming an unprecedented role of leadership, even dominance, in areas traditionally in the local and State bailiwick.

Under measures already signed, Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools will become a reality for the first time—with Washington keeping a veto power over how the money is used.

The so-called Appalachia bill breaks new ground, too, in taxing citizens everywhere to subsidize economic recovery and development in one region.

Federal responsibility for medical care for the aged is asserted in the multibillion-dollar medicare bill which has passed the House.

Still pending are White House proposals to pay rent subsidies to middle-income families, to inject Washington into city planning and to double the antipoverty program.

Each of these measures represents an effort to deal with real problems which must be met at some level of government. The question is which level.

Great Society champions argue that local and State governments have proved unwilling or unable to do the job, and that Washington has the responsibility to move in—which it is now doing.

What is alarming is that such a momentous shift in American government could take place with no true national dialog, and so little public recognition that it is even taking place.

Problem one is that so much legislation is being passed so fast that no one is quite sure what jokers may be in the deck.

Another trouble is that, in a sense, no opposition party exists. Republicans are outnumbered more than two to one in both houses. And many, understandably, are too concerned with rebuilding the party image to take a vocal antispending stance.

Normally, the Democrats would soon fall out among themselves, and a dollar-conscious business community would raise an outcry.

President Johnson, however, heads off such criticism by calling in potential opponents and hearing their views while the legislation is being drafted. Thus, a consensus is reached, with little fanfare, before the bill even reaches Congress.

This is remarkably astute politics, and it makes for deceptively smooth government. But it smothers the kind of public discussion essential to healthy democracy.

What, for example, will be the future costs of medicare, aid to education and the anti-poverty program? No one knows—except that the present price tag is only a starter.

Another foot-in-the-door tactic is to leave legislation purposely vague in order to skirt opposition. The idea is, "pass it now and fix it later."

Mr. Johnson will have his problems later in the form of soaring budgets, higher taxes, court tests, and administrative waste and confusion. By that time, however, there may be no turning back from the welfare state, L.B.J. style.

The Posture of Neutrality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES B. UTT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following essay, entitled "The Posture of Neutrality," which was delivered at the graduation ceremony at Hollywood High School on Thursday, January 28, by Miss Nancy Knight. I am not only deeply impressed, but greatly encouraged by the sentiments expressed in her paper, for the very survival of our great Republic depends upon the youth of today.

The essay follows:

THE POSTURE OF NEUTRALITY

Recently, a major metropolitan newspaper published the results of a public opinion poll. The question: Are you in favor of Federal aid to education? The significant conclusion, obvious in the results of this poll, did not lie in the percentage of those who reacted negatively or those who responded affirmatively. Standing out like an ominous flare at the scene of a highway disaster was the frightening fact that more than one-half of those interviewed expressed no opinion at all. These are the neutrals, those who lack sufficient interest to examine, to evaluate, and to take a stand. Progress, whether it is achieved by an individual, a nation, or the universe, always is the product of active involvement. In this great period of social upheaval and change, to what extent are we involved? Are we to be spectators or participants?

History has proven that men who cling to their positions of neutrality have stunted the growth of new ideas and impeded progress. Those who fail to take a stand do not fulfill their obligation to society.

Pontius Pilate is a classic example of a neutral. In his capacity as Roman provincial governor, he was called upon to decide whether Christ should be put to death. The Bible records his evasion of responsibility in Matthew 27: 24 which reads, "He took water and washed his hands before the multitudes, saying, I am innocent of the blood of this just man." Pontius Pilate's conscience dictated a course of action. He believed that Christ was an innocent man, but was afraid to resist the majority.

Neutrality may lead to national tragedy. History is filled with events that demonstrate the folly of apathy. For example, the Western powers, although they had promised aid to the point of intervention, if necessary, did nothing when Hungary was invaded by the Russians on October 23, 1956. The Hungarian people lost their freedom because of Western neutrality. To those now living in enslavement, neutrality is far more devastating than war.

Hitler's Third Reich, with all of its atrocities, never would have been possible if men of principle had taken an active stand to prevent it. Less than 5 percent of the German population were Nazis. Hitlerism flourished because of what the remaining 95 percent did not do. The swastika flag flew over more than half a continent because of the refusal of larger nations to become involved.

The inertia of neutrality can also lead to disaster in the destiny of an individual. In May 1964, in the predawn darkness of the middle-class community of Kew Gardens, N.Y., Kitty Genovese was murdered while 37 witnesses stared from their windows but would not call the police or otherwise intercede. Primarily concerned with their own comfort and safety, these 37 witnesses refused to involve themselves. Their neutrality nourished crime and resulted in the death of an innocent girl.

When people take a stand and dedicate themselves to their beliefs, they are then accepting their responsibilities as human beings. The posture of neutrality is neither positive nor negative. It is passive. Neutrality is the doctrine of doing nothing. Any situation of importance requires doing something constructive.

Consider the people of Judea in their great moment of decision when the Syrian King Antiochus ordered them to discard their heritage, abandon their God, and worship the graven images he had placed in their temple. Would not their acceptance have been far easier than the savage battle that ensued? Yet, the Jewish people, though apparently hopelessly outnumbered, did take a stand and did win. It is in celebration of this refusal to remain neutral that the world Jewish community now annually celebrates the happy holiday, Hanukkah.

Or—remember Joan of Arc? She was only 18 years old and unable to read or write, thus being a perfect candidate for neutrality. Instead, she elected to assume military leadership in the fight to save her country. As a result of her efforts, France was saved.

Three hundred and forty-four years later, on December 16, 1773, a band of Bostonian men refused to tolerate the punitive tax on tea which was imposed by the British. To dramatize their protest, they disguised themselves as Mohawk Indians. Brandishing hatchets, they boarded 3 British ships in the harbor, broke open 342 cases of tea, and dumped the contents overboard. This act caused severe new restrictions on Massachusetts from British Parliament. An attempt was made to starve out the citizens of Massachusetts, but their refusal to remain neutral had inspired the people in the other colonies to come to their aid with food and supplies. Instead of neutrality, there was organized action, leading eventually to our Declaration of Independence.

Neutrality is stagnation. Like the automobile whose gearshift is in neutral, a society which is neutral goes nowhere. Civilization can move forward only if it is geared to move forward. The engine may be running, but the vehicle will not advance if the engine is merely idling. Those of us who are graduating tonight are prepared for a constructive contribution to our society. Those who have educated us have done their best to equip us with sound motivations. But—only we can shift gears. Only we can choose our destinations. We can move in reverse, we can idle and go nowhere, or we can move forward. As free men, we have the right to change destinations. As human beings, we will encounter hazards such as stop signs and detours. But always we must avoid the stagnation of neutrality.

The distinguished American poetess, Edna St. Vincent Millay, was approximately the same age as we candidates for graduation when she wrote one of her most famous poems, "Renascence." She closes her lyrical rhapsody with this expression of the futility of neutrality.

"And he whose soul is flat—the sky
Will cave in on him by and by."

NANCY V. KNIGHT.

Future of the U.S. Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix I am submitting an interesting talk by Mr. William B. Rand, president, United States Lines, at launching of the SS *American Resolute*, at Sun Shipbuilding & Dry Dock Co., Chester, Pa., on April 15, 1965.

Members who share my concern as to the future of the U.S. merchant marine may find these remarks thought provoking.

The talk follows:

Mrs. Mailliard, Miss Mailliard, Congressman MAILLIARD, ladies and gentlemen, it is a great pleasure to welcome you who are joining with us today in the launching of our newest ship—the SS *American Resolute*.

It is particularly pleasant to meet Mrs. Mailliard and to congratulate her on the perfect swing she displayed in smashing the traditional bottle of champagne and sending the *Resolute* into her natural element a few short hours ago. I must add, also, that she was most admirably supported in her christening role by lovely Miss Toni Mailliard.

In nudging the *Resolute* into the Delaware, Mrs. Mailliard closed the logbook on a particular, and I might say spectacular, class of cargo liners. For this 13,000-ton vessel is the last of five sister ships, which have the distinction of being the first vessels in the entire American merchant marine to have been designed and built from the keel up as fully automated ships.

The SS *American Resolute* is an electronic marvel. The technological advances built into this vessel are such that a single officer on the bridge can control her 18,750 horsepower engines as easily as a Sunday admiral can manipulate his outboard on a postage stamp lake.

A simple turn of a wheel set in a console on the *Resolute*'s bridge can dictate the speed of the ship, fast or slow, ahead or astern.

The bridge installation, however, is really an extension of the ship's main controls, centered in a huge console in the engine room.

But many of you guests here today are shippers, and I'm sure you are more interested in just what a ship like our *American Resolute* can do for you, rather than what makes her run.

Well, to begin with, she can help you pinpoint vessel transit time to a much more precise degree than heretofore.

This is made possible by the easy, 21-knot service speed of the new ship. The vagaries of weather which are often a factor in delayed ocean transit time, are greatly offset by a reserve speed of some 4 knots built into the *Resolute* and her sister ships.

Our fast new Challenger-class ships are today crossing the Atlantic in 6½ days which cuts 3 to 4 days from the old running times.

Speed and efficiency are the key notes throughout the entire ship. Like her 4 sisters and 11 predecessors of conventional design, she has automatic, pushbutton hatch covers, high-speed electric winches. Two of her six hatches have triple hatch openings permitting the spotting of cargo directly to final stowage point without need for shunting or man handling once aboard. These hatches are served by a 70-ton, heavy-lift boom.

The *Resolute* and his sisters have a 700,000-cubic-foot cargo capacity a striking feature of which is 151,000 cubic feet of refrigerated space. This latter area is equivalent to the capacity of 43 railroad cars and is easily accessible to expeditious cargo-handling devices such as forklift trucks.

I said earlier that the launching of the *Resolute* closed the book on the group of ships, which we call our *Challenger II* class.

It did, but it also signaled the start of a new breed of ship even more advanced as far as automation and speed are concerned than the *Resolute*.

We have contracted to build in this same yard five "Super Challengers" which will be powered by 26,000 horsepower turbines giving a cruising speed of 23 knots and a fantastic top speed of some 27 knots. They will be the fastest freighters ever to put to sea.

Additional features of these new ships will include a push-botton cellular arrangement for stowage of containers and powerful booms providing lifts of 30 tons, 70 tons, and 140 tons. They will have a 760,000 cubic foot cargo capacity.

The *American Resolute*, the 15 new ships that have preceded her and the score or so more vessels that we plan to build at an overall cost of nearly $400 million are a concrete indication of the confidence my company has in the future of the American merchant marine.

However, I must confess that that confidence I refer to has been somewhat shaken by certain events of recent years. There is no longer any semblance of a clear policy on the national level as to the future of American shipping—as a matter of fact, we are living today in a climate of confusion such as we have never experienced before. We, who operate American-flag ships, cannot make a maximum contribution to national maritime policy when it is so uncertain as to what that shipping policy is and whose responsibility it is to determine that policy.

We know, however, what we are doing and we think it constitutes a constructive contribution toward a sensible national policy to develop a sound and healthy merchant marine. For example, we know we are pursuing a ship replacement schedule that is saving the Government money and attempting to buy the United States the best performance at the most economical cost. Already, it can be seen that the decision to build bigger and faster vessels to replace our aging fleets of wartime construction has enabled us, through the reduction in number of units, to reduce the operating subsidies the Government is paying to support U.S.-flag shipping. The payoff on this program increases every year with the substitution of these new vessels for the old. We estimate in my company an approximate saving to the United States of 15 percent of the operating subsidy based on a comparison of 1964 performance of five Challengers in a trade that once required six C–2's. Add on top of this, the saving in future subsidy costs of the automation features now being built into these vessels—a saving which has been estimated to mean $2 million less subsidy expense over the life of the vessel—and I think that you can see the fact that we have been at work for years in our planning to try to get the Government a greater return for each subsidy dollar spent.

Another contribution we are making—and would dearly love to increase—is our contribution to conserving American dollars toward a more favorable national balance-of-payments position. The American merchant marine annually contributes almost $1 billion directly to the favorable side of our balance of payment—without the American-flag fleet this amount and another billion to pay for the shipping services our exporters would still have to buy, would represent an additional $2 billion deficit in the Nation's payments balance. This contribution is a plus factor of the greatest significance to our Nation right now and will probably remain so for a long time.

Another accomplishment in which we take some pride in having played a big part is the great expansionary performance of American exports, the single most vital means of earning dollars for the Nation. The whopping big $6.8 billion 1964 trade surplus represents approximately a one-third increase over the 1963 surplus, this performance notwithstanding some strong denunciations of liner rate making policies by critics who contend these policies discriminate against American exports. We recently addressed a letter to hundreds of the Nation's leading industrial companies, part of which letter sought comments of protest on this issue of allegedly discriminatory rates. The response has more than reinforced our own belief that the charge is incorrect. We find that what the shipper really does need—rates to keep him competitive in foreign markets—we have been setting, with his interests and his voice, a very strong factor in the determination of the rate.

In all these things we have done I feel we have been fighting a real uphill battle, succeeding not because of our critics but in spite of them. Our present regulatory policy toward the shipping interests of other nations has created an almost impossible climate on the high seas and in the capitals of the major shipowning nations. Regulations by the United States of its foreign commerce, must take into account the rights, interest, and sovereignty of other nations—and our public officials are going to have to face up to this fact. Other governments have different philosophies regarding international shipping and, so long as there is no wherewithall to apply and enforce our laws across the board, on all parties, these laws and regulations operate to the detriment of the one controllable segment of carriers in our foreign trade—the American merchant marine. We have said it many times and we will say it again—we are not against regulation per se but only against ineffective unilateral regulation which traps us in the middle of the great debate on how an international business should be conducted. It seems certain that the United States is bound and determined to regulate the shipping of its foreign commerce in order to eliminate the abuses, real and imagined, which are believed to exist. It seems equally certain that the major shipowning nations are going to oppose any regulatory action that they feel will endanger the economic welfare of their own lines.

An irresistible force meeting an immovable object? I hope not and sincerely wish the clamor of voices and conflicting policies could be stilled long enough to give reasonable men and interested parties time to cope with this problem.

But this is too serious a note on which to end an occasion of great pleasure and significance to the American merchant marine generally and United States Lines particularly. We feel strongly that the partnership in maritime endeavors epitomized by governmental policy over the years must and will continue, and more and more ships like the *American Resolute* will take their place as leaders in the free world's trade routes.

Faster Pace in the Space Race

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the editorial in Life magazine of April 9, 1965, focuses sharply on our past and current achievements in our national space program. The editors of Life point out the evolution of our space program to a valuable and well-planned effort. The comments on the security value of the space program describe well our present status and the alternatives for the future. This editorial puts in perspective the space race at its present point in time and is a valuable critique on the importance of our continued effort in this field.

With unanimous consent the editorial follows:

FASTER PACE IN THE SPACE RACE

These weeks are so crowded with "firsts" and "breakthroughs" in space that man's progress there seems more hectic and jumpy than it really is. First came Russia's Voskhod II and Leonov's somersault; then the U.S. Gemini, with Grissom's and Young's changes of course in midflight; then Ranger 9 with its extraordinary closeups of the moon. And this week Early Bird, the bundle of audio and video channels which NASA is launching for the Communications Satellite Corp., is aimed to give U.S. private enterprise and intercontinental telephone users a stake in the busy welkin.

The first Sputnik was less than 8 years ago, but already the space age has reached what President Johnson calls an "early maturity." Each technical advance is a planned and measured consequence of the previous one; Mercury fed Gemini and Gemini feeds Apollo; each hero stands on the shoulders of predecessors who are also his contemporaries. Since 1958 no fewer than 94 U.S. space flights have left the cape, 59 of them fully successful. At first the ratio of successes was 1 in 2; in the last 2 years it has been 16 to 1.

There are still a few worried critics, such as the New York Times, who think the space effort is a distorted use of U.S. resources at a time when we still have terrestrial problems to solve. That is now surely the view from the caboose. Our space program is, as Johnson puts it, "a national asset of proven worth and incalculable potential." Its cost is leveling off at about $7 billion a year. One hopes this includes enough to land us on the moon before the Russians—and what's wrong with wanting to be first? But Gemi-

ni and Apollo (landing target date 1970) provide a safe and sensible program worth sticking to, in any case. Our next unmanned moon shot after Ranger, for example, will be Surveyor, a complex of mechanical eyes and hands that will make a soft lunar landing and send back landscape views, soil analysis and other instrumented information.

There are other worried critics like General LeMay who fear that the Soviets, retaining their early lead in several sectors of space-faring, may achieve a critical military advantage—for example, through a first manned orbiting platform. The U.S. military now has a 20-percent share in our whole space program and could no doubt have more if anyone could describe a more acceptable military mission in space. The one generally agreed on is defensive intelligence and communications, in which the United States already excels. Our program, though less dramatic than the Russian, has already milked the heavens of a lot more new information than theirs.

The first beneficiary of this information has been U.S. technology and industry. Most NASA money involves private contractors, and of the 300,000 men now employed in the moon program only 15,000 are Government employees. And all U.S. industry gradually feels the challenge of the new thoroughness and precision, of the unprecedented tolerances and complexities, that success in space demands.

This challenge is now with us for good. Even before Apollo meets the Moon, we will face gigantic choices for the next adventure. Shall we concentrate on intensive study and mapping of the Moon? Or on the "inner space" nearer Earth, peopling it with orbiting laboratories, rescue stations, etc.? Or on the outer solar system, whither we already have launched a flyby mission, Mariner IV, on its 7½-month trip to Mars? Or shall we pursue all three lines at once?

The choice will be determined in part by comparative costs and by the Russian competition, which still has overtones of secrecy and military menace. But it will also be determined by what we learn from what we are already doing. Our program, which may or may not be overtaking the Russian, is well past its own first period of jumpy desperation. We can stick to it in confidence.

Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD RUMSFELD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, although U.S. policy in Vietnam has been under heavy attack from various sources and for a variety of reasons, there is reason to believe that recent U.S. actions have placed the responsibility for the continuance of the conflict on Hanoi and Peiping, as is pointed out in the following editorial from the Chicago Sun-Times, and the article by the knowledgeable observer of world affairs, Mr. Milburn P. Akers:

VIETNAM

The failure of the Communists to move toward peaceful settlement of the Vietnamese conflict has been disappointing. First North Vietnam and then Red China rejected the appeal of 17 nonalined nations to accept President Johnson's proposal for unconditional discussion to end the war. Red China talks threateningly of Chinese organizations sending their own people to fight if the U.S. escalates the war further. Premier Kosygin of Russia calls for a cessation of bombing in North Vietnam.

Such public reactions were to be expected but Washington obviously hoped that some private soundings toward peace talks might come from the other side. None apparently has.

These developments have brought demands from some Americans that the United States change its posture. They argue that since bombing of North Vietnam did not move the Vietcong Communists toward a less aggressive attitude in the war and toward peace talks, easing off or stopping the bombings for awhile might so move them. It would let them save face.

We believe Defense Secretary McNamara and Secretary of State Rusk make a better and more pragmatic analysis when they argue that stopping the bombing would do the cause of peace more harm than good. It has raised South Vietnamese morale and lowered the morale of the Vietcong. It has brought heavy political and military pressure on North Vietnam. It has slowed infiltration. Stopping the bombing would be interpreted as a defeat for a major U.S. military undertaking and could cause the collapse of the South Vietnam Government.

When Mr. Johnson offered unconditional discussion—to be carried on without a cease fire—he offered a billion dollars to help southeast Asia to a better life. His speech was promptly labeled the "carrot and stick" approach. Those who deplore the heavy military commitment the United States continues to make in Vietnam would have the President drop the stick but still offer the carrot.

The main purpose in Vietnam must not be forgotten, however. It is to prevent the spread of communism. In the circumstances and as long as the Communists refuse to enter peace talks, the stick as well as the carrot must be used.

Communism is an idea that must be countered by better ideas for improving man's lot. That's the carrot. But communism in South Vietnam is also aggression from North Vietnam and this must be countered by force. The United States has announced it will put more money and men into the ground war in South Vietnam. This is to prove to the Communists that he meant it when Mr. Johnson said, "We will not be defeated." He also meant it when he offered unconditional discussions to stop the bloodshed. When the Reds believe him on both counts, perhaps they will be moved to the talking stage. But they are hardly likely to be moved toward a peaceful attitude by a lessening of America's militant attitude. They never have been in the past.

REDS BEAR VIET RESPONSIBILITY

(By Milburn P. Akers)

Now that Red China and North Vietnam have rejected the appeal of 17 neutral nations for discussions intended to resolve the southeast Asian conflict there should be no confusion as to responsibility for its continuance. For this is the same appeal which President Johnson accepted in his unconditional discussions speech at Johns Hopkins University.

This column has been critical of the U.S. role in South Vietnam ever since the late President John F. Kennedy switched that role from a passive to an active one. And it has been equally critical of the roles of Red China and North Vietnam. Throughout the Eisenhower administration the American role was limited to economic assistance and a military assistance group of less than 685 men which devoted itself to training the South Vietnamese army.

During 1961, Kennedy's first year in the White House, the Vietcong began an intensified campaign, one which threatened the existence of the Saigon government of President Ngo Dinh Diem. On October 26, 1961, Kennedy pledged "that the United States is determined to help the Vietnamese preserve its independence, protect its people against Communist assassins and build a better life."

On December 11, 1961, the U.S. aircraft ferry-carrier *Core* arrived in Saigon with 33 U.S. Army helicopters and 400 air and ground crewmen assigned to operate with the South Vietnamese army.

On December 20, of the same year, the New York Times reported that uniformed U.S. troops and specialists were operating in battle areas with South Vietnamese forces and had been authorized to fire back if fired upon. Two thousand U.S. military men were then in South Vietnam.

The escalation of the war in South Vietnam had begun. It has gone on steadily since. It should be noted that Kennedy, as he switched the U.S. role from passive to active, did so as the consequence of greatly intensified Vietcong activity. Each escalatory step by the United States has come as a consequence of one by the Vietcong.

Soviet Russia on January 10, 1962, in a note to Britain, charged the United States with aggressive interference in South Vietnam, a charge which the British rejected with the statement that "the tension in South Vietnam arises directly from the pursuance by the North Vietnamese * * * of seeking to overthrow the established government by force."

Few, if any, newspapermen who are stationed in Saigon, or who have visited there since the conflict began, would deny that British assertion of 1962. I was in South Vietnam in January and February of 1963 and saw plenty of evidence to convince me of the fact of North Vietnamese aid of the Vietcong and of its direct participation in the conflict.

By the time Lyndon Johnson succeeded Kennedy in the White House the United States had more than 12,000 fighting men in South Vietnam. The new pattern had been set although the United States generally continued to maintain the fiction that it was still acting only in an advisory capacity and Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara, making periodic trips to Saigon, continued to report that a successful conclusion of the war in South Vietnam was in the offing. The direct assaults on military installations by the Vietcong began after Mr. Johnson's succession and the policy of retaliation by air strikes commenced. Today, the United States has more than 40,000 military personnel in South Vietnam.

As earlier stated, this column has for 3 years or more been critical of U.S. policy in South Vietnam. But it has never failed to point out that North Vietnam and Red China are, in fact, the agggressors; that the Vietcong, if only, as some contend, a group of indigenous patriots in rebellion against the Saigon government, could not long maintain themselves in the type of war that has been waged against them. Hanoi and Peiping bear at least as much responsibility for the situation which exists in southeast Asia as does the United States. In my judgment they bear more. And since their rejection of the 17-nation plea for negotiations—a plea accepted by President Johnson—they now bear the entire responsibility for the continuance of that conflict.

This column many times urged negotiations to end the Vietnamese conflict. It has been critical of President Johnson as well as the Hanoi and Peiping regimes for not having sought a resolution of the conflict long ago. Now that Mr. Johnson has agreed to such negotiations and Hanoi and Peiping have refused to participate in them there is little the United States can do other than to wage the war to victory.

Publisher E. M. "Ted" Dealey of the Dallas Morning News

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article which appeared in the Longview Daily News, April 10, 1965. Also I include an article that appeared in the Longview Daily News, April 4, 1965. As one who was a member of the Subcommittee on Newsprint and Brands and Grade Labeling, I can attest to the wonderful work Mr. "Ted" Dealey did in helping to bring about the realization of a newsprint industry in east Texas.

I have read the Dallas News all of my life. I regard it as a very splendid newspaper and I know Mr. Dealey has made a tremendous and most outstanding contribution to the success of this great paper; his leadership has been excellent, indeed.

The articles follow:

[From the Longview (Tex.) Morning Journal, Apr. 4, 1965]

FIFTY YEARS ON THE NEWS

(The following editorial is reproduced from the April 1 issue of the Dallas Morning News.)

The publisher of the News, E. M. (Ted) Dealey, today completes 50 years of service to this institution. For him, this newspaper, for his colleagues past and present, it has been a rewarding association.

A half century in one journalistic home is no mean accomplishment. Newspapering has been Ted Dealey's life—but more important, a newspaper has. To the News he has devoted every energy. To the News he has pledged every talent and dream.

Active as ever, Mr. Dealey will be at his desk this morning carefully examining the pages of a product to which he has contributed so substantially and making certain that it remains true to its ideals and continues the heritage of a glorious past.

Fifty years ago this spring Ted Dealey was studying in the School of Philosophy at Harvard University where he earned a master's degree in 1 year. His father, the late G. B. Dealey of the News, wired him offering him a job.

He reported on April 1 as secretary to President C. Lombardi. He was a reporter and staff correspondent until 1924, distinguishing himself in covering some of the State's most hotly contested political races. He was Sunday editor and editorial writer 1924–28, assistant to the publisher 1928–32 and vice president from 1932–1940. In the latter year he was named president when G. B. Dealey became chairman of the board.

When G. B. Dealey died in 1946 Mrs. Dealey became chairman of the board, and upon her death in 1960 Ted Dealey was named publisher and chairman of the board. Today he retains the title of publisher and J. M. Moroney, Sr., is board chairman.

It is a distinguished career, and his colleagues offer their heartiest congratulations.

We who labor with words in the news and editorial divisions know him best as a superb writer, an artisan with an individualistic style that combines fact and literary incisiveness with color and zest.

The devotion Ted Dealey has given his task is part of a spirit which has characterized the News since its establishment in Dallas 80 years ago this fall. Those who are gone dreamed big dreams, met trouble and crisis as a challenge and conquered adversity in full stride. We acknowledge their contribution with deepest gratitude.

The News is what it is because of diligence and loyalty, from the highest to the humblest. Tomorrow is another assignment to be faced confidently and with assurance to our readers, to Dallas, and to Texas that the high aims of our heritage will be preserved in perpetuity.

[From the Longview (Tex.) News, Apr. 10, 1965]

A GREAT TEXAN

It is with a deep sense of personal appreciation that we salute today our honored contemporary and friend, the distinguished E. M. "Ted" Dealey, publisher of the great Dallas Morning News, who on Thursday rounded out 50 years with his newspaper which represents the oldest business institution in Texas.

To some of us, this is much more than just an ordinary anniversary. There is historic stature, accompanied by a roll of the drums of recognition of accomplishment, in this occasion which is both personal for Ted Dealey and public for Texas people and for the proud profession of journalism.

As an east Texas publisher, it has been no secret that we have admired our big city friend across the years. We have tried in our own way to emulate the fine example of institutional leadership and responsibility of this great man who belongs not only to Dallas—though he is an institution in his own right there—but belongs as well to Texas, the Southwest, and the Nation.

Ted Dealey was born in Dallas in 1892, only 7 years after his pioneering father and outstanding leader and builder, the late George Bannerman Dealey, established the Dallas Morning News there on October 1, 1885, as an affiliate of the Galveston News. He officially began his career with the News on April 1, 1915.

This gallant son has followed well the brilliant trail blazed by that giant of journalism. Serving as reporter, general newsman, editorial writer, president, board chairman, and publisher whose first love always has been writing. Ted Dealey long has been recognized as a national figure in his own right. Today he ranks with the alltime journalistic greats of the world.

His executive leadership at the Dallas News since 1940 has shown itself in the fact that daily and Sunday circulation has more than doubled, advertising linage has almost tripled, and newsprint usage has nearly quadrupled. Sharing with him in these accomplishments in recent years has been his illustrious son, Joe M. Dealey, who has risen through the ranks to the presidency.

He helped to create a brandnew Texas industry—newsprint production. He helped unite southern publishers in establishing a papermill at Lufkin to make newsprint from southern pine, and we are proud that our own Longview newspapers were among the first to contract to buy and use the first experimental rolls of paper from that mill.

It is a matter of record that the crisp and powerful writing of Ted Dealey, plus his determined backing of his chief staff people, has had a leading role in giving Dallas clean and progressive government and in helping to create and encourage in Texas a public and governmental climate in which business and industry could expand and prosper.

Mr. Dealey takes pride in, and his able staff is inspired by, his daily interest in both the news and business affairs which he heads up as publisher. At 72, he is a striking figure, neat of dress, trim and erect, walks and works with vigor. His counsel in city and State affairs is avidly sought. His contributions to public progress cover many fields. The honors that have been accorded him are countless.

Here truly is a son of Texas whose life and work, across half a century of service, always has and today continues to typify the dauntless courage, the venturous spirit, and the great heart that is the high heritage of the Lone Star State.

We here in Longview and east Texas, as do others of his friends everywhere, wish him well at this milestone point in his distinguished career. To us, there is only one Ted Dealey—that's Texas Ted.

CARL L. ESTES.

Hon. Geo. L. Dickinson, of Longview, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial and article about Mr. George L. Dickinson.

Not so long ago Mr. and Mrs. George L. Dickinson visited me in Washington. It was a happy privilege to be with them here.

I wish to second and affirm all which has been written about Mr. George L. Dickinson in an editorial that appeared April 16, 1965, in the Longview Daily News. We all shall miss this very splendid young man. To his folks and his friends I express my sincere sympathy:

[From the Longview (Tex.) Daily News, Apr. 16, 1965]

LIVING SERVICE

The life of George L. Dickinson, for whom funeral services were held Friday morning at the First Christian Church, was in a degree truly remarkable a life of service to his fellow men, his community, his church, and his country.

Here was a young businessman who, though stricken by illness at age 45 when many men are just beginning to be of real service to others, had already served with distinction and honor in the business and professional groups to which he belonged, in the civic and community organizations with which he was identified, in official public capacity, and in high places of leadership in his church.

A resident of Longview since 1932, he was the son of one of Longview's best known and most highly respected couples, the Reverend and Mrs. George D. Dickinson. He was active in the First Christian Church where his father was minister for many years after coming to Longview from Garland, serving on the board of deacons and in various other capacities, including a period as president of the Loyal Men's Bible Class.

As a young man, George L. Dickinson early assumed an active role of civic and community service and proved himself a most effective leader. He served with distinction and rose to the presidency of the Longview Junior Chamber of Commerce. He went on to serve as director of the Greater Longview United Fund, the Longview Chamber of Commerce, and the Pinecrest Country Club. He was a member of and active in various capacities in the Knights of Pythias lodge, and the State and National associations of independent insurance agents.

His most distinguished public service was as a member of the Longview City Commission, where he served from 1951 until 1958 and retired without seeking reelection. Here he provided enlightened and firm leadership and was a dedicated and effective commissioner who kept himself well informed on local needs as well as opportunities for expansion and growth of the community. He made an unusual and continuing contribution to Longview's progress during those years of public service.

It was in appropriate honor and tribute to former Commissioner Dickinson that City Manager Harry Mosley and the present city commission closed the city hall Friday during the funeral service.

In the honorable and useful business of insurance, where he was associated with his father and Guy Harrison in the Dickinson-Harrison Insurance Agency, young Dickinson was a good businessman, a concerned and helpful counselor to individuals and businesses alike. He served in such a way that be became fast friends with those with whom he came in contact in a business way.

Longview has suffered a great loss in the passing of a young man so dedicated and effective in service in so many fields. To his wife, Mrs. Eloise Dickinson, daughters Elaine and Carol, son Logan, and to his parents and sister, we express our deep sympathy.

For all of us, there is a lesson in the life and work of George L. Dickinson. Not only did he live service in all his activities, but he conducted himself in such a way that the service he rendered is now and will continue to be a living and active force for good in his community, his country, his church.

CARL L. ESTES.

[From the Longview (Tex.) Daily News, Apr. 14, 1965]

GEORGE DICKINSON, 45, DIES IN DALLAS

George L. Dickinson, 45, Longview insurance executive and former member of the Longview City Commission, died about 11 a.m. Wednesday in a Dallas hospital after an illness of more than 6 months.

Funeral services directed by Rader Funeral Home are pending.

Dickinson only recently had been discharged from Good Shepherd Hospital where he had suffered a bout with virus pneumonia. Before that, he had been ill in a Dallas hospital. Death occurred at the Bristol Hospital in Dallas.

Dickinson served as Longview city commissioner from 1951 until 1958 when he decided not to run for reelection. He was a member of the First Christian Church and also of that church's men's Bible class.

He was a former director of the Greater Longview United Fund and the Pinecrest Country Club and a member of the Longview Elks Lodge.

During World War II, Dickinson established an enviable record as a navigator in the U.S. Air Corps and was sent on many missions over enemy territory from his base in England.

Born in Garland, he came to Longview with his parents, the Reverend and Mrs. George D. Dickinson, and graduated from Longview High School. He attended Texas Christian University.

Upon his return from service in World War II, he entered the insurance business with his father. Later, he formed a partnership with Guy Harrison in 1951 and remained active in this business until his health failed.

He was a member of the Longview Association of Independent Insurance Agents and the Texas State Association of Independent Insurance Agents.

Survivors include his wife, Eloise; two daughters, Carol and Elaine Dickinson; one son, Logan; his parents, the Reverend and Mrs. George D. Dickinson; one sister.

Where Is American Government Going?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the April 1965 issue of the CPA, membership bulletin of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, Inc., contains an interesting article pertaining to the general outlook for government in America.

The article was written by Mr. Lyman L. Bryan, director of the Washington division of the institute.

I believe Mr. Bryan's comments about what lies ahead will be of interest to Members of Congress and under leave to extend my remarks, I submit the article for inclusion in the RECORD:

WHERE IS AMERICAN GOVERNMENT GOING?—OUR MAN IN WASHINGTON TAKES A LONG LOOK

Our Government is changing fast; is it changing for the better?

Every accountant in America has pondered this question. Government helps finance his clients. It taxes and regulates them. It confers and regulates the accountant's right to practice. It asks him (and his clients) questions he would resent even if his mother asked them. It does all of this because the total public interest is invoked, and the retention of this situation, as reflected at the polls, implies that this is clearly the will of the people.

In this environment, what will the accountant's tomorrow be like? Whether we like it or not, what will tomorrow bring in American government? This writer has a cloudy crystal ball, usually hidden in a dark cellar. It has been brought forth only at the editor's insistence, aimed at 1984, and this column represents my personal view of what it foreshadows.

However, to check my personal impressions, I submitted my guesses to several people, whose caliber of experience with government I respect, in both political parties. With one lone dissent, their impressions generally agreed with my own. These commentators included a former White House assistant, an aid to a prominent House leader, a conservative businessman, a well-known author of textbooks on American government, a liberal educator, two executive directors of national businessmen's associations, an engineer, and an economist. I had stressed candor, and while several excellent but markedly differing letters resulted, Republicans and Democrats generally agreed that what I had written was a fair and accurate projection of the kind of government which is likely to exist in 1984.

Here is what the crystal ball seems to show:

1. Increased national economic planning: This kind of central planning probably will not follow the classic European pattern, where outside cadres of the "intellectual elite" have held forth. More likely it will be conducted by a White House secretariat, using outside advisers, and be subject to executive and congressional checks.

2. Continuing expansion of Federal, State, and local bureaucracies: Total governmental employment grows at all levels, but in recent years State and local government expenditures have grown much more rapidly than Federal. At all levels, elected and appointed officials have played a decreasing role as compared with career employees; in the Federal Government, civil service employees increased from 69 to 85 percent of the total between 1941 and 1961.

3. Expanding influence of the executive branch: Presidents and Congresses come and go, but the objectives of agency programs remain generally constant. This provides stability in program, but is accompanied by interim delegation to the executive branch of Government by the Congress and voters.

4. Sharp increases in urban and suburban influence: This will (and already has begun to) influence major Federal legislation. Decreased rural and smalltown influence is underway.

5. Decentralization to State and local governments: More Federal grants to States, but with less Federal financial control. (Put another way, more Federal money, but more State control—the Federal highway program is a prototype.)

6. Immense technological emphasis: Federal control over scientific decisions, through grants to business and educational recipients, is already extensive. Federal use of computers may also stimulate large-scale correlated responses—on the part of regulated enterprises.

7. Increased governmental expenditures: This is a sure thing. It may be accompanied by reduced reliance on top-level accounting experience within government, as compared with the influence of other experts such as economists and engineers. The number of CPA's in government has never kept step with the pace of expenditures, so it is quite possible that other disciplines will help fill the vacuum. If accountants are to reverse this trend, they must show themselves more interested in government in the future.

8. A total increase in the Government role: This will have an impact on all elements of society, affecting business clients and accountants in varied ways. This would suggest a growing need for accountants to be closely aware of Federal, State, and local government actions.

The date George Orwell picked for the title of his frightening book about a government-dominated society, "1984," was chosen as a reasonable target date for my predictions in the hope that at worst things will not be nearly as bad as he pictured them. But if the nightmare of "Big Brother is watching you" is to be avoided, accountants and all other alert citizens must take a much more active part in the governmental process.

The difficulties of the task were once sharply summarized by the French revolutionary, Danton, the night before he was beheaded. Said Danton: "Tomorrow, I shall sleep in glory * * * but one had better be a poor fisherman than meddle with the art of governing men."

LYMAN L. BRYAN,
Director, Washington Office.

Freedom Crusade Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESTER L. WOLFF
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a situation that has not made headlines but, nevertheless, involves a serious curtailment of religious and ethnic freedom. I am referring to the treatment accorded Christians in Constantinople—Istanbul—and I want to go on record in support of the following proclamation by

Hon. Eugene H. Nickerson, county executive of Nassau, Long Island, N.Y.:

PROCLAMATION ON FREEDOM CRUSADE WEEK

Whereas the Christians of Constantinople are being expelled and persecuted and their properties are being confiscated without compensation; and

Whereas the hierarchy and the clergy of the ancient and venerable Eastern Greek Orthodox Patriarchate in Constantinople are being persecuted, deprived of the right to exercise their churchly and religious functions and some of the hierarchy are being exiled unjustly; and

Whereas the people of cyprus are seeking the rights to establish a democratic government where all the citizens will have equal suffrage, equal protection of the laws, religious freedom and equal educational, economic, and social opportunities; and

Whereas the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, otherwise known as the Order of AHEPA is seeking redress and a solution of these problems in accordance with the American principles and traditions originally enunciated in the Declaration of Independence and which, ever since, have become the cornerstone of the ideals, beliefs, and traditions of the American people and Government: Now, therefore,

I, Eugene H. Nickerson, Nassau County executive, do proclaim the week of May 9–15, 1965, as Freedom Crusade Week in Nassau County, N.Y.

I endorse the basic principle of U.S. foreign policy on self-determination for all peoples and earnestly urge our Government to fully implement and support this policy of self-determination for the people of Cyprus.

I further urge our Government to do all in its power to bring about freedom of religion in the Republic of Turkey.

I further urge our Government to do all in its power to stop the persecution and exiling of the Christian people of Constantinople.

I further urge on all our citizens of all creeds to participitate in the AHEPA Crusade for Freedom Week for Constantinople and Cyprus, and to pray for a just solution of the problems and the establishment of a just and permanent peace in these ancient places where civilization was born and where all our great religions were first promulgated and established.

Calhoun Bust Presented to U.S.S. "John C. Calhoun"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, our beloved Dr. Robert C. Edwards, president of Clemson University, on March 10, in Charleston presented to the Polaris submarine *John C. Calhoun* a bust of South Carolina's greatest statesman. At the presentation ceremony aboard the U.S.S. *John C. Calhoun*, Dr. Edwards made a brief but very appropriate address. I commend Dr. Edward's superb address on that occasion to the Congress and to the country:

REMARKS OF R. C. EDWARDS AT THE PRESENTATION CEREMONIES ABOARD THE U.S.S. "JOHN C. CALHOUN"

Congressman RIVERS, Admiral Daspit, Admiral Loughlin, Commander Axene, Commander Thurtell, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, we are delighted to have such a splendid audience for this historic occasion. We are especially grateful to Congressman RIVERS for his presence here today. Having recently assumed the chairmanship of the Armed Services Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives, we appreciate fully the importance of the tremendous responsibilities that rest on his shoulders and the demands made upon his time. It is a great relief to me personally to know that during this most perilous and critical period in our history that we have directing the affairs of this most important congressional committee a man of such outstanding knowledge, ability and dedication as Congressman RIVERS. It was my happy privilege to listen to his marvelous address at the commissioning ceremonies of this great ship on September 15, 1964, at Newport News.

Clemson University, for which I speak, has a unique interest in the ship on whose deck we stand. This ship bears the name of one of South Carolina's—and the Nation's—most illustrious sons, John Caldwell Calhoun.

Clemson University, named for Calhoun's son-in-law, Thomas Green Clemson, whose vision and generosity created the institution, stands on land which was the John C. Calhoun plantation.

The house, called "Fort Hill," was Calhoun's home for the last 25 years of his life, and is beautifully preserved as an historic shrine at the center of the Clemson campus. Calhoun's spirit, as well as Clemson's, pervades the very air each Clemson student and teacher breathes and constitutes an inspiration to all of us there.

This spirit is an inspiration, too, to the officers and men of the U.S.S. *John C. Calhoun*.

This is the joint heritage which Clemson University is proud to share with the U.S.S. *John C. Calhoun*.

No American was ever more dedicated than was Calhoun to the purpose for which this ship exists—the defense of our country.

For 39 years Calhoun served the Nation as a Member of both Houses of Congress, as a Cabinet officer under two Presidents, and as Vice President of the United States.

From 1811 to 1817 he was a Member of the National House of Representatives from South Carolina. As acting chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, he stood with Henry Clay and others who for their patriotism were called "War Hawks"—a name which has become a badge of distinction again in these troubled times. He stood for strong defense of American rights against depredations of the British, from whom we had only a few years before won our independence.

In his devotion to the protection of the security of this country and the traditions that have made it great, the Honorable MENDEL RIVERS is truly the John C. Calhoun of 1965.

I remind you of those solemn words of Mr. Calhoun when he said, "The honor of a nation is its life. Deliberately to abandon it is to commit an act of political suicide." So he introduced the resolution declaring war on Great Britain in 1812, and his views prevailed.

From 1817 to 1825 he was Secretary of War in the Cabinet of President James Monroe. He reinvigorated many aspects of military administration and clarified the command situation. One historian from another region of the country says, "he gained, as he deserved, a lasting reputation as one of the ablest of War Secretaries."

From 1825 to 1832 he was Vice President of the United States in the administration of President John Quincy Adams and the first administration of President Andrew Jackson.

From 1833 to 1843 and again from 1845 to his death in 1850, he was a U.S. Senator from South Carolina, standing with Henry Clay and Daniel Webster as a towering figure in the Senate's history.

In 1844 and 1845, between his two periods of service as Senator, he was Secretary of State, holding the highest Cabinet office under President John Tyler.

Such, in barest outline, was the career of John C. Calhoun on the stage of national affairs.

It is appropriate that this ship should be named for him and that Clemson University should help to perpetuate his memory.

Our university, like the statesman whose home it now occupies, is dedicated to public honor and to public service. We are basically a scientific and technological institution engaged both in the research and the teaching so needed by South Carolina and the Nation in this scientific age. This gives us another special interest in a ship embodying the most advanced of technologies. Our university has a military tradition, too, and our sons have served with distinction in every war since Clemson was founded.

For all these reasons, Clemson University is pleased today to present to the Navy for display in this ship a bust of John C. Calhoun.

This bust, an excellent likeness, was once the property of Thomas G. Clemson and has been in the home that was Calhoun's and later Clemson's.

Commander Axene, will you please come forward?

It is with pride and with great pleasure that I deliver to you this bust to the ship as a gift from Clemson University, knowing that the U.S.S. *John C. Calhoun* will add new luster to a long-revered name.

Aid of the Arts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELMER J. HOLLAND

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 7, 1965

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. Speaker, for a number of years I have been dwelling on the importance of education. The need for people to be well educated increases each day, for without it—employment will be practically nonexistent and, without it, the leisure time, automation, and technological developments furnished all, will not be enjoyed to its fullest extent.

As a cosponsor of the legislation setting up a National Foundation for Arts and Humanities, I should like to call the Members' attention to an editorial appearing in the Pittsburgh Post Gazette on April 21, recommending passage of this bill:

AID FOR THE ARTS

When the American Symphony Orchestra League met in Pittsburgh recently, its delegates sounded a new policy note for their organization. Reversing a stand taken as recently as 1962, when 60 percent of the members said they favored independence of orchestras from Government money, the league this year decided to endorse Federal financial support for the arts.

As an organization representing 900 major metropolitan and community orchestras, the league made known its new position at a significant time. Congress, too, has changed its mind in the last 10 years. When President Eisenhower in 1955 proposed a Federal Advisory Commission on the Arts, Congress turned a deaf ear. President Kennedy in 1961 recommended a similar agency, but was rebuffed. The Senate in 1963 passed a Ken-

nedy administration bill to provide Federal aid for the arts, but the House refused to go along. Finally, in 1964, with the support of the Johnson administration, Congress enacted a law creating a National Council on the Arts, an advisory body composed of a chairman and 24 members appointed by the President. Earlier this month the Council—made up of members representing art, sculpture, literature, music, theater, opera, the screen and television—held its first meeting and Chairman Roger L. Stevens announced that the organization wanted to deliberate longer before issuing a magna carta for the arts.

Meanwhile, Congress this spring has been busy on another item of legislation in the field of the arts, this time to set up a National Foundation for the Arts and Humanities. The earlier objective of providing Federal support for the arts has now been broadened to include the humanities, a step which was initiated by Pittsburgh Congressman WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD when he introduced last summer a bill to establish a National Humanities Foundation, an agency intended to match the National Science Foundation and to aid a wide range of humanistic subjects—among them history, philosophy, law, and literature. The latest version of Representative MOORHEAD's bill, which has now been approved by a House Education and Labor Subcommittee, calls for a National Arts and Humanities Foundation which would administer Federal endowments of $5 million each for the arts and the humanities, plus an additional $5 million for each endowment to use in matching private donations. In the Senate, similar legislation is being considered in Senator CLAIBORNE PELL'S Labor and Public Welfare Subcommittee, where favorable action is expected in the near future.

With solid support coming from the administration, from academic circles and from such organizations as the Symphony League, the Arts and Humanities Foundation bill appears to have a good chance of enactment. If this new source of encouragement for music and other half-starved artistic endeavors and for humanistic studies should finally be established, it would help to redress the cultural balance in our society, which tends to emphasize science and technology to the neglect of creative pursuits that are equally important but that do not have the glamor of a race to the moon.

Dodge and Columbia County, Wis., Boards of Supervisors Oppose Soil Conservation Cuts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, after spending the week of the Easter recess in my home district viewing the damage sustained within my district from both tornados and floods, I am convinced more than ever that the administration proposal to reduce appropriations for soil and water conservation programs would be a serious blow to conservation practices throughout the country.

While the headlines have dealt with the serious flood conditions in Minnesota and western Wisconsin, much Wisconsin farmland is flooded each spring in the small headwater rivers and water basins. Here is where emphasis on conservation practices is most needed and this is where the cutback in funds would be most seriously felt.

Throughout my district I have found farmers and city dwellers alike concerned about this prospect of reduced conservation efforts. This is reflected in the resolutions adopted by the Dodge and Columbia County Boards of Supervisors. The board of supervisors, of course, are the governing bodies of the counties and represent not just the farmer but the town and city dweller as well. These resolutions in my judgment reflect the views of the vast majority of citizens in my district. Accordingly, I include these resolutions of the Dodge and Columbia County Boards of Supervisors in the RECORD at this point:

"RESOLUTION OPPOSING A CUT IN SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE APPROPRIATIONS, WHICH WOULD DIRECTLY AFFECT ASSISTANCE TO THE COLUMBIA COUNTY SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT

"Whereas the Columbia County Soil and Water Conservation District program has recognized the need for continuation and expansion of district assistance to landowners in conserving our natural resources; and the inventory of conservation needs has pointed out the large amount of work still needed in our district; and the requests for district assistance increases each year, with a corresponding increase in the application of conservation practices; and district assistance to landowners is vital in keeping our soil on the land, our streams and lakes silt free, our rainfall on the land where it falls, beautification of our county, and protection of our tax base; and the proposed cutback in appropriations for Soil Conservation Service technical assistance to districts would curtail our help to landowners; and the proposed revolving fund would place an additional burden on the stewards of our national resources: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Columbia County Board of Supervisors affirm the need of continued soil and water conservation practices and that Federal appropriations be continued to meet present and future soil and water conservation practice needs."

STATE OF WISCONSIN,
County of Columbia, ss:

I, Natalie Sampson, county clerk in and for said county do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of a resolution adopted by the board of supervisors on the 31st day of March, 1965.

NATALIE SAMPSON.

"RESOLUTION 4

"Resolution to the Honorable Board of Supervisors of Dodge County, Wis., members

"Whereas the agricultural conservation program of the Federal Government has contributed immeasurably to the prosperity of the national economy and the beautification of the American landscape and the promotion of the conservation of natural resources; and

"Whereas it is proposed that $100 million be cut from the agricultural conservation program cost sharing funds; and

"Whereas it is proposed to establish a revolving fund through which landowners would be charged a total of $20 million for Soil Conservation Service technical assistance to districts: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Dodge County Board of Supervisors register its opposition to cutting $100 million or any part thereof from agricultural conservation program cost sharing funds and to the establishment of a revolving fund; be it further

"Resolved, That the county clerk of Dodge County be and hereby is authorized and directed to forward a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, Governor Knowles, Senators PANZER, PROXMIRE, and NELSON, Congressman KASTENMEIER, and Assemblymen Nitschke and Doughty.

"All of which is respectfully submitted this 20th day of April 1965.

"Adopted April 20, 1965.

"JOHN O'DONOVAN,
"Chairman, Dodge County Soil and Water Conservation District."

I, Walde H. Mueller, clerk of Dodge County, Wis., do hereby certify that the above is a true and correct copy of Resolution 4 passed at a meeting of the Dodge County Board of Supervisors on April 20, 1965.

WALDE H. MUELLER,
Dodge County Clerk.

A Revivified United Nations Is Needed in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY S. REUSS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the peacemaking potential of the United Nations should be put to work in Vietnam.

Recently, I introduced a concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 386, to revivify the United Nations and make it available for a role in southeast Asia. The resolution would remove the congressional requirement that the United States keep the General Assembly in a paralyzing impasse over the application of article 19.

In an article in the Evening Star on April 19, 1965, columnist Max Freedman pointed out the opportunity for the United Nations to make a contribution to peace in Vietnam. I include his excellent article hereafter.

I include also an editorial from The Nation of April 26, 1965, on the need for a vital United Nations organization.

The articles follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 19, 1965]

U.N.'S DUTY IN VIETNAM STALEMATE

(By Max Freedman)

UNITED NATIONS.—Without publicity and solely with the desire to promote conditions favorable to a peaceful settlement, the United Nations has taken a watching attitude in the Vietnam situation. In the process it has provided yet another proof of how the United Nations can cast its influence into the scales of peace when more direct agencies of diplomacy find it almost impossible to operate.

In his Johns Hopkins address, President Johnson tried a bold experiment in public diplomacy. He appealed for an honorable end to the fighting, while pledging the United States to continue the military pressure on North Vietnam.

In general, it may be said that the appeal impressed only those who are willing to heed the arguments of reason. Our major allies and by far the largest part of the neutral world have welcomed the President's initiative. But there the favorable response ends.

Communist forces in South Vietnam have given no sign they are ready to drop their weapons. With varying degrees of hostility but in each case with open suspicion, the Governments of North Vietnam and China and Russia have returned dusty answers to the President's message.

Equally disappointing has been the response to the British effort to establish contact with the Communist side by the methods of private diplomacy. The imaginative and constructive offer of the British Government to send Patrick Gordon Walker, the former Foreign Secretary, to the embattled area has thus far produced no visible result. China in particular has been critical of the British role as prejudiced and tainted since it is an axiom of Chinese policy that in the Vietnam war Great Britain is an agent of American policy.

Perhaps France, which like Britain has recognized the Peiping government, may have better access to China's rulers. But even that is highly doubtful, and in any event deeply rooted American suspicions of France would first have to be overcome before there could be an effective French intervention.

Confronted with this bleak response to the President's appeal, alike in public and in private diplomacy, many Americans are eager to put their trust in the more belligerent passages of the Johns Hopkins speech. They are saying that the bombing and military raids must be continued, probably on a more intensive scale, until the Communists come to their senses and accept peace.

These Americans, large in numbers and outspoken in their advocacy, have never placed much faith anyway in the force of world opinion. Force alone is enough for them. They regard world opinion as a mythical thing or as a fraudulent invention that can be manipulated to meet the convenience of the interested governments. But the State Department does not accept this cynicism; nor does President Johnson; nor do millions of Americans who cannot shake their conviction that there must be something profoundly wrong with American policy whenever it cannot be defended and explained in open debate at the United Nations.

The President deemed it wise and essential to state his commitment to a peaceful settlement when faced with an appeal of conscience from only 17 neutral nations. The cry of the neutral world would become much louder and more insistent if the President should ever drift into the folly of regarding his pledge of peace as a dead letter. The search for a negotiated settlement must remain therefore as a fixed and urgent priority of American policy, regardless of the changes and chances in the military struggle and regardless of the clamor to impose a solution by military means.

Under the charter of the United Nations, Secretary General U Thant has an inescapable duty to do what he can to compose the crisis in Vietnam even though China and North Vietnam are not bound by the principles of the world organization. The situation in Vietnam is quite plainly a threat to world peace and therefore comes within his jurisdiction and is a proper matter for the concern of the United Nations. The Secretary General, as a former leader of Burma, has the most detailed knowledge of the whole problem of Vietnam and can make an important personal contribution to its study and resolution.

Some weeks ago the Secretary General was denounced by large sections of American opinion for a personal statement on Vietnam which was well intentioned but blunderingly phrased and sadly misunderstood. But this experience has at least freed him from the suspicion of being the creature or agent of American policy and given him the chance to use the full prestige of his great office for peace. Behind the scenes and against great odds he is now quietly preparing the United Nations for the time, still distant unfortunately, when it can bring peace in Vietnam closer to the agenda of diplomacy.

[From the Nation, Apr. 26, 1965]

THE REDISCOVERY OF THE U.N.

Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands, like certain other consorts of royal ladies is a very conscientious fellow, and well informed on all sorts of industrial and governmental matters. When, the other day, he was called on to speak at the University of Michigan, he gave much better value, in return for his honorary degree, than is usual on such occasions. Democracy, he pointed out, is not for the indifferent, for those who feel that those in authority should solve the problems and leave the citizen to his own concerns. Perhaps this was true once, Prince Bernhard went on, "but the problems which face those in authority, whether in parliament or in government or in other high stations in life in our modern world, prove to be beyond their powers of solution since they involve the whole of mankind."

Prince Bernhard was not speaking particularly of the United Nations, but this statement could hardly have been more apropos in that connection. Indeed, after the impasse at the last session of the General Assembly, it is clearer than ever before that an international body, even when limited to an ancillary role, is indispensable to the solution of international problems. The U.N.'s past failures and frustrations are the strongest testimony to its value: when it failed, the reason was that it intervened in situations so desperate that intervention seemed imperative, and it was defeated by the very nationalistic passions it had been founded to control.

Discerning observers see this clearly, and have no intention of writing off the U.N. Its vitality will be restored to the extent that the great powers cease using it as instrument of their cold war objectives. "International events of recent weeks," Senator GEORGE AIKEN, of Vermont, told his colleagues late in March, "seem to have overwhelmed the capacity of this Government for affirmative action, except in the military field." He was referring to Vietnam, but then he reminded the Senate that when the United States had turned the screws on the Russians (and the French) in an effort to stigmatize them as delinquent debtors in the Congo operation, he and other Senators had sought to learn from the Department of State what the American reaction would be if the General Assembly were to send a U.N. force into some area in which American interests were involved on the other side. Would the United States pay up? The State Department would not even discuss the question and, considering what its policies have been, the evasiveness is understandable.

When the Russians stood fast, the United States decided that to wreck the U.N. would not be in our interest. Representative HENRY REUSS, of Wisconsin, has recently given several practical reasons for revivifying the U.N. as speedily and thoroughly as possible. If the Vietnam conflict does not expand into a general war and the belligerents are eventually dragged by self-interest to the negotiating table, the U.N. will be needed to further peacemaking efforts, to administer the aid program envisioned by President Johnson, to supervise an election if one is agreed on, and to take care of other contingencies that may arise. Mr. REUSS suggests that the United States should cease its futile invocation of article 19 of the U.N. Charter. The Aiken and Reuss moves may have administration backing. If not, they should have.

President Johnson's "100 Days"—A Remarkable Record of Achievement

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, a most informative article in the current issue of U.S. News & World Report describes the remarkable record of achievement by President Johnson and the Democratic 89th Congress during the 1st 100 days of this session. According to the article "nothing to touch it has been seen since F.D.R.'s first 100 days." Those who carefully examine the record certainly agree.

The U.S. News observations are much like the comments that I made last week in my own newsletter. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of the U.S. News article and my April 22 newsletter at this point:

L.B.J.'s "100 DAYS"—A RECORD PILING UP

It's one success after another for Lyndon Johnson. That has been the record of the 1965 session of Congress to date. Bills that have been bogged down for years are sailing through now. Nothing to touch it has been seen since F.D.R.'s first 100 days.

Not since the first 100 days of Franklin Roosevelt back in 1933 has a President enpoyed the success with Congress that Lyndon Johnson now is enjoying.

In that preiod 32 years ago, the Nation was emerging from a financial panic with people united in a demand for action. The rapid-fire enactment today of new laws of major importance is coming at a time of high prosperity and of national contentment.

The Johnson record, as a result is being cited by some of the President's aids as even more impressive than the Roosevelt record.

In quick succession, Congress has taken these actions:

Gold backing for deposits with Federal Reserve banks was ended without so much as an argument. The vote: 300 to 82 in the House; 74 to 7 in the Senate.

A billion-dollar development program for the 11-State area in the East known as Appalachia sailed through the form the White House asked. The vote: 257 to 165 in the House, and 62 to 22 in the Senate.

An aid program for local schools starting at $1.3 billion a year passed both Houses of Congress without a single major change from White House plans. In this case fundamental issues of policy and constitutional principle were involved. The vote: 263 to 153 in the House, 73 to 18 in the Senate.

For years, Presidents have tried to get from Congress approval of a plan for meeting costs of hospital care for elderly people under social security. Always they met defeat. Lyndon Johnson is about to achieve success where others failed. The House has voted medicare, 313 to 115. The Senate, having approved plans in the past, will join in, and could even broaden the plan.

It's the same story with a law to provide Federal supervision of local elections to assure Negroes the right to register and vote

in areas where they now meet discrimination. Action by the Congress has been blocked in the past. It is about to be taken now.

Congress also is about to approve and submit to the States an amendment to the Constitution providing for an appointment to the Vice-Presidency if that office becomes vacant. It also provides for a line of action if a President is assassinated, dies or is disabled while in office.

The House approved this plan April 13 by 368 to 29. A similar measure went through the Senate unanimously.

Excise taxes are to be reduced by more than $1.7 billion later in 1965. In this case, Mr. Johnson may have difficulty restraining the urge in Congress to make larger reductions than he wants.

The success story carries all along the line.

The "poverty war" will be given $1.5 billion more to spend. A battle is mounting over the way this money is being used, but critics are saying that, politically, money is money in congressional districts.

There will be the usual approval of foreign aid and approval for a wide range of other White House proposals.

What the President wants: The record suggests this: Nearly anything President Johnson really wants from the 89th Congress he can get. In the Senate today are 68 Democrats and 32 Republicans. In the House there are 294 Democrats and 140 Republicans, with 1 vacancy.

In 1964, during the year when he served out the term of the late President John F. Kennedy, Lyndon Johnson started to make the record that is being developed fully in 1965.

That year, the new President pried loose a tax-cut bill that had been tied up in the Senate Finance Committee while Mr. Kennedy was in office.

President Johnson, too, got through Congress a new law governing civil rights of Negroes—a measure that had been bogged down earlier in Congress and had blocked action on most of the other legislative plans of the late President.

Now the President's program seems to have clear sailing.

There is some doubt that Congress will grant the President's request for a new Cabinet Department of Housing and Urban Development, but a large part of his urban program is likely to be enacted. Also headed for passage is President Johnson's plan to improve water resources and to help cities control air and water pollution.

The President, in fact, has outlined as broad a program for expansion and improvement as Mr. Roosevelt proposed for recovery from depression. And the record of Mr. Johnson's 100 days during the present session of Congress suggests that, with huge Democratic majorities in House and Senate, the President will push most of his projects through.

In the 32 years which have passed since the first 100 days of the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration, there have been innumerable discussions about the achievements of the Congress in those short 100 days. The actions taken way back then were considered to be fantastic, as indeed they were. Few people, even the most knowledgeable ones, expected a later Congress and administration to match the output of the great 73d Congress. To the delight and surprise of nearly all, the 89th Congress has given the 73d a run for its money.

The United States was in the depths of a horrible economic depression when F.D.R. took office. The people wanted relief and action and they got it in the form of the NRA, the Bank Holding Act, the Bank Moratorium, and the Emergency Relief Act, to mention the major bills passed. The administration was great, and so was the Congress.

In 1965, when Lyndon B. Johnson took office, he had with him a tremendous popular mandate and an overwhelmingly Democratic Congress, but there were no really great legislative demands from a people enjoying relative prosperity. The President had his own program, however, and he wasted not a minute in making his recommendations to what has turned out to be an eager and responsive Congress. The results have been nothing short of sensational in President Johnson's first 100 days.

The first measure of importance to travel the whole distance and become law was L.B.J.'s program for poverty stricken Appalachia. The Senate acted first, and then the bill was placed in the hands of the extraordinarily skillful Representative ROBERT E. JONES, Alabama's only liberal Member. JONES steered the bill through without a single amendment—a splendid and unusual achievement.

The Appalachia legislation will help not only the States directly involved but will benefit the whole Nation as the economy of that poor area improves. New markets will open, and thousands of men will be put back to work to take their places as taxpayers and customers. Their children will receive better educations and, hopefully, be prepared to enter the job market equipped to be employed.

The President's next legislative victory ended a fight of nearly 100 years within the 100 days when the great education bill sailed through the Congress. In this instance, the bill originated in the General Education Subcommittee of the House. From the time it left our subcommittee, all the way to the President's desk for signature, not one comma in it was changed. In this case, the bill was handed to the colorful and able Senator WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon. He duplicated Representative JONES' feat of passing the bill unamended. Several of my earlier newsletters have discussed the education bill in depth, so I shall say only that the entire Nation will benefit permanently from the education program.

Following the education bill, the House passed a massive revision of the social security law including President Johnson's medicare program. Only a year ago, the Senate passed a medicare program, but it failed to get out of Committee in the House. Many feel that the last Congress would have defeated medicare if it had reached the House for a vote. We will never know, but it's safe to say that the margin would never have been within a hundred votes of what it was in the 89th Congress. As time goes by, I shall make available to my constituents the many details of the medicare and social security programs. They are marvelous, in my opinion.

As we break for a few days' rest, we are confident that a voting rights bill will be ready for action upon our return. A great national demand has built up favoring this legislation, and I suppose that we can thank Alabama's Governor George Wallace and his red-neck pals for that demand. There have been many martyrs in the cause of equal rights who shall be remembered long after the Wallaces have been forgotten. Their monument will be the real emancipation of the southern Negro. The red-neck monument will be the shame they brought to their neighbors and to the Nation.

Before it leaves office, a long time from now, the Johnson administration will have done much more than its sensational 100 days have already brought forth. The administration recognizes the needs of the people and of the country and intends to meet those needs. There will be mistakes, too, for this is the nature of things. I predict though a favorable balance sheet in the history books and am honored to have a small part in the making of that history.

Citation for Dr. Paul Hamilton Allen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, recently, Dr. Paul Hamilton Allen, a respected and well-known botanist for the United Fruit Co., passed away. Dr. Allen had devoted his life to horticulture and botany, living with his wife, Dorothy Osdieck Allen, within the tropics. His contributions to these fields were many and he was recognized as the leading authority on palms. As a result of his work the number of known species of palms was more than doubled.

On March 26, at the annual meeting of the Fairchild Tropical Gardens in Miami, Fla., the Robert H. Montgomery Palm Medal was awarded, posthumously, to Dr. Allen. Dr. Walter H. Hodge of the National Science Foundation, in presenting this award to Mrs. Allen, read a citation describing the life and work of this dedicated scientist.

I call the attention of my colleagues to this citation, the text of which follows:

ROBERT H. MONTGOMERY PALM MEDAL CITATION FOR PAUL HAMILTON ALLEN

It would be hard to say when the late Paul Allen saw his first living palms. It is doubtful that it was in his native Oklahoma. More likely it was as a student at the Missouri Botanical Garden whose conservatories in the thirties were at their horticultural zenith. Soon he was to see palms in their native haunts in Panama. The garden was initiating a modern flora of that botanically important isthmian country and, as an impressionable young man, Paul Allen had the great good fortune to be included in a plant collecting trip to that land. As any good botanist could have predicted he was thrilled and excited by the great green world of the tropics. In 1936 he returned for good with a new wife, Dorthy Osdieck of Kirkwood, Mo., who was to love the tropics with as much zest as her young husband. Except for a brief respite in 1953, when Paul served as director of the Fairchild Tropical Garden, the Allens lived their married life within the tropics.

His first job was to manage the Missouri Botanical Garden Tropical Station based in the Canal Zone. Palm collecting was part and parcel of the overall task of assembling the herbarium collections and associated data on which the Panama flora was to be based. Paul Allen's success is demonstrated in the account of the palms prepared for this flora by Liberty Hyde Bailey in 1943. Prior to 1936 only 37 species of palms were known from Panama. Paul's field efforts more than doubled this number and in so doing 13 new Panamanian palms were discovered, 5 of which very appropriately honor the name of this superb and discriminating plantsman.

In subsequent years Paul Allen developed a special affection for the palms along with his other major plant love—the orchids. Under the kindly aegis of a new employer, the United Fruit Co., he studied the flora—including the palms—of Costa Rica, Honduras and El Salvador. During this time several new palms were named by him—primarily in the genera Roystonen and Cryosophila. In the fifties a new young society devoted to these principes of plants was formed. Paul Allen served the Palm Society

as charter member, director, and mamber of its editorial board.

For all those things, and more, it is especially appropriate that this garden—devoted as it is to palms and to tropical plants in general—should elect to honor one who epitomized in his own life's work what the Fairchild Tropical Garden itself attempts so successfully to do. In awarding the Robert H. Montgomery Palm Medal posthumously to Paul Hamilton Allen it is particularly fitting that his wife Dorthy—his loyal and able helpmate—and talented botanical artist as well—has found it possible to come here from St. Louis to receive it. I hope that this belated presentation will demonstrate in a small way the sincere appreciation and affection many of us have had for Paul Allen and for the outstanding contribution that he made during his lifetime to botany and to horticulture.

Armenian Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, half a century ago, on April 24, 1915, the government of the Turkish Empire as an ally of the Central Powers, commenced a systematic plan of massacre of the Armenian nation which took the terrible toll of more than 1,500,000 lives and left more than a million displaced, exiled and horribly scarred men, women and children as victims of the first modern genocide.

This was not the first genocide in the infamous history of the barbaric Turks, who, true to their Mongol heritage, destroyed and burned everything in their path.

The people in the Turkish-occupied Armenia had existed in the numbness of a virtual state of slavery since 1375, when the last Armenian kingdom in Cilicia fell prey to the invading Memlouls.

The Armenocide of 1915 not only destroyed lives, but thousands of cities and towns and centuries-old monasteries. Churches were destroyed and burned. Countless old manuscripts bibles and valuables of art together with savings and property were destroyed. This destruction totaled more than $35 billion.

The Armenians were condemned to death because they had willed to live on their ancestral soil as a free Christian nation.

Since this horrible massacre, the same pattern has been followed by Communist, Fascist, and Nazi dictators.

Genocide must be branded for the crime that it is. Any one responsible for this brutality shall ultimately be brought to justice. Persecution of defenseless minority peoples must be stopped. The world must be alerted that the atrocities which have been committed against the Armenian people will not be repeated.

The Armenian martyrs of 1915 contributed strongly to the victory of America and its Allies in World War I and prompted President Woodrow Wilson to say "The Armenians are our little ally."

It should be noted that of all the nations who participated in the grand alliance of 1915–1918, the Armenians were perhaps the smallest of these, but the Armenians suffered more casualties than any of the other states of that alliance.

The American people have an obligation to these people which could be fulfilled by revising the Immigration and Nationality Act. We Americans must provide a haven for the fair share of these homeless people and other refugees and escapees who have fled or have been displaced by forces of tyranny.

Yeshivath Adath B'nai Israel Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the proclamation of the city of Cleveland designating Sunday, March 7, 1965, as "Yeshivath Adath B'nai Israel Day," and the addresses of Meyer Feldman, former counsel to President Johnson, and Rabbi Israel Porath, president of the Orthodox Rabbinical Council of Cleveland, at the golden jubilee dinner of the Yeshivath Adath B'nai Israel held in Cleveland, Ohio, on March 7, 1965:

CITY OF CLEVELAND PROCLAMATION DESIGNATING SUNDAY, MARCH 7, 1965, AS "YESHIVATH ADATH B'NAI ISRAEL DAY"

Whereas the Jewish community of Cleveland is observing on March 7, 1965, the 50th anniversary of the founding of Yeshivath Adath B'nai Israel; and

Whereas the city of Cleveland is pleased to number among its citizens graduates of this oldest Jewish Orthodox educational institution and shares with them an interest in its progress; and

Whereas this pioneering educational venture in Jewish life is serving our community and Nation in a most effective way by integrating human knowledge with a high moral purpose and spiritual ideal.

Now, therefore, I, Ralph S. Locher, as mayor of the city of Cleveland, do hereby proclaim Sunday, March 7, 1965, as "Yeshivath Adath B'nai Israel Day" in Cleveland, and urge the citizens of this community to take cognizance of the record of accomplishment of Yeshivath Adath B'nai Israel, and join in commemoration of its 50th anniversary.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the corporate seal of the city of Cleveland to be affixed this 18th day of February 1965.

RALPH S. LOCHER,
Mayor.

CHANCES AND CHALLENGES, 1965

(Address made by Meyer Feldman, former counsel to the President, at the golden jubilee dinner of the Yeshivath Adath B'nai Israel, Mar. 7, 1965, Cleveland, Ohio)

It is a privilege to join you in celebrating your jubilee dinner. In the half century since your founding, you have given thousands of students a deep and abiding sense of the continuity and vitality of Judaism.

Today, as you mark 50 years of progress in Hebrew education, it is appropriate to use the occasion to survey past accomplishments as a method of stimulating us for the future.

Fifty years ago—before World War I—Jewish education in the United States was a highly individual, haphazard kind of undertaking.

Two million Jews had come to the United States. Most were from eastern Europe. They tried to transplant the Jewish educational system with which they were familiar—the Heder, the Talmud Torah, and the Yeshiva.

Jewish education was improvised along these lines. It was chaotic, unstable, and unrewarding. School buildings, equipment, and discipline were poor. Attendance was irregular. Qualified teachers were scarce. One survey of conditions 50 years ago declared:

"The demand for Jewish education is comparatively small.

"Small as the demand is, the means and equipment are far too inadequate to meet it.

"Wherever that demand is met, there is a lack of either system or content."

A survey published in 1918 found only 23 percent of New York's Jewish children were receiving any Jewish instruction at all; only one-eighth of these were in school buildings "worthy of the name," and in most of these schools half the children dropped out every year.

Yes, when your school was founded there was little to celebrate in Jewish education.

As we celebrate your 50th anniversary it seems to me we have at least three other causes for celebration.

First, there is a vastly increased interest in Jewish education.

The turning point came at just about the time Yeshivath Adath B'nai Israel opened its doors.

At just about that time the Bureau of Jewish Education was created. Comprehensive plans were made to advance Jewish education on a communitywide basis. The Hebrew Principals Association and the Jewish Teachers Association were organized. Perhaps most important—this activity began to attract able and dedicated teachers.

Our second cause for celebration lies in the advances in education now being made in Israel. All of Israel's leaders recognize that the future of their nation, their security, their spiritual destiny, and their entire pattern of development rest upon their educational system. Disparate cultures, poverty, a flood of immigration (larger, proportionate to population, than any the world has known) and the primitive beliefs, have placed enormous demands upon its educational structure.

While Israel's population tripled, its school population increased sixfold.

Despite these handicaps, enormous progress is being made at all educational levels.

There is a vigorous program of preschool education for culturally deprived children. Last year, 5,000 of them received free nursery education to give them a headstart. This is a key feature of our own antipoverty program.

Vocational schools, with the support of such farsighted organizations as Histadrut, Hadassah, WIZO, Misrachi, and ORT have made remarkable progress. We have sent our experts to Israel to learn how they teach the blind to weave cloth or, even, to run computers.

In the field of higher education it has been said that, pound for pound, Israel possesses the greatest abundance of talent in the world. It has five excellent universities and no mediocre ones.

The new imperative in American education gives us our third great cause for celebration today. For 82 years there has been a fruitless effort to enact general Federal legislation for primary and secondary schools. Always,

the effort was defeated by bigotry, religious prejudice or suspicion of Federal power. This year we have an education bill that will be signed into law.

It is a bold program. It is a new program. It will proclaim a new era in American education.

It is based upon the simple axiom that we can raise the level of all American education by raising the bottom.

When this idea was first considered there was no doubt in my mind that it would cause a violent dispute in the Jewish community. I was not disappointed.

Some Jewish leaders testified the new education bill would "undermine public education," or "gravely threatens" the public school system. Others applauded the bill as "a major step forward in meeting the educational needs of the schoolchildren of our Nation."

I can readily understand the concern over the preservation of our constitutional concept of separation between church and State. The most tragic chapters in Jewish history admonish us to enforce that separation. No matter where the land or what the era, State control over religion invariably results in oppression of Jews. From the Crusaders to the modern atheistic tyranny in Russia Jews have always been persecuted whenever the State sought to impose a religious doctrine.

However, I cannot agree that the education bill now before the Congress jeopardizes our interests. On the contrary, it offers hope for all Americans—especially the poor, the underprivileged, the handicapped, and the exceptional.

There is an explosion of knowledge all around us. Its limits are not yet in sight. It demands the kind of educated America the bill will help create.

But it is not learning alone, as President Wilson once pointed out, that gives education "a place in the public annals of the Nation. It is indispensable," he said, "that the air of affairs should be admitted to all its classrooms * * * the air of the world's transactions, the consciousness of the solidarity of race, the sense of duty of man toward man."

One of the supplementary benefits of Yeshiva teaching is the interest it inspires in Jewish traditions and Jewish life.

And today we have more need than perhaps ever before of an informed Jewish community. As we look at the world from our privileged sanctuary in this beloved land we see:

A Russia where 3 million fellow Jews are being deprived of their religious, cultural, and economic rights.

A Jordan grown belligerent despite every effort at peaceful solutions to irritations along its 500-mile border with Israel.

An Egypt sharpening its instruments of war against Israel in Yemen and the Congo. I could go on. Revolve the globe in any direction. You will be unable to find a place where peace is gaining ground.

We live in perilous times. The crisis in Vietnam is familiar reading on the front page of every paper in the country. Less familiar is the growing crisis in the Near East. It cannot—and should not—be ignored.

The Arab nations surrounding Israel have, for the first time, joined their military forces under a unified command.

They have obtained financing for military equipment from oil-rich members of the unified command.

They have a diabolical plan for the diversion of Israel's vital water resources—and have actually embarked on this project.

Recent news reports say the Arab nations have obtained large supplies of tanks, submarines, and bombers from the Soviet Union—and that they are building sophisticated weapons like guided missiles.

Perhaps most important, Arab morale was strengthened to dangerous proportions by their success in getting West Germany to halt arms shipments to Israel.

Knowing these things, however, is not enough. In a democracy the obligation of citizenship includes the expression of opinion.

Those of you who have had the intellectual discipline of the Yeshiva are well equipped to assert your opinions.

It was Thornton Wilder who said "Every good and excellent thing stands moment by moment on the razor-edge of danger and must be fought for." Peace in the Near East is a good and excellent thing. Today it stands on the razor-edge of danger. Therein lies the challenge to you.

Again, let me express my best wishes to you and my admiration for your extraordinary contributions to Jewish life during the past 50 years.

Thank you.

REMARKS BY RABBI ISRAEL PORATH, PRESIDENT OF THE ORTHODOX RABBINICAL COUNCIL OF CLEVELAND AT THE GOLDEN JUBILEE DINNER OF THE YESHIVATH ADATH B'NAI ISRAEL, CLEVELAND, OHIO, MARCH 7, 1965

The attainment of 50 years of existence is an important milestone in the annals of any establishment, and certainly much more so in the history of a communal educational institution. The term Jubilee comes from the Biblical "Yovel" which designates the completion of each half century, that used to be celebrated with solemn rituals in the ancient land of Israel.

The Torah commands, "You shall sanctify the 50th year." "You shall proclaim it by the blast of the Shofar throughout your land. The 50th anniversary shall be unto you a year of jubilation."

In the life of an individual we are told in Pirke Ovoth, The Ethics of Our Fathers, "at the age of 50 one is considered mature for advice and consultation." It is a period not only to rejoice, but mainly to take account, to review past achievement, as well as failures, to reevaluate the works and the results of the years gone by, so as to realize and recognize by what ways and means one is to utilize the potentials for the future.

In the area of Jewish education which is tonight our main concern, times have changed considerably during the past decades, and for the better. The founders of the Yeshiva were newcomers, laymen who escaped from the European terror of oppression, in search of security and freedom. They were at great disadvantages. They could hardly master the language of the land. They could hardly adjust themselves to the habits, customs and to the American way of life.

They have not been professionals. They were simple and honest people. They had to work very hard to earn their decent livelihood by the sweat of their brow and the labor of their hands. But with all the odds against them, and with all their personal financial worries, they possessed a spiritual endowment of inherent faith in providence, and loyalty and reverence to all which is dear and sacred in Jewish law and tradition. They did not live by bread alone. Within their inner recesses they kept a burning desire for the promotion and transmission of our religious heritage to posterity.

So they banded together, a group of hard-working laymen, but animated by spirit, full of zeal, sincerity, and perseverance and established the Yeshiva for Cleveland-born children, to get a basic training in the knowledge of Torah and in the practice of Torah living.

They carried the whole burden on their own shoulders. There was, as yet, no Jewish community fund to subsidize them. They had to wander and go out soliciting and collecting donations from synagogue to synagogue, and from meeting to meeting, from individual to individual. The same was true about the Sisterhood who invested time and energy to raise the monthly budget to pay the meager wages to the Melamdim. It was a painstaking and backbreaking task. But they persisted and kept on working without complaint.

Now looking back in retrospect, we realize what simple, honest, and unselfish dedication can accomplish. When looking around nowadays and seeing Cleveland-born young and middle-aged intelligent men who are members of and active in the Young Israel, the Hebrew Academy, the Mikva Association, and practically in every area of genuine Orthodox activities, you may be sure that 90 percent of them had been pupils of Yeshiva Adath. They are now the backbone of Orthodox Jewry in Cleveland.

To you members of the alumni and parents of pupils present here tonight, I want to say a few words. The Yeshiva is your religious alma mater. Today, the Yeshiva is in a much more advantageous situation than ever before. The Yeshiva has special classes for girls as well as for boys, a thing that was lacking in previous years. The Yeshiva is now an arm of the Bureau of Jewish Education. It enjoys the recognition and the substantial cooperation of the federation. It has a trained staff of devoted teachers under the supervision of efficient principals and educators. Its board of education consists of the members of our United Orthodox Rabbinate, and the Roshai Yeshiva of Telshe. And you have a very effective PTA organization able, ready, and willing to undertake any worthwhile enterprise for the good and welfare of the Yeshiva Adath.

Tonight you start the first festival of the jubilee year. Others will follow. It is now up to you. Go out in full strength and proclaim it a year of concerted effort to make the good name of the Yeshiva even better. Sanctify the 50th jubilee. Proudly convey the message of Jewish learning and practice throughout the breadth and length of our Jewish neighborhoods.

And as we read yesterday at the Sabbath morning service, when Moses saw all the work that was being done in accordance with Heavenly prescriptions, he gave them his benediction saying:

"May it be His will to bestow His blessing upon the work of your hands. And may His pleasantness be upon us to establish our works." Amen.

Alumni Award to Edna H. Mack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of attending this year's spring convocation at Gardner-Webb College. When alumni awards were presented for distinguished service, among those receiving an award was Edna H. Mack, of Toledo, in my own Third District in Washington. It gives me great pleasure to place in the RECORD at this time this award:

Born in nearby Gaffney, S.C., Edna Elizabeth Humphries Mack, came to Boiling Springs High School for her secondary education. In 1929, she graduated with a bachelor of arts degree from Limestone College.

She has, in addition to her undergraduate work, studied at George Peabody College for Teachers, at Western Washington College for Teachers, and at the University of Washington. Following graduation from Limestone, she began her long teaching career, teaching the upper elementary grades in Cherokee and Spartanburg Counties, S.C., for 14 years. For several years, she was a Sunday schoolteacher as well as pianist in Macedonia Baptist Church, Gaffney, S.C. At the present time, Mrs. Mack is teacher-librarian of Toledo High School, Toledo, Wash., where for 4 years she was class sponsor and where since 1958 she has sponsored the library club and the national honor society. A longtime friend of hers said that Mrs. Mack's "quiet, unassuming way has won for her many friends wherever she has studied, taught, or lived."

LAWS AND RULES FOR PUBLICATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

CODE OF LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES

TITLE 44, SECTION 181. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; ARRANGEMENT, STYLE, CONTENTS, AND INDEXES.—The Joint Committee on Printing shall have control of the arrangement and style of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and while providing that it shall be substantially a verbatim report of proceedings shall take all needed action for the reduction of unnecessary bulk, and shall provide for the publication of an index of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD semimonthly during the sessions of Congress and at the close thereof. (Jan. 12, 1895, c. 23, § 13, 28 Stat. 603.)

TITLE 44, SECTION 182b. SAME; ILLUSTRATIONS, MAPS, DIAGRAMS.—No maps, diagrams, or illustrations may be inserted in the RECORD without the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing. (June 20, 1936, c. 630, § 2, 49 Stat. 1546.)

Pursuant to the foregoing statute and in order to provide for the prompt publication and delivery of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Joint Committee on Printing has adopted the following rules, to which the attention of Senators, Representatives, and Delegates is respectfully invited:

1. *Arrangement of the daily Record.*—The Public Printer shall arrange the contents of the daily RECORD as follows: the Senate proceedings shall alternate with the House proceedings in order of placement in consecutive issues insofar as such an arrangement is feasible, and the Appendix and Daily Digest shall follow: *Provided*, That the makeup of the RECORD shall proceed without regard to alternation whenever the Public Printer deems it necessary in order to meet production and delivery schedules.

2. *Type and style.*—The Public Printer shall print the report of the proceedings and debates of the Senate and House of Representatives, as furnished by the Official Reporters of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in 7½-point type; and all matter included in the remarks or speeches of Members of Congress, other than their own words, and all reports, documents, and other matter authorized to be inserted in the RECORD shall be printed in 6½-point type; and all rollcalls shall be printed in 6-point type. No italic or black type nor words in capitals or small capitals shall be used for emphasis or prominence; nor will unusual indentions be permitted. These restrictions do not apply to the printing of or quotations from historical, official, or legal documents or papers of which a literal reproduction is necessary.

3. *Return of manuscript.*—When manuscript is submitted to Members for revision it should be returned to the Government Printing Office not later than 9 o'clock p.m. in order to insure publication in the RECORD issued on the following morning; and if all of said manuscript is not furnished at the time specified, the Public Printer is authorized to withhold it from the RECORD for 1 day. In no case will a speech be printed in the RECORD of the day of its delivery if the manuscript is furnished later than 12 o'clock midnight.

4. *Tabular matter.*—The manuscript of speeches containing tabular statements to be published in the RECORD shall be in the hands of the Public Printer not later than 7 o'clock p.m., to insure publication the following morning.

5. *Proof furnished.*—Proofs of "leave to print" and advance speeches will not be furnished the day the manuscript is received but will be submitted the following day, whenever possible to do so without causing delay in the publication of the regular proceedings of Congress. Advance speeches shall be set in the RECORD style of type, and not more than six sets of proofs may be furnished to Members without charge.

6. *Notation of withheld remarks.*—If manuscript or proofs have not been returned in time for publication in the proceedings, the Public Printer will insert the words "Mr. ——— addressed the Senate (House or Committee). His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix," and proceed with the printing of the RECORD.

7. *Thirty-day limit.*—The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD any speech or extension of remarks which has been withheld for a period exceeding 30 calendar days from the date when its printing was authorized: *Provided*, That at the expiration of each session of Congress the time limit herein fixed shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee.

8. *Corrections.*—The permanent RECORD is made up for printing and binding 30 days after each daily publication is issued; therefore all corrections must be sent to the Public Printer within that time: *Provided*, That upon the final adjournment of each session of Congress the time limit shall be 10 days, unless otherwise ordered by the committee: *Provided further*, That no Member of Congress shall be entitled to make more than one revision. Any revision shall consist only of corrections of the original copy and shall not include deletions of correct material, substitutions for correct material, or additions of new subject matter.

9. The Public Printer shall not publish in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the full report or print of any committee or subcommittee when said report or print has been previously printed. This rule shall not be construed to apply to conference reports.

10(a). *Appendix to daily Record.*—When either House has granted leave to print (1) a speech not delivered in either House, (2) a newspaper or magazine article, or (3) any other matter not germane to the proceedings, the same shall be published in the Appendix. This rule shall not apply to quotations which form part of a speech of a Member, or to an authorized extension of his own remarks: *Provided*, That no address, speech, or article delivered or released subsequently to the sine die adjournment of a session of Congress may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

10(b). *Makeup of the Appendix.*—The Appendix to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD shall be made up by successively taking first an extension from the copy submitted by the Official Reporters of one House and then an extension from the copy of the other House, so that Senate and House extensions appear alternately as far as possible throughout the Appendix. The sequence for each House shall follow as closely as possible the order or arrangement in which the copy comes from the Official Reporters of the respective Houses.

The Official Reporters of each House shall designate and distinctly mark the lead item among their extensions. When both Houses are in session and submit extensions, the lead item shall be changed from one House to the other in alternate issues, with the indicated lead item of the other House appearing in second place. When only one House is in session, the lead item shall be an extension submitted by a Member of the House in session.

This rule shall not apply to extensions withheld because of volume or equipment limitations, which shall be printed immediately following the lead items as indicated by the Official Reporters in the next issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, nor to RECORDS printed after the sine die adjournment of the Congress.

11. *Estimate of cost.*—No extraneous matter in excess of two pages in any one instance may be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by a Member under leave to print or to extend his remarks unless the manuscript is accompanied by an estimate in writing from the Public Printer of the probable cost of publishing the same, which estimate of cost must be announced by the Member when such leave is requested; but this rule shall not apply to excerpts from letters, telegrams, or articles presented in connection with a speech delivered in the course of debate or to communications from State legislatures, addresses or articles by the President and the members of his Cabinet, the Vice President, or a Member of Congress. For the purposes of this regulation, any one article printed in two or more parts, with or without individual headings, shall be considered as a single extension and the two-page rule shall apply. The Public Printer or the Official Reporters of the House or Senate shall return to the Member of the respective House any matter submitted for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which is in contravention of this paragraph.

12. *Official Reporters.*—The Official Reporters of each House shall indicate on the manuscript and prepare headings for all matter to be printed in the Appendix, and shall make suitable reference thereto at the proper place in the proceedings.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey

Aiken, George D., *Vt*
Allott, Gordon, *Colo*
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.* 6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn*
Bayh, Birch E., *Ind*
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*
Bible, Alan, *Nev*
Boggs, J. Caleb, *Del*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md* 1327 33d St.
Burdick, Quentin N., *N. Dak.*
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va* The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va*
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev*
Carlson, Frank, *Kans* Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N.J*
Church, Frank, *Idaho*
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa*
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky*
Cotton, Norris, *N.H*
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr*
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill*
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn*
Dominick, Peter H., *Colo*
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill*
Eastland, James O., *Miss* 5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La*
Ervin, Sam J., Jr., *N.C*
Fannin, Paul J., *Ariz*
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii* 5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Fulbright, J. W., *Ark*
Gore, Albert, *Tenn*
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*
Harris, Fred R., *Okla*
Hart, Philip A., *Mich*
Hartke, Vance, *Ind*
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.* 5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala*
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla* Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr*
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash*
Javits, Jacob K., *N.Y*
Jordan, B. Everett, *N.C*
Jordan, Len B., *Idaho*
Kennedy, Edward M., *Mass*
Kennedy, Robert F., *N.Y*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif*
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*
Long, Edward V., *Mo*
Long, Russell B., *La*
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.* 5916 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark*
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo*
McGovern, George, *S. Dak*
McIntyre, Thomas J., *N.H*
McNamara, Pat, *Mich*
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.* The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont* 453 First St. SE.
Miller, Jack R., *Iowa* 5417 Kirkwood Dr., Bethesda, Md.
Mondale, Walter F., *Minn*
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg* 4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky*
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak* 122 Schotts Court NE.
Murphy, George, *Calif*
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*
Nelson, Gaylord, *Wis*
Neuberger, Maurine B., *Oreg.*
Pastore, John O., *R.I*
Pearson, James B., *Kans*
Pell, Claiborne, *R.I* 3425 Prospect St.
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt*
Proxmire, William, *Wis*
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va* 4608 Reservoir Rd.
Ribicoff, Abraham A., *Conn*
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va*
Russell, Donald S., *S.C*
Russell, Richard B., *Ga*
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass* 2320 Tracy Pl.
Scott, Hugh, *Pa*
Simpson, Milward L., *Wyo*
Smathers, George A., *Fla*
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John, *Ala* 4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss*
Symington, Stuart, *Mo*
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga*
Thurmond, Strom, *S.C*
Tower, John G., *Tex*
Tydings, Joseph D., *Md*
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N.J.*
Williams, John J., *Del*
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex*
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak* Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Secretary for the Majority—Francis R. Valeo.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Anderson (chairman), Russell of Georgia, Magnuson, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Holland, Mondale, Tydings, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Hickenlooper, Curtis, Jordan of Idaho, and Aiken.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Holland, Eastland, Talmadge, Jordan of North Carolina, McGovern, Bass, Montoya, Mondale, Russell of South Carolina, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Cooper, Boggs, and Miller.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell of Georgia, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Pastore, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, McGee, Mansfield, Bartlett, Proxmire, Yarborough, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Kuchel, Hruska, Allott, Cotton, and Case.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell of Georgia (chairman), Stennis, Byrd of Virginia, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Cannon, Byrd of West Virginia, Young of Ohio, Inouye, McIntyre, Brewster, Saltonstall, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Thurmond, Miller, and Tower.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Sparkman, Douglas, Proxmire, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Long of Missouri, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. McIntyre, Mondale, Bennett, Tower, Thurmond, and Hickenlooper.

Committee on Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Lausche, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Hart, Cannon, Brewster, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. Bass, Cotton, Morton, Scott, Prouty, Pearson, and Dominick.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, McIntyre, Kennedy of New York, Tydings, Prouty, and Dominick.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Long of Louisiana, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Fulbright, Ribicoff, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Curtis, Morton, and Dirksen.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Sparkman, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Gore, Lausche, Church, Symington, Dodd, Clark, Pell, McCarthy, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Carlson, Williams of Delaware, Mundt, and Case.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Gruening, Muskie, Ribicoff, Harris, Kennedy of New York, Metcalf, Montoya, Mundt, Curtis, Javits, and Simpson.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Jackson (chairman), Anderson, Bible, Church, Gruening, Moss, Burdick, Hayden, McGovern, Nelson, Metcalf, Kuchel, Allott, Jordan of Idaho, Simpson, and Fannin.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), McClellan, Ervin, Dodd, Hart, Long of Missouri, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Bayh, Burdick, Tydings, Smathers, Dirksen, Hruska, Fong, Scott, and Javits.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Pell, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Nelson, Kennedy of New York, Javits, Prouty, Dominick, Murphy, and Fannin.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Monroney (chairman), Yarborough, Randolph, McGee, Brewster, Hartke, Burdick, Russell of South Carolina, Carlson, Fong, Boggs, and Simpson.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. McNamara (chairman), Randolph, Young of Ohio, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Metcalf, Jordan of North Carolina, Inouye, Bayh, Montoya, Harris, Cooper, Fong, Boggs, Pearson, and Murphy.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Jordan of North Carolina (chairman), Hayden, Cannon, Pell, Clark, Byrd of West Virginia, Curtis, Cooper, and Scott.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D.C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 5136 Palisade Lane.
Mr. Justice White, of Colorado, 2209 Hampshire Rd., McLean, Va.
Mr. Justice Goldberg, of Illinois, 2811 Albemarle St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John F. Davis, 4704 River Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Henry Putzel, Jr., 3703 33d St.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED
TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Goldberg. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit. Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Address by Hon. Dean Rusk Before the American Society of International Law, Washington, April 23, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include not only a notable but a great and timely address delivered on April 23, 1965, by Hon. Dean Rusk, the Secretary of State, in Washington, D.C., before the American Society of International Law.

Secretary Rusk's comparison between the basic conditions of today and of pre-World War II, which he well summarized "Surely we have learned over the past three decades that the acceptance of aggression leads only to a sure catastrophe," is appropriate, timely, and correct. This part of his able address might well be termed "Lest We Forget."

The address follows:

I

When this distinguished society was founded 59 years ago, the then Secretary of State, Elihu Root, became its first president. With the passage of time, the Secretary of State has been elevated to a less demanding role, that of honorary president. Secretary Root himself not only established the precedent of becoming president while Secretary of State; he also superseded it by continuing to serve as your president for 18 years. The proceedings of the first meeting indicate that Secretary Root not only presided and delivered an address, but that he also selected the menu for the dinner.

The year 1907, when the first of the society's annual meetings was held, today appears to have been one of those moments in American history when we were concentrating upon building our American society, essentially untroubled by what took place beyond our borders. But the founders of this society realized that the United States could not remain aloof from the world. It is one of the achievements of this society that, from its inception, it has spread the realization that the United States cannot opt out of the community of nations—that international affairs are part of our national affairs.

Questions of war and peace occupied the society at its first meeting. Among the subjects discussed were the possibility of the immunity of private property from belligerent seizure upon the high seas and whether trade in contraband of war was unneutral. Limitations upon recourse to force then proposed were embryonic, as is illustrated by the fact one topic for discussion related to restrictions upon the use of armed force in the collection of contract obligations. The distance between those ideas and the restrictions upon recourse to armed force contained in the Charter of the United Nations is vast. It is to these charter restrictions—and their place in the practice and malpractice of states—that I shall address much of my remarks this evening.

II

Current U.S. policy arouses the criticism that it is at once too legal and too tough. Time was when the criticism of American concern with the legal element in international relations was that it led to softness—to a "legalistic-moralistic" approach to foreign affairs which conformed more to the ideal than to the real. Today, criticism of American attachment to the role of law is that it leads not to softness, but to severity. We are criticized not for sacrificing our national interests to international interests, but for endeavoring to impose the international interest upon other nations. We are criticized for acting as if the Charter of the United Nations means what it says. We are criticized for treating the statement of the law by the International Court of Justice as authoritative. We are criticized for taking collective security seriously.

This criticism is, I think, a sign of strength—of our strength, and of the strength of international law. It is a tribute to a blending of political purpose with legal ethic.

American foreign policy is at once principled and pragmatic. Its central objective is our national safety and well-being—to "secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity." But we know we can no longer find security and well-being in defenses and policies which are confined to North America, or the Western Hemisphere, or the North Atlantic Community. This has become a very small planet. We have to be concerned with all of it—with all of its land, waters, atmosphere, and with surrounding space. We have a deep national interest in peace, the prevention of aggression, the faithful performance of agreements, the growth of international law. Our foreign policy is rooted in the profoundly practical realization that the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter must animate the behavior of states, if mankind is to prosper or is even to survive. Or at least they must animate enough states with enough will and enough resources to see to it that others do not violate those rules with impunity.

The preamble and article 1 and 2 of the charter set forth abiding purposes of American policy. This is not surprising, since we took the lead in drafting the charter—at a time when the biggest war in history was still raging and we and others were thinking deeply about its frightful costs and the ghastly mistakes and miscalculations which led to it.

The kind of world we seek is the kind set forth in the opening sections of the charter: a world community of independent states, each with the institutions of its own choice, but cooperating with one another to promote their mutual welfare * * * a world in which the use of force is effectively inhibited * * * a world of expanding human rights and well-being * * * a world of expanding international law * * * a world in which an agreement is a commitment and not just a tactic.

We believe that this is the sort of world a great majority of the governments of the world desire. We believe it is the sort of world man must achieve if he is not to perish. As I said on another occasion: "If once the rule of international law could be discussed with a certain condescension as a utopian ideal, today it becomes an elementary practical necessity. Pacta sunt servanda now becomes the basis for survival."

Unhappily a minority of governments is committed to different ideas of the conduct and organization of human affairs. They are dedicated to the promotion of the Communist world revolution. And their doctrine justifies any technique, any ruse, any deceit, which contributes to that end. They may differ as to tactics from time to time. And the two principal Communist powers are competitors for the leadership of the world Communist movement. But both are committed to the eventual communization of the entire world.

The overriding issue of our time is which concepts are to prevail: those set forth in the United Nations Charter or those proclaimed in the name of a world revolution.

III

The paramount commitment of the charter is article 2, paragraph 4, which reads: "All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the purposes of the United Nations."

This comprehensive limitation went beyond the Covenant of the League of Nations. This more sweeping commitment sought to apply a bitter lesson of the interwar period—that the threat or use of force, whether or not called "war," feeds on success. The indelible lesson of those years is that the time to stop aggression is at its very beginning.

The exceptions to the prohibitions on the use or threat of force were expressly set forth in the charter. The use of force is legal—

As a collective measure by the United Nations; or

As action by regional agencies in accordance with chapter VIII of the chapter; or

In individual or collective self-defense.

When article 2, paragraph 4 was written it was widely regarded as general international law, governing both members and nonmembers of the United Nations. And on the universal reach of the principle embodied in article 2, paragraph 4, wide agreement remains. Thus, last year, a United Nations Special Committee on Principles of International Law concerning friendly relations and cooperation among States met in Mexico City. All shades of United Nations opinion were represented. The committee's purpose was to study and possibly to elaborate certain of those principles. The committee debated much and agreed on little. But on one point, it reached swift and unanimous agreement: that all States, and not only all members of the United Nations, are bound to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State. Nonrecognition of the statehood of a political entity was held not to affect the international application of this cardinal rule of general international law.

But at this same meeting in Mexico City, Czechoslovakia, with the warm support of the Soviet Union and some other members, proposed formally another exemption from the limitations on use of force. Their proposal stated that: "The prohibition of the use of force shall not affect * * * self defense of nations against colonial domination

in the exercise of the right of self-determination."

The United States is all for self-defense. We are against colonial domination—we led the way in throwing it off. We have long favored self-determination, in practice as well as in words—indeed, we favor it for the entire world, including the peoples behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains. But we could not accept the Czech proposal. And we were pleased that the Special Committee found the Czech proposal unacceptable.

The primary reason why we opposed that attempt to rewrite the charter—apart from the inadmissibility of rewriting the charter at all by such means—was that we knew the meaning behind the words. We knew that like so many statements from such sources, it used upside down language—that it would in effect authorize a State to wage war, to use force internationally, as long as it claimed it was doing so to liberate somebody from colonial domination. In short, the Czech resolution proposed to give to so-called wars of national liberation the same exemption from the limitation on the use of force which the charter accords to defense against aggression.

What is a war of national liberation? It is, in essence, any war which furthers the Communist world revolution—what, in broader terms, the Communists have long referred to as a "just" war. The term "war of national liberation" is used not only to denote armed insurrection by people still under colonial rule—there are not many of those left outside the Communist world. It is used to denote any effort led by Communists to overthrow by force any non-Communist government.

Thus the war in South Vietnam is called a war of national liberation. And those who would overthrow various other non-Communist governments in Asia, Africa, and Latin America are called the forces of national liberation.

Nobody in his right mind would deny that Venezuela is not only a truly independent nation but that it has a government chosen in a free election. But the leaders of the Communist insurgency in Venezuela are described as leaders of a fight for national liberation—not only by themselves and by Castro and the Chinese Communists, but by the Soviet Communists.

A recent editorial in Pravda spoke of the "peoples of Latin America * * * marching firmly along the path of struggle for their national independence" and said: "the upsurge of the national liberation movement in Latin American countries has been to a great extent a result of the activities of Communist Parties." It added: "The Soviet people have regarded and still regard it as their sacred duty to give support to the peoples fighting for their independence. True to their international duty the Soviet people have been and will remain on the side of the Latin American patriots."

In Communist doctrine and practice, a non-Communist government may be labeled and denounced as "colonialist," "reactionary," or a "puppet," and any state so labeled by the Communists automatically becomes fair game * * * while Communist intervention by force in non-Communist states is justified as "self-defense" or part of the "struggle against colonial domination." "Self-determination" seems to mean that any Communist nation can determine by itself that any non-Communist state is a victim of colonialist domination and therefore a justifiable target for a war of "liberation."

As the risks of overt aggression, whether nuclear or with conventional forces, have become increasingly evident, the Communists have put increasing stress on the "war of national liberation." The Chinese Communists have been more militant in language and behavior than the Soviet Communists. But the Soviet Communist leadership also has consistently proclaimed its commitment in principle to support wars of national liberation. This commitment was reaffirmed as recently as Monday of this week by Mr. Kosygin.

International law does not restrict internal revolution within a state, or revolution against colonial authority. But international law does restrict what third powers may lawfully do in support of insurrection. It is these restrictions which are challenged by the doctrine, and violated by the practice, of "wars of liberation."

It is plain that acceptance of the doctrine of "wars of liberation" would amount to scuttling the modern international law of peace which the charter prescribes. And acceptance of the practice of "wars of liberation," as defined by the Communists, would mean the breakdown of peace itself.

IV

Vietnam presents a clear current case of the lawful versus the unlawful use of force. I would agree with General Giap and other Communists that it is a test case for "wars of national liberation." We intend to meet that test.

Were the insurgency in South Vietnam truly indigenous and self-sustained, international law would not be involved. But the fact is that it receives vital external support—in organization and direction, in training, in men, in weapons, and other supplies. That external support is unlawful, for a double reason. First, it contravenes general international law, which the United Nations Charter here expresses. Second, it contravenes particular international law: The 1954 Geneva Accords on Vietnam, and the 1962 Geneva Agreements on Laos.

In resisting the aggression against it, the Republic of Vietnam is exercising its right of self-defense. It called upon us and other states for assistance. And in the exercise of the right of collective self-defense under the United Nations Charter, we and other nations are providing such assistance.

The American policy of assisting South Vietnam to maintain its freedom was inaugurated under President Eisenhower, and continued under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson. Our assistance has been increased because the aggression from the north has been augmented. Our assistance now encompasses the bombing of North Vietnam. The bombing is designed to interdict, as far as possible, and to inhibit, as far as may be necessary, continued aggression against the Republic of Vietnam.

When that aggression ceases, collective measures in defense against it will cease. As President Johnson has declared: "* * * if that aggression is stopped, the people and Government of South Vietnam will be free to settle their own future, and the need for supporting American military action there will end."

The fact that the demarcation line between North and South Vietnam was intended to be temporary does not make the assault on South Vietnam any less of an aggression. The demarcation lines between North and South Korea and between East and West Germany are temporary. But that did not make the North Korean invasion of South Korea a permissible use of force.

Let's not forget the salient features of the 1962 agreements on Laos. Laos was to be independent and neutral. All foreign troops, regular or irregular, and other military personnel were to be withdrawn within 75 days, except a limited number of French instructors as requested by the Lao Government. No arms were to be introduced into Laos except at the request of that government. The signatories agreed to refrain "from all direct or indirect interference in the internal affairs" of Laos. They promised also not to use Lao territory to intervene in the internal affairs of other countries—a stipulation that plainly prohibited the passage of arms and men from North Vietnam to South Vietnam by way of Laos. An International Control Commission of three was to assure compliance with the agreements. And all the signatories promised to support a coalition government under Prince Souvanna Phouma.

What happened? The non-Communist elements complied. The Communists did not. At no time since that agreement was signed have either the Pathet Lao or the North Vietnam authorities complied with it. The North Vietnamese left several thousand troops there—the backbone of almost every Pathet Lao battalion. Use of the corridor through Laos to South Vietnam continued. And the Communists barred the areas under their control both to the Government of Laos and the International Control Commission.

To revert to Vietnam: I continue to hear and see nonsense about the nature of the struggle there. I sometimes wonder at the gullibility of educated men and the stubborn disregard of plain facts by men who are supposed to be helping our young to learn—especially to learn how to think.

Hanoi has never made a secret of its designs. It publicly proclaimed in 1960 a renewal of the assault on South Vietnam. Quite obviously its hopes of taking over South Vietnam from within had withered to close to zero—and the remarkable economic and social progress of South Vietnam contrasted, most disagreeably for the North Vietnamese Communists, with their own miserable economic performance.

The facts about the external involvement have been documented in white papers and other publications of the Department of State. The International Control Commission has held that there is evidence beyond reasonable doubt of North Vietnamese intervention.

There is no evidence that the Vietcong has any significant popular following in South Vietnam. It relies heavily on terror. Most of its reinforcements in recent months have been North Vietnamese from the North Vietnamese Army.

Let us be clear about what is involved today in southeast Asia. We are not involved with empty phrases or conceptions which ride upon the clouds. We are talking about the vital national interests of the United States in the peace of the Pacific. We are talking about the appetite for aggression—an appetite which grows upon feeding and which is proclaimed to be insatiable. We are talking about the safety of nations with whom we are allied—and the integrity of the American commitment to join in meeting attack. It is true that we also believe that every small state has a right to be unmolested by its neighbors even though it is within reach of a great power. It is true that we are committed to general principles of law and procedure which reject the idea that men and arms can be sent freely across frontiers to absorb a neighbor. But underlying the general principles is the harsh reality that our own security is threatened by those who would embark upon a course of aggression whose announced ultimate purpose is our own destruction. Once again we hear expressed the views which cost the men of my generation a terrible price in World War II. We are told that southeast Asia is far away—but so were Manchuria and Ethiopia. We are told that if we insist that someone stop shooting that that is asking them for unconditional surrender. We are told that perhaps the aggressor will be content with just one more bite. We are told that if we prove faithless on one commitment that perhaps others would believe us about other commitments in other places. We are told that if we stop resisting that perhaps the other side will have a change of heart. We were asked to stop hitting bridges and radar sites and ammunition depots with-

out requiring that the other side stop its slaughter of thousands of civilians and its bombings of schools and hotels and hospitals and railways and buses.

Surely we have learned over the past three decades that the acceptance of aggression leads only to a sure catastrophe. Surely we have learned that the aggressor must face the consequences of his action and be saved from the frightful miscalculation that brings all to ruin. It is the purpose of law to guide men away from such events, to establish rules of conduct which are deeply rooted in the reality of experience.

V

Before closing, I should like to turn away from the immediate difficulties and dangers of the situation in southeast Asia and remind you of the dramatic progress that shapes and is being shaped by expanding international law.

A "common law of mankind"—to use the happy phrase of your distinguished colleague, Wilfred Jenks—is growing as the world shrinks, and as the vistas of space expand. This year is, by proclamation of the General Assembly, International Cooperation Year, a year "to direct attention to the common interests of mankind and to accelerate the joint efforts being undertaken to further them." Those common interests are enormous and intricate, and the joint efforts which further them are developing fast, although perhaps not fast enough.

In the 19th century, the United States attended an average of one international conference a year. Now we attend nearly 600 a year. We are party to 4,300 treaties and other international agreements in force. Three-fourths of these were signed in the last 25 years. Our interest in the observance of all of these treaties and agreements is profound, whether the issue is peace in Laos, or the payment of United Nations assessments, or the allocation of radiofrequencies, or the application of airline safeguards, or the control of illicit traffic in narcotics, or any other issue which States have chosen to regulate through the lawmaking process. The writing of international cooperation into international law is meaningful only if the law is obeyed—and only if the international institutions which administer and develop the law function in accordance with agree procedures, until the procedures are changed.

Everything suggests that the rate of growth in international law—like the rate of change in almost every other field these days—is rising at a very steep angle.

In recent years the law of the sea has been developed and codified—but it first evolved in a leisurely fashion over the centuries. International agreements to regulate aerial navigation had to be worked out within the period of a couple of decades. Now, within the first few years of man's adventures in outer space, we are deeply involved in the creation of international institutions, regulations, and law to govern this effort.

Already the United Nations has developed a set of legal principles to govern the use of outer space and declared celestial bodies free from national appropriation.

Already nations, including the United States and the Soviet Union, have agreed not to orbit weapons of mass destruction in outer space.

Already the Legal Subcommittee of the United Nations Committee on Outer Space is formulating international agreements on liability for damage caused by the reentry of objects launched into outer space and on rescue and return of astronauts and space objects.

Already the first international sounding rocket range has been established in India and is being offered for United Nations sponsorship.

To make orderly space exploration possible at this stage, the International Telecommunications Union had to allocate radio frequencies for the purpose.

To take advantage of weather reporting and forecasting potential of observation satellites, married to computer technology, the World Meteorological Organization is creating a vast system of data acquisition, analysis, and distribution which depends entirely on international agreement, regulation and standards.

And to start building a single global communications satellite system, we have created a novel international institution in which a private American corporation shares ownership with 45 governments.

This is but a part of the story of how the pace of discovery and invention forces us to reach out for international agreement, to build international institutions, to do things in accordance with an expanding international and transnational law.

Phenomenal as the growth of treaty obligations is, the true innovation of 20th century international law lies more in the fact that we have nearly 80 international institutions which are capable of carrying out those obligations.

It is important that the processes and products of international cooperation be understood and appreciated; and it is important that their potential be much further developed. It is also important that the broader significance of the contributions of international cooperation to the solving of international problems of an economic, social, scientific and humanitarian character not be overestimated. For all the progress of peace could be incinerated in war.

Thus, the control of force in international relations remains the paramount problem which confronts the diplomat and the lawyer—and the man in the street and the man in the ricefield. Most of mankind is not in an immediate position to grapple very directly with that problem, but the problem is no less crucial. The responsibility of those, in your profession and mine, who do grapple with it is the greater. I am happy to acknowledge that this society, in thinking and debating courageously and constructively about the conditions of peace, continues to make its unique contribution and to make it well.

Comprehensive Land-Use Planning and the Public Domain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK E. MOSS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, at a recent Public Land Management Conference of the National Association of Counties, Mr. Irving Senzel, Chief of the Division of Lands and Minerals in the Bureau of Land Management, in Washington, D.C., made a very interesting and comprehensive statement concerning land use and planning in the public domain.

I ask unanimous consent that the address of Mr. Senzel be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMPREHENSIVE LAND-USE PLANNING AND THE PUBLIC DOMAIN

(By Irving Senzel, Chief, Division of Lands and Minerals, Bureau of Land Management, Washington, D.C.)

To get started right I'd better clarify a bit the title of my assignment. I believe that we all have a fairly consistent understanding of what we mean by land-use planning. That leaves "public domain" and "comprehensive" to be discussed.

PUBLIC DOMAIN

By "public domain," I refer to the lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management—some 180 million acres in the Western States and more than 250 million acres in Alaska. Other Federal lands no doubt also affect the nature of your land-use planning. However, my topic today is limited to BLM holdings.

COMPREHENSIVE

I can't get away so easily with the word "comprehensive." I can't use it entirely as I wish. This word is asserting itself more and more in Federal legislation and in the literature on planning. My understanding of the word as used in the law and literature can be approached somewhat as follows: Planning is not comprehensive if it omits consideration of any fact that pertains to your problem. The other way around, comprehensive planning requires consideration of every pertinent fact.

This is a large order and, for all intents and purposes, is really impossible. Comprehensive planning therefore, means to me an earnest attempt to consider in your problem as many related facts as possible. This adds a feeling of comfort to an otherwise forbidding task. It also recognizes that planning is a human endeavor, starting with the best you can do now and becoming bigger and better as you proceed.

COMPREHENSIVE LAND-USE PLANNING

Why is "comprehensive land-use planning" particularly pertinent to the public domain? The basic reason is that the lands are owned by a sovereign, the people of the United States, and this landlord is a peculiar type of landlord. It seeks to use its lands, not for profit, but for specific public benefits. It seeks to manage or dispose of its lands in what it calls "the public interest."

This may be to foster the economy, encourage industry, further public education, protect watersheds, and many others, in various combinations. These objectives are more or less clearly stated in the great body of law known as the public land laws and in many other laws related to them.

Comprehensive land-use planning for the public domain therefore means consideration of the many policies and programs enacted by the Congress and the activities of many Federal agencies carrying out the program. What has this to do with counties, and States and other State subdivisions? One reason is that the Congress has prescribed that many of its objectives must be accomplished by or through State and local governments—highways, wildlife, flood control, curbing or urban sprawl, acquisition and preservation of open space—to mention a few.

It would not do for the Federal Government and the States and local governments to work at cross purposes in its day-to-day activities. Comprehensive land use planning therefore requires consideration of the activities of all governmental levels.

COORDINATION REQUIRED

It is fairly easy to go on to show that comprehensive land-use planning is multidimensional. It requires coordination among agencies, coordination of various functions within agencies, coordination among governmental levels, coordination among areas.

Here again we get into what seems an impossible task—unless we take a reasonable view and again do the best we can. One way we can make the job manageable is to carefully delineate zones of major attention for each of the participants involved in a particular planning problem or situation.

Let's relate this view to comprehensive land-use planning by BLM and by the counties in relation to the public domain. In this situation, we can make a distinction between two classes of lands. One class is the lands which can be expected to be retained in Federal ownership for a given period for multiple use management. The other class would be the lands expected to be transferred to non-Federal ownership within a given period.

Many factors go into the determination of which lands fall in each class. The new public land legislation (Public Laws 88–606, 88–607, and 88–608) however gives us general guidelines for making these determinations. Our proposed regulations attempt to harmonize these guidelines with those in other laws and to create a background for evaluation and decision.

PRIMARY INTEREST FOR COUNTIES

This differentiation into two classes makes comprehensive land-use planning for BLM and for the counties much more manageable. The counties' prime interest is in the lands destined for disposal. They, of course, also have an interest in the other class too. On the other hand, the BLM's prime management interest is in the retention category. However, it also has important responsibilities in the disposal process.

A PRACTICAL APPROACH TO PLANNING

If each party will give, at the beginning at least, its prime attention to its prime area of interest, it can concentrate its initiative and its energies where they will yield the greatest return.

Each will then take a secondary or coordinating role in the land class of its secondary interest.

This approach will have another benefit. None of us can undertake now all the planning that is needed to do the best job possible. We must establish priorities, on the basis of taking most urgent things first. The approach I describe will permit selection of areas of most immediate attention. And the areas selected by each party for primary attention need not be the same.

Automatically each of us would be giving its major attention to areas of most concern to him. Thus in disposal areas, counties would concentrate their land-use mapping and zoning administration. BLM would participate as an interested property owner. In management areas, BLM would concentrate on plans for resource protection, management, and development. The counties would participate to the extent of their interest.

Admittedly, this is something less than comprehensive in an ideal sense. However, it meets the test from a practical point of view.

This approach would eliminate the need for total involvement in each other's planning processes. Cooperation would be needed only at those points where interests coincided. Where interests diverge, coordinated activities would cease. Otherwise, we'd be interfering in each other's business for no good purpose.

Doing things this way would also simplify machinery for coordination. For example, we can differentiate the various things which require close cooperation from those that merely require exchange of information. We'll have to work very closely on such things as sales under the new law and on planning for highway networks and their maintenance. Our recreation development plans would have to be harmonized to some detail. On the other hand, our range development plans will often be not more than general interest to you.

CONCLUSION

Finally, and perhaps most important, this plan for planning will not interfere with the more comprehensive aspects of our comprehensive land-use planning. In fact, it can coordinate with it and work within its framework. You can proceed with your 701 planning, your comprehensive recreation planning under the Land and Water Conservation Act, your general zoning program, and all the other types of planning you have to do without having to wait on us. We can proceed with our long-range planning and with our budgetary process without waiting for you or complicating your work. We have already undertaken pilot studies and other experimental work to see if this idea is sound. First evaluations, which we received from county and BLM officials the day before yesterday indicate that it will work and that it will benefit all of us.

Problems We Face in International Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, for years the prime Communist objective has been to drive this country to isolationism and force us to abandon our commitments throughout the world. The results of such a course would be disastrous to us as a nation and to the entire free world.

Dr. You Chan Yang, former Korean Ambassador to the United States and now executive vice president of the Korean Cultural and Freedom Foundation, Inc., addressed the Political Study Club on April 10 and discussed the problems that face us in international affairs today.

Dr. Yang's remarks make it quite clear that disunity and retreat spell death, but if we unite and stand fast, we need have no fear for the future.

ADDRESS BY DR. YOU CHAN YANG, FORMER KOREAN AMBASSADOR TO THE UNITED STATES, BEFORE THE POLITICAL STUDY CLUB, APRIL 10, 1965

Madam President Miller, officers of the Political Study Club, and distinguished guests, it is a privilege and a pleasure to address you today on a subject of paramount importance—a subject which is touching all of our lives. At the time Dienbienphu was about to fall, I went to the State Department and offered one division of Korean troops to assist the beleaguered French. Concurrently, Chiang Kai-shek made a similar offer of free Chinese forces. We planned to launch an offensive to divert Red Chinese supplies and forces from the Indochina front. The result of my effort was disappointing in that State advised me that no troops were desired but that, as an alternative, President Syngman Rhee was wanted in southeast Asia to serve as a symbol and rallying point for the people of the free world. President Rhee with heavier and more pressing commitments in his own country was unable to acquiesce to the American request.

Over the years the main Communist objective has been to drive the United States to isolationism, to force this Nation to abandon its international commitments and to withdraw its stalwart forces from their posts throughout the world. This Communist policy has been manifested by the notorious "Yankee go home" placards which have been displayed and by the same infamous message scrawled on walls and pavements. As a related tactic Communist agents have infiltrated institutions of higher learning all over the world and have enrolled students in cells espousing American isolationism and have indoctrinated innocent but well-meaning young men and women in ways and means of violent behavior against the United States. Over the years, denigration of the United States has been the principal topic of the Kremlin-Peiping axis and is now promulgated by each of them independently of the other.

On both sides of the Iron and Bamboo Curtains we have witnessed systematic attacks organized and led by Communists against American embassies, libraries, privately owned property, and the nationals of this country. For what purpose? The objective of these actions is again to force the United States into a posture of isolationism as a result of sheer disgust and revulsion.

Basic Communist aims are the withdrawal of economic and military assistance and the confinement of the American people to this continent. Under these circumstances the way would be paved for the Communists to continue their implacable steps toward world domination and to conquer without bloodshed by propaganda, infiltration and subversion. Should this day ever come, the security of the United States will have been obliterated. The final goal of the Communists is to dominate the industrial capacity, the natural resources and the productivity of America. If the United States permits the Communists to advance further toward their goal, this Nation will be woefully weak and helpless in the face of the ultimate onslaught.

The recent Communist attack upon the U.S. Embassy in Saigon with the attendant loss of life by unarmed civilians was heinous. We cannot accept such operations. There is a law of man's relationship to man and also a law of war. Honorable men do not violate either. There is a code of ethics, and there is a code of international relations with respect to the property and persons of a foreign government accredited to a resident government.

The allies of this great Nation around the world must recognize the fact that they have everything to lose and nothing to gain if the United States withdraws into isolationism. In this atomic age disunity spells death, but the unity of strength and determination of the free world will insure life and security.

For the record here and now, I should like to congratulate your great President, Lyndon B. Johnson, for his courage and determination, sometimes in the face of congressional discord and other times in the face of poignant tragedy brought on by the loss of American lives in Vietnam. He has stood steadfast in his noble determination to oppose the further encroachments of communism and to preserve an area of Asia as a portion of the free world. The example of the President has been emulated by the leaders of his administration and by such dedicated patriots as Senator THOMAS J. DODD, of Connecticut. Senator EVERETT M. DIRKSEN, of Illinois, has given steadfast evidence of his bipartisan support of the national determination enunciated by the President.

Let us examine for a moment the propriety of U.S. actions as contrasted with those of the Communists. Recently when American lives were lost and $30 million worth of aircraft were destroyed on the ground, were there anti-Communist demonstrations in the United States and elsewhere in the world? Why not? Are they scared? The Com-

munists deface an embassy or wreck a library and achieve millions of dollars worth of international publicity for their cause. The Americans make a diplomatic protest and in contrast receive the replacement of broken window panes and defaced walls. This is not quid pro quo. They reap a propaganda harvest and this great Nation receives, in the minds of their stooges, only another black eye.

Permit me to portray for you what will undoubtedly happen if peace is negotiated in Vietnam. In 1954 the Communists requested the convening of a Geneva Conference to settle the Korean question at a political level. At that time it was evident that a malevolent political trick was about to be perpetrated. This was manifestly evident to the Korean Government which declined to attend the conference. The terms of reference did not include plans for reunification of the country or the establishment of a free democratic government. At the specific request of the U.S. Government, I did attend as one of the representatives of the Republic of Korea.

However, I made one request that, after 2 months of negotiation with the Communists and if basic issues were not resolved for which the conference was called, the United States and Korean delegations would withdraw. The U.S. Government assented to this request. After a brief 2 weeks the U.S. delegation was convinced that the Communists did not come to Geneva to settle the Korean question but alternatively to lay the groundwork for further aggression in Vietnam. You are aware of the results of the debacle in Geneva. Korea today is a divided nation as is Vietnam, and 11 million residents of this latter nation have been brought under Communist domination and tyranny. It is good to know that the United States was not a signatory to this agreement. The so-called Geneva modus vivendi serves as but another example of the manner in which free nations are tricked into appeasement and concessions to the Communists.

Since 1954 it has come to my attention that many sincere and honest Americans favor the neutralization of Vietnam. They and all Americans should appraise the situation of a neighboring country—Laos. The experience of the Laotians serves as a frightful reminder of the fact that no neutrality could exist in the land immediately adjacent—Vietnam or anywhere else.

During the course of my stay in your Nation, I have traveled the length and breath of this great country, urging steadfast opposition to communism. Had the Korean war been won, there would be today no problem with the Communists in Korea, Vietnam, or in other nations of southeast Asia. The Korean war is the only war in which the United States has participated in its history which was not concluded by a decisive victory for your Nation. A stalemate in Korea has resulted in encouragement to the Communists to carry out their aggressive designs upon not only Indochina but also the Middle East and the continent of Africa.

After signing a cease-fire agreement in Korea, the United States is still maintaining 60,000 soldiers in a rugged line facing the ever-hostile Communists across a so-called demilitarized zone. The attitude and conduct of your troops has been punctiliously correct. On the other hand, the Communists continuously violate the armistice agreement and endeavor to infiltrate spies, saboteurs, and provocateurs into the free Republic of Korea. Viewed in the light of the correctness of American conduct, Communist provocations are each day becoming more intolerable.

What is the solution to the delemma with which the free world finds itself faced? It is not to be found in appeasement, concessions, or retreat either before a propaganda blast or after a politically motivated military assault.

We of the nations of the free world must be willing to hold hands in fellowship and determination to preserve our way of life. We must have understanding, appreciation, mutual respect, and an unshakeable determination to make secure what we hold dear. When a coach dispatches a football team to the field, he does not instruct the representatives of his alma mater not to cross the 50-yard line. No such restriction has been, and I doubt ever will be, placed upon the predatory forces of communism. They are out to win and to win for keeps. Unrealistic restrictions should not be imposed upon the forces of the free world who today, tomorrow, or 5 years from now may be called upon to defend their wives, children, and homes.

One of your greatest Presidents said freedom is for those who are strong enough and are willing to fight for it. Your forefathers set the pattern in 1776. If you remember to stand up and be counted, your precious freedom will be cherished by you and your children. I thank you.

Establishment of a Greek Theater in Ypsilanti, Mich.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT McNAMARA
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the establishment of a Greek theater in Ypsilanti, Mich., is nearing reality. I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from a newspaper article describing this unique theater be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM THE DETROIT FREE PRESS, APRIL 23, 1965, BY CURT HASELTINE

Ground will be broken early this summer in Ypsilanti, Mich., for the first Greek theater to be established outside of Greece since Euripides.

Although the exterior of the $4 million structure will be modern classic, the seating for 1,900 and the stage arrangement will be patterned after the classic theaters of Athens and Epidaurus.

The theater, designed by Architect Harry Weese & Associates of Chicago, will be located on the banks of the Huron River in downtown Ypsilanti.

The Ypsilanti Greek Theater group was organized in 1963 to provide a cultural center but the germ of the idea goes back more than a century to the man who gave Detroit its street plan.

Judge Augustus Woodward named Ypsilanti in 1825 in honor of Gen. Demetrius Ypsilanti, the "George Washington" of the 1820 Greek revolution against Turkish domination.

A statue of General Ypsilanti erected there in 1928 by the international order of AHEPA is the focal point of an annual pilgrimage commemorating Greece's fight for freedom.

Now the Ypsilanti Greek Theater, scheduled to open in 1966, will present classic Greek plays in English using specially commissioned translations to recapture the theatrical strength of the original plays.

The theater will not be devoted solely to Greek classic plays, but will also present folk songs and dances, operettas, musical comedies, and concerts.

It is also expected to serve in the interim periods between festivals as a civic auditorium for lectures and conventions.

The building will include a smaller theater with a seating capacity of 250 to be used as an auditorium for smaller groups. Plans also include a permanent library and study center with a collection of Greek art and sculpture with regularly scheduled exhibitions.

Alexis Solomos, for 14 years artistic director of the Greek National Theater in Athens, will serve as the first resident artistic director of the Ypsilanti Greek Theater.

A local fund drive toward the $4 million cost has already raised $200,000. Interest has also been shown in the project by the Greek and French Governments as well as AHEPA, the nationwide Greek organization of America.

The movement expects aid from the Greek Government and private individuals, and cultural organizations in Greece. The French consulate in Chicago has expressed interest in having French attractions in the festival cycles. AHEPA has agreed to a fund solicitation by the Ypsilanti Greek Theater among AHEPA members.

Mrs. Clara G. Owens, a teacher on leave of absence from the Wayne public school system, is the president and moving force behind the theater project. Stephen T. Spilos of Detroit is a vice president; Nicholas T. Georges, Detroit, treasurer.

The Ppsilanti site for the Greek theater is only 30 miles from Michigan's largest city by freeway (I–94); near the Eastern Michigan University campus and barely 10 minutes' drive from the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor, and less than a half hour from Greenfield Village, which is visited annually by more than 1 million travelers.

Further indications of success can be seen in a broad national renaissance stirred by the Lincoln Center of the Performing Arts in New York City, and the planned John F. Kennedy Memorial Center for the Arts in Washington, D.C.

It is felt that the Greek theater can do more for Ypsilanti than the Shakespearean festival has done for Stratford, Ontario, and that it can become a major U.S. cultural attraction for tourists from overseas.

Ku Klux Klan Disloyalty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues the following column by a fine newspaperman, Ralph McGill. I hope that loyalty to the country will increasingly prevail against the disloyal activities of the Ku Klux Klan:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 15, 1965]

FORMER KLANSMAN A GOOD PROPHET

(By Ralph McGill)

Bill Hendrix, of Oldsmar, Fla., after many years as a Klansman of high rank—such as, grand dragon and wizard—publicly announced retirement as head of the Southern Knights of the Ku Klux Klan in early January 1961.

He had to choose between loyalty to his country and the Klan, he said. And since the Klan had become an enemy of his country, by turning to dynamiting and other

forms of lawlessness, he felt that an honest American had no choice save to get out. He did.

Now, in 1965, Bill Hendrix has written the House Un-American Activities Committee offering his cooperation and suggesting the committee schedule a meeting in the Tampa or St. Petersburg area.

In this letter to the committee Mr. Hendrix said:

"While in Atlanta, Ga., in 1959 at a national Klan rally, those of our group withdrew from Klan activity and requested all Klan groups to disband. Later we gave out a story to Ralph McGill and he printed the story which had nationwide attention.

"We still say the Klan must operate outside the law under its present programs * * * I believe if you will look on your records you will find that the Southern Knights of the Ku Klux Klan has a long record. * * * We disbanded because we found that a Klan group could not operate without going outside the law. The very name Klan to many people today means working outside the law and many of the new Klan leaders know nothing about the law and care less.

"We believe that the southern politicians are to blame for the plight of the South and that such as Faubus, Barnett, and Wallace are wrong and are the cause of most of the unlawful actions now being practiced in the South."

In a postscript to the copy of his letter to the House committee, former Dragon Hendrix suggests that the original statement of withdrawal might be published. It is at hand.

Worried because a criminal element was obtaining control of some Klans, Hendrix said, 6 years ago:

"I can no longer agree to such things as bombing and burning schools and churches. * * * Twenty years ago when I joined the Klan I took an oath that I would obey and uphold the Constitution of the United States and its political subdivisions. All Klan members took that oath. * * * I stated frankly that under the law I saw no way out but to accept the court orders on segregation.

"'I am certainly for segregation' I told the Klansmen, 'and have said so from the public platform for more than 20 years. But, I am not going out and bomb and burn schools and commit crimes some people in the Klan are proposing. We of the Southern Knights hold the honor of not ever having had a member in trouble for violating the law. I want all you Klansmen to remember that you and I took the same oath. * * * I have held every office in the Klan and I know that the Klan is going to get lawless.'"

There is not room for all Hendrix's statement and letter of almost a decade ago. But he was a good prophet. The Federal Bureau of Investigation found ties with Klans in the bombing and killing of Sunday school children in Birmingham, in the horrible murder and hiding of the bodies of the three young civil rights workers in Mississippi, in the killing of an unoffending and unarmed woman on the highway between Selma and Montgomery, and in many other violent crimes.

Time was when decent men did get into the Klans. Most of them long ago saw, as did Bill Hendrix, that the several Klans were headed toward actions no decent American could condone. They got out.

We trust the House Un-American Activities Committee will use what help Hendrix can offer. Certainly the Klan, as President Johnson has said, and as the record demonstrates, is un-American in effect and action.

Management of News in the Southeast Asia Area

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, in his Saturday column for April 24, Dolph Simons, Jr., publisher of the Lawrence, Kans., Journal-World, comments in a very telling way on the management of news in the southeast Asia area.

I hope Mr. Simons continues to hit this critical subject—and I intend to share his comments with the Congress. Freedom of the press, and accurate news reportage, are essential to our national purposes all the time—just as much in time of war and danger as in time of peace.

Mr. Simons most recent column follows:

THE SATURDAY COLUMN
(By Dolph C. Simons, Jr.)

Reports issued the past 10 days at the American Society of Newspaper Editors meeting in Washington and at the American Newspaper Publishers Association's annual convention in New York can't help but make the public wonder if it is being told the truth or is being fed propaganda about the war in Vietnam.

There is no question but that U.S. officials in Washington and Saigon have tried their best to color, distort, and censor the news coming out of the Asian country. They have refused to allow American reporters into certain military areas, they do not allow American military personnel to talk to reporters and they have tried to attach misleading importance and evaluations to many situations. This is happening at both ends of the war, at the Pentagon and in Vietnam.

Unfortunately, the American public doesn't seem to concerned about this dangerous attempt by the Government to control the news even though American casualties are increasing week by week.

It is difficult to understand this lack of interest about Vietnam, since there's no question that America is going to become more and more involved, more men will be killed, the cost to American taxpayers will keep soaring, and there is the possibility this "limited" war could plunge Uncle Sam into an all-out war with China or Russia.

American newsmen are trying their best to report the war, but our own officials are not allowing the public to know what is going on. George Beebe, president of the Associated Press Managing Editors Association, pointed out the American public is not getting either "the full story or the true story" on the Vietnam war.

To make matters even worse, the U.S. Information Agency has been given the assignment of handling the press briefings in Saigon. This is an American propaganda agency set up to try to make the United States look good throughout the world, and here it is serving as the official voice of what is going on in Vietnam. USIA controls the military briefings and has set up regulations about news policies regarding air strikes, and the ground rules under which American newsmen have to operate. The Pentagon and the White House evidently not only approve of this controlled news, but are encouraging it.

How can the public have confidence in its Government and statements of its officials, whether it is about Vietnam or the cost of medicare, if Government spokesmen think it is all right to spoon-feed the public in the field of news? Various well-qualified spokesmen in Washington and New York hit hard at deliberate attempts by our Government to mislead the public by either withholding news or telling only part of a story.

When an elected Government official thinks he is powerful enough to control the news, censor the news and deliberately mislead the public, it's time to watch out. This is what happened in other countries prior to the ruthless takeovers of such men as Hitler, Peron and others.

The press is trying to report the news in Vietnam and to inform the public on what is actually taking place. American citizens are going to have to become more concerned over this censorship and voice their opinions to Representatives and Senators to bring about a change.

Reapportionment in Ohio—Issue No. 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. GILLIGAN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, in Ohio, next month, an election will occur which will determine to a large degree the civil rights of Ohio citizens, white and Negro, for many years to come.

The election in question concerns reapportionment of the State Legislature in Ohio, and is known as issue No. 3. This issue is a nonpartisan one, Mr. Speaker, and is concerned with the essential right of the majority of the people of Ohio to receive a majority of the legislative seats in the legislature. Compared below are the last three Ohio House of Representative election contests:

[In percent]

Year	Percentage majority party vote statewide	Percentage of House seats won by the majority party
1960	53	39
1962	53	36
1964	58	45

We see here, Mr. Speaker, that for the last three elections, the majority party, as indicated by the vote of the people of Ohio, received a minority of the seats in the legislature.

If this had happened in any of the undemocratic nations of the world, where electoral systems are rigged by tyrants and demagogs to assure minority rule, we would be shocked. The citizens of such countries would look upon their electoral systems as unworkable shams,

and would finally lose faith in their leaders and in democracy.

We in the United States, despite our traditions of freedom, democracy, and majority rule, have suffered for many years in our States under rigged and basically undemocratic systems. We suffered until finally the Supreme Court found it necessary to declare the doctrine, "one citizen, one vote." The Court found that the U.S. Constitution basically requires an electoral system under which a majority of the voters would actually elect a majority of the representatives in our States.

Now the State of Ohio proposes a reapportionment amendment, which has been widely publicized as a reform, but which is in fact the worst kind of political outrage.

Why do I say this? Let me recount how the proposed amendment to the Ohio constitution was conceived and submitted to the people.

Within days after the previous legislature in Ohio was voted out of office in November 1964, it was called back into session, into a lame duck special session. Responsible to no one, desirous of protecting the old system of minority rule against the newly elected legislature, the very legislators who had been repudiated at the polls proceeded to put issue No. 3 on the ballot for May 1965.

The story of how they did it should shock every believer in American democratic processes.

First, there was no reason to hold such a special session. Only 2 months later the new legislature would meet, and could have dealt with this problem.

Second, the leadership of the entrenched minority which had been defeated by the voters only days before, decided upon their tactics in secret, and drafted a resolution which was to be placed on the ballot as an amendment to the Ohio constitution.

They held hearings, Mr. Speaker, on a resolution which was not printed for distribution, the details of which were known only to a favored few. Most of the members of their own group did not know what was in the resolution. The opposition party was not told, nor was the public.

Then came the vote on the issue. Though it seems unbelievable, copies of the bill were not given to the members of the legislature who were being asked to vote.

What is issue No. 3 like, Mr. Speaker? Let us consider it in the light of our magnificent political tradition of "the rule of law and not of men." The Legislative Service Commission of Ohio, realizing that documents such as the Ohio constitution must not be open to manipulation, issued a study on September 10, 1964, which said in part that "the constitutional provisions should be as explicit and extensive as possible in prescribing actions for future apportionments." Does issue No. 3 measure up to that requirement? It does not.

First, there is proposed by issue No. 3 the establishment of an apportionment board—made up in part of men who hold elective office—will be permitted to draw the lines of legislative districts without any exact formula. This board could determine by itself, within a wide range, the very size of future legislatures. It would design legislative district lines which would cut across county lines in determining noncity districts, and no rural or city district is safe from the worst kind of gerrymandering.

Second, the phrases which deal with some of the most important aspects of the bill are so elastic as to permit, and even to assure the worst kind of backroom political manipulation.

For example, one phrase states that:

Districts shall (b) * * * as similar in economic and community interests as possible.

What does that mean? It can mean virtually anything the board wishes it to mean.

Another phrase states that a county which has a population "less than but substantially equal to a ratio" may receive one representative. I looked in the dictionary for a definition of "substantially," Mr. Speaker. The definition was "ample to satisfy." Ample to satisfy whom? Could such a phrase ever satisfy any lawyer working with the simplest legal paper? Of course not.

Still another phrase states that previous district lines "shall be respected to the fullest extent possible." How far will that be? No one can know.

And those who propagandize for issue No. 3 say that if Ohioans do not vote for the amendment, it will be up to the Federal courts to settle the matter. This, too, is the ugliest kind of falsehood. We have a legislature now sitting, Mr. Speaker, and it is likely that it will be sitting after May 4. It is a legitimate legislature, and there is no reason why it can not do the job of giving Ohioans a decent amendment to be voted on in the November elections.

In the past few months we have witnessed brutalities in Selma and Birmingham which have aroused the conscience of America. Negroes in Alabama have sought only the chance to vote, and to have their vote count. They had the election systems rigged against them, and all Americans protested. But the same kind of outrage is being proposed in Ohio, Mr. Speaker. The electoral system will be rigged so as to frustrate the right of the people to vote—and to have their votes count equally.

The people of Ohio, Mr. Speaker, believe fully in the democratic processes. They want an electoral system in which every man's vote counts as much as the next man's—no more and no less. They want an electoral system which will mean true majority rule, that will mean that a party winning a majority of the votes will win a majority of the seats in the legislature. They are sick and tired of sleazy political gimmicks like issue No. 3, and at the polls on May 4, they will defeat issue No. 3.

Union City After 40

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, April 23, 1965, the Jersey Journal, a leading newspaper published in my district, took editorial notice of the 40th anniversary of the consolidation of Union Hill and West Hoboken into the city of Union City.

Like much of the district which I have the honor to represent, Union City is not new. As the editorial mentions, it has been plagued by most of the ills that beset 19th-century cities attempting to function in our 20th-century world.

Today, under the able leadership of Mayor William V. Musto, Union City is undergoing a renaissance. The future has never looked brighter for this city. On this 40th anniversary, I salute Union City and its capable chief executive, William V. Musto.

I think the Union City story should interest all members who serve an urban-industrial area.

The editorial follows:

UNION CITY AFTER 40

It is 40 years since Union Hill and West Hoboken were consolidated into the city of Union City.

A recent Jersey Journal feature story recalls still-visible reminders of the old names. Most prominent is Union Hill High School. Before he retired last year as superintendent of the city's public schools, William G. Fiedler foresaw the school's eventual replacement with a centralized high school (also incorporating Emerson High School, which has serviced the old West Hoboken section).

Until 8 years ago, due to differences in debts incurred before consolidation, seperate tax rates were maintained for Union Hill and West Hoboken.

Union Hill was a nickname due to its geographic location atop the Palisades. Its official name was the Town of Union.

Union City was the "union station" of the trolley car era. Its center was Transfer Station, at Summit Avenue and Seventh Street, in the West Hoboken section. Another major transfer point was at 48th Street, next to the old Pastime Theater (since renamed) in Union Hill.

Not until after World War II was the trolley eliminated from such narrow streets as New York and Bergenline Avenues, two of the city's major thoroughfares.

Union City had a big silk industry, too. The industry's decline threw thousands out of work in the late 1920's. Further ratables were lost with the cutting of the Lincoln Tunnel approach through the center of the city.

Today, Union City is being revitalized under Mayor William V. Musto's "Operation Rehabilitation." After years of effort, the city obtained air rights to permit construction of business and apartment buildings over the tunnel cut. A tour through city streets shows much other evidence of a city on the move.

And, after 40 years, consolidation is still a timely word. Mayor Musto seeks the con-

solidation of all Hudson County into one big city as the best answer in groping with urban problems. He would settle, for now, for a North Hudson-wide consolidation.

Union City has weathered the storms of the past 40 years—and this gives much promise for the future.

Dr. Stewart G. Fletcher Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN H. DENT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased, as I am sure my fellow Westmorelanders were, to read the editorial in the Latrobe Bulletin, entitled "A Distinguished Honor," which follows:

A DISTINGUISHED HONOR

A distinguished honor has been bestowed upon Dr. Stewart G. Fletcher, vice president and technical director of Latrobe Steel Co.

He is the president-elect of the American Society for Metals, assuming his post in October.

Not only is it a distinction for Dr. Fletcher, it is a significant honor for his company and for the Greater Latrobe area.

The American Society for Metals is one of the foremost professional organizations in the world and one which has high qualifications for membership.

To become its chief executive officer is an outstanding honor.

Composed of the leading men in the metals industry in America, the ASM is ever so particular in selecting its president.

Although they are not written as such, the ASM has certain qualifications for its president. He must be an individual who is highly respected in his field, has an outstanding record in his field, is representative of the ideals and objectives of the ASM and is capable of contributing to the metals industry through his expert knowledge.

Obviously, Dr. Fletcher fits these prerequisites, as attested by his election to the organization's highest office.

There are 125 local chapters of the ASM in the United States and Dr. Fletcher's duties as president will require him to visit most of them, during which time he will deliver technical papers relating to the metals industry.

Latrobe Steel Co. is one of the leading firms in the specialty steel industry. And Dr. Fletcher has been part of the effort which has placed Latrobe Steel among the leaders in this industry.

He is one of America's outstanding researchers in the metals business, and has been acclaimed for a number of developments in the manufacture of specialty steels.

Unquestionably his superiors and his fellow workers at Latrobe Steel are proud of Dr. Fletcher.

The Latrobe district should be equally as proud.

Congratulations, Dr. Fletcher.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to publicly congratulate Dr. Fletcher for al. the citizens of our community who share in this honor and award of achievement.

Mr. Speaker, this honor is shared by the Latrobe Steel Co. and all its employees and officers who have been associated with Dr. Fletcher whose contributions have made Latrobe Steel one of the top leaders in this industry.

Absentee Voting by Servicemen—A Bill To Amend the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 26, 1965

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, the question of servicemen's voting was raised during the press conference held by Secretary McNamara. Since 1950, Mr. Speaker, I have carried out everything within my capacity to encourage servicemen voting and to facilitate their voting. The services know this, or should know it. The proper committees involved have been questioned and have been requested to pass my resolution. Action was taken on one occasion but this action was limited.

Finally, after much prodding on my part, the Department of Defense issued a directive on absentee voting. They can do it now if they desire—and the following resolution is explanatory of the proper method.

Mr. Speaker, I have sent a copy of my resolution together with the following letter to the Secretary of Defense and I hope that he will see that a good directive is issued and put into operation.

The letter and resolution follow:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 26, 1965.

Hon. ROBERT S. MCNAMARA,
Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I was very happy that I took the time to listen to your press conference on April 26 and I commend you for your informative and concise answers.

One of the questions raised at your press conference was one involving servicemen's voting to which you replied you would look into this issue. In an endeavor to be helpful, I wish to call to your attention that for many years I have been deeply concerned regarding servicemen's right to vote. One of the resolutions I introduced in the 86th Congress recommended "in hand" delivery of military ballot applications to all members of the Armed Forces.

For many years I have introduced the enclosed bill to provide for "in hand" delivery of military ballot applications to all servicemen. This application would be an ordinary postal card which when signed by the serviceman would be returned to his home State and a commission would see that he received his proper absentee ballot in order to vote. By "in hand" delivery I mean that the same method of giving the serviceman his personal mail would be followed in giving him a post-card application. In 1955 a Federal Voting Assistance Act was enacted into law but it only pertained to national elections. Under this act a serviceman could request an application from his commanding officer. You can imagine how few boys in far-off lands would make this request.

New York State has a division for servicemen's voting which is bipartisan. The Democratic director of this division, the Honorable Neil M. Lieblich, who is a personal friend as well as a neighbor of mine, has over the years helped me submit this problem. Unfortunately, Mr. Lieblich is very ill at the present time. Commissioner Lieblich came to Washington on many occasions and spoke with Mr. Platt, deputy coordinator of the Federal voting assistance program of the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower), and I am sure that their file is as voluminous as mine on this subject.

The latest action on this was that Mr. Platt informed me that the Department of Defense issued a directive providing that in all general elections occurring on even-numbered years, a Federal post card application for an absentee ballot would be issued by delivery in hand to all Armed Forces personnel of voting age. However, there is a problem involved in that there being no general elections in odd-numbered years in many States, no provision is provided for delivery of applications to residents of those States of the Union which do conduct general elections in odd-numbered years.

I am so bold to suggest that one of your people look into the absentee ballot program for the State of New York and study this procedure with a view toward issuing a directive in line with this method as I feel it is a foolproof one.

Military ballots are important as it as been found that with the increase in servicemen voting many close elections have been decided by this vote.

I plan to speak on the House floor regarding this matter and your comments on this subject would be appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

———.

H.R. 1045

A bill to amend the Federal Voting Assistance Act of 1955

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 203 of the Act entitled "An Act making recommendations to the States for the enactment of legislation to permit and assist Federal personnel, including members of the Armed Forces, and their families, to exercise their voting franchise, and for other purposes", enacted August 9, 1955 (69 Stat. 589), is amended by striking out "made available" in the second, third, and fourth sentences of clause (2) and inserting in lieu thereof, in each of such sentences, "delivered in hand".

Inadequate Postal Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the United States recently sent two men around the earth in 90 minutes. But we cannot deliver a letter in some areas in this country in less than 2 weeks or maybe longer. I think there is quite a contrast in the type of management exhibited by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the Post Office Department. It would appear that the Post Office Department is lagging behind the space age.

The American people applauded our space shots, but they are not applauding our present mail service. This is evidenced by the hundreds of letters I have received since I requested hearings into the problem of inadequate and inefficient postal service.

I bring to the attention of my colleagues a few more of the many letters

I have received from postal patrons in every part of the United States:

PHOENIX, ARIZ., *April 6, 1965.*

Hon. GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CUNNINGHAM: After having read March 23, 1965, issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I decided perhaps I could top all the letters for slow delivery.

Enclosed is outside of letter mailed November 10, 1964, as you can see. This letter was received in Tempe, Ariz., just 14 days later and a distance of approximately 9 miles. In my opinion 2 days would have been ample time for delivery.

Any improvement that can be achieved through your efforts will be greatly appreciated.

Respectfully,

——— ———.

WESTPORT, CONN.,
April 22, 1965.

Hon. GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CUNNINGHAM: I understand that hearings "on the quality of U.S. mail service" are to be held in Washington and I wish to register with you my protest about the exceedingly poor quality of the service.

Everyone's mail is important but when one is engaged in a great variety of community projects, as I am, it is especially so. Deadlines of various kinds are commonplace in my activities—notices of meetings, reports, immediate answers, etc.—and prompt mail service is imperative.

I could give you a list of instances that would fill several pages where my mail has been anywhere from 2 weeks to 6 months overdue, in no larger an area than my own county plus the two adjoining counties of New Haven and Hartford.

In addition, the condition of magazines, periodicals, packages, etc., is often deplorable. A package of printed stationery which I ordered from New York was delivered to me so badly crushed that it was unusable, even though the box had been enclosed in the customary outer mailing carton.

I hope that something constructive will develop from your committee's work. It is about time we had better service.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ——— ———.

SANTURCE, P.R.,
April 3, 1965.

Representative GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CUNNINGHAM: I read in the New York Times of your subcommittee's investigation of the mail service. I do hope you will be able to include Puerto Rico in this investigation. As you may know, service here is impossible. It can take 3 weeks for a first-class letter to go from Arecibo to San Juan (50 miles away). Two weeks can be the time for an airmail letter to reach San Juan from Buffalo, N.Y.

I have written to the postmaster here but have never received a reply. Perhaps my letter never reached him.

The service here is so slow and erratic that the smallest improvement would be welcome.

Yours truly,

Mrs. ——— ———.

ST. PAUL, MINN.

Representative GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CUNNINGHAM: An article in U.S. News & World Report said you were a member of the House Subcommittee on Postal Operations and with others listed near the article. I, too, have a "gripe" on the way our mail is handled. I sent cookies to my Air Force son when he was in England and they came through nicely—about 8 years ago. Now I have another son in California, and each time they reach him not as cookies—just crumbs. A parcel sent to Glenview, Ill., to another son, was crushed, precious colored slides of the grandchildren lost, as well as other articles in the box. We pack them well, wrap securely, use 3M tape they use on huge cartons—but the box is so crushed, things slip out between the tape strips.

Again, it takes 3 days for a letter from here to Minneapolis—just across the river from us. It all must be in the handling at the post office. I can't understand it.

Sincerely,

Mrs. ——— ———.

OSWEGO, N.Y.,
April 10, 1965.

Hon. GLENN CUNNINGHAM,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have been following through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD your fight to achieve a better, more efficient postal system. I wholeheartedly endorse your aims.

In the last few years, especially, the quality of the postal service has noticeably declined. Our family has had several distasteful experiences with service, but I would like to mention just one.

I am a member of the Columbia Record Club. It uses a procedure whereby a dated card is sent the customer every month. If this card is not returned before the date printed on it, you receive the "current selection," which may or may not be the record you desire. Two months ago I received a card which I returned promptly with a check for the record I desired. But apparently the card never arrived there because I never received the canceled check. I received a record I did not desire, and am forced to pay for it.

Please carry on the good work.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

Voting Bill Evils Compounded

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I request unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an outstanding editorial on voting rights.

Printed on the same editorial page and continued on the opposite page was S. 1564, the Senate committee voting rights bill of 1965. The editor refers to this bill in his editorial.

This editorial, taken from the April 14, 1965, issue of the Knoxville Journal, Knoxville, Tenn., and written by Mr. Guy Smith, editor, contains a great deal of food for thought and should receive the careful study of each Member of this Congress:

VOTING BILL EVILS COMPOUNDED

On this and the opposite page of today's issue is reproduced the text of a bill—(S. 1564)—"to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States." It will be recognized by readers as a revision by the Senate Judiciary Committee of the original version sent to Congress by the Justice Department with the blessing of the President.

The Judiciary Committee voted the bill out in twice its original wordage but in a version which compounded both the unconstitutional and discriminatory—so far as the States made its target are concerned—features of the original model.

Some readers may ask themselves the question as to why the Knoxville Journal since March 15 has devoted so much space in this column and in other columns to this legislation. We printed the text of the original version as submitted by the President, ready-written by U.S. Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach. (This represented an unusual procedure because ordinarily the President outlines his objectives and delegates to Congress the function of actually drawing a measure to fulfill them.) Subsequently we published the text of an alternative bill introduced in the House by Republican Representatives GERALD FORD and WILLIAM MCCULLOCH. Today we are providing for readers a text of the revised bill as approved by a majority of the Senate Judiciary Committee. To answer the question raised at the beginning of this paragraph: We have devoted all this space to this bill for the benefit of the minority of our readers who will take the trouble to examine the provisions of any piece of legislation because this bill is not only the most radical but is also the most blatantly unconstitutional measure ever seriously considered by a U.S. Congress.

LAUNCHED ON EMOTIONAL CREST

Launched at the crest of emotions generated by bruitality of police and State troopers in Alabama, the legislation was suspect from the outset.

Attorney General Katzenbach testified on March 23, 1965, before the Senate Judiciary Committee "the judicial process upon which all existing remedies (for discrimination against minority groups in their voting rights—EDITOR) depend in institutionally inadequate to deal with practices so deeply rooted in the social and political structure."

This was a significant statement for any lawyer, but especially for the chief law enforcement officer in the Federal Government, to make in disparagement of the Nation's judicial processes.

It was especially noteworthy in view of the strides which have been made during the past decade by Federal courts in advancing school integration and other objectives designed to give the Negro his long withheld rights to citizenship.

What the Katzenbach statement meant, as the bill sent to the House originally bore out, was that the Johnson administration had adopted the impatience of Rev. Martin Luther King with constitutional processes and now intended to have a bill enacted that would, in its judgment, do the job no matter to what extent it contravened the provisions of the Constitution. The administration decided to take this step, it will be noted, with deliberate purpose, because every objective of the bill, the text of which is printed elsewhere on this page, is already on the books as a result of legislation enacted by Congress in 1957, 1960, and 1964. The difference now is that the President has committed himself to a course of action which will substitute determinations by the U.S. Attorney General for adjudications by the Federal courts. Such substitution will give him greater political powers than those of the President himself, but presumably it will apply them only in 10 or 11 States including Tennessee. The other 10 States made targets of this bill are Texas, Arkansas, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, South Carolina, Virginia, parts of North Carolina, and perhaps Alaska.

NOTEWORTHY REVISION

The most noteworthy revision in the text of the bill under discussion as printed on

this page is that in section 4(b) which reads as follows (provisions added by the committee are single quoted):

"(b) The provisions of subsection (a) shall apply in any State or in any political subdivision of a State which (1) the Attorney General determines maintained on November 1, 1964, any test or device, and with respect to which (2) the director of the census determines (A) that less than 50 per centum of the persons, other than aliens and persons in active military service and their dependents, of voting age residing therein were registered in November 1, 1964, or that less than 50 per centum of such persons voted in the Presidential election of November 1964 and '(B) that according to the 1960 census, more than 20 per centum of the persons of voting age were nonwhite; or, (3), notwithstanding the foregoing (1) and (2), the director of the census, determines, by a survey made upon the request of the Attorney General that the total number of persons of any race or color who are registered to vote in any State or political subdivision is less than 25 per centum of the total number of all persons of such race or color of voting age residing in such State or political subdivision.'

"A determination or certification of the Attorney General or of the Director of the Census under this section or under section 6 shall be final and effective upon publication in the Federal Register."

This is the section which can trigger enforcement action which is to empower the U.S. Attorney General to take over registration and voting in any State covered by this sly voting formula.

The triggering process does not depend, however, upon court action but throughout the bill is replete with such phrases as "if the Attorney General determines." This means that enforcement of the law becomes a matter of choice, or whim, or personal belief on the part of one man rather than upon a showing of fact before a court of jurisdiction. For that matter, a court of jurisdiction is specified in the bill, in that cases arising out of enforcement processes can be heard only by a Federal court located in Washington. No ordinary Federal court or three-judge panel of Federal judges elsewhere in the Nation can pass upon legal questions growing out of this measure.

DISCRIMINATION ON LITERACY TESTS

It will also be noted by the reader that the new bill permits literacy or other tests already on the books in 30 States to stand while, in the target States listed above, no person is barred from participation in voting even if he is a convicted felon or an admitted moron. In other words, Federal registrars would presumably register and vote thousands of persons in the 10 or 11 States named who could not possibly exercise the voting franchise in any of the remaining States of the Union. This is as iniquitous a form of discrimination as that which has been practiced against the Negro in Alabama and Mississippi for many years.

If, in truth, constitutionality is not a factor in the deliberations of Congress in a voting rights bill, then we may appropriately continue to contend for a bill which would meet the following three requirements:

1. Strike down eligibility requirements for voting in all States.

2. Establish a uniform system of registration in all States based primarily on the voter's ability to sign his own name.

3. Include a new provision which would upon complaint of a certain number of citizens call for a Federal investigation of voting practices in such areas as Chicago, with appropriate penalty provided for buying and selling votes, or the use of coercion related or unrelated to Federal grants of relief or other handouts.

With the exception of the third contention in the above, what we are advocating was pretty well embodied in the GOP bill introduced in the House as an alternative to the Johnson bill.

The point made here is that, if we are to have under all circumstances a bill which is unconstitutional, then let it be unconstitutional with reference to all States rather than to just 11 or 12.

The Virginia Commission on Constitutional Government and other similar organizations have cited countless instances in which the first bill submitted by the President would violate the Constitution. This revision, as we said above, compounds such violations. The trouble with these objections and all similar ones is that President Johnson and the majority in Congress are no longer concerned about constitutionality. Nor presumably is the majority of the Supreme Court which on March 15 attended a joint session of Congress and were observed on television to nod approval and applaud when in broad strokes the President outlined the bill he would send to Congress and solemnly demanded of that body immediate action.

Dams Are for People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE F. SENNER, JR.
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. SENNER. Mr. Speaker, recently, I expressed to my colleagues the conviction that construction of Marble and Bridge Canyon Dams in Arizona, as part of the Lower Colorado River Basin project, will not drown the Grand Canyon. In fact, ample evidence is available to show that no such destruction will occur.

On the contrary, construction of the dams will make more accessible to tourists magnificent vistas that can now be enjoyed by only a small handful of adventurers.

Subsequent to my statement Mr. Rich Johnson, president of the Central Arizona Project Association, prepared some remarks and a map which clearly demonstrate the need for Bridge and Marble Canyon Dams. Mr. Johnson further illustrates with great definition that construction of the dams will have no deleterious effect on the Grand Canyon.

I urge my colleagues to study Mr. Johnson's observations with the care and thoughtfulness they certainly deserve.

The remarks of Mr. Rich Johnson follow:

DAMS ARE FOR PEOPLE

There is opposition to construction of Bridge Canyon and Marble Canyon Dam on the Colorado River. It is inspired primarily by the Sierra Club and the National Parks Association. Both of these private organizations are dedicated solely to the preservation of scenery without regard for the other basic needs of people which must be met by wise development of the Colorado River's resource potential.

The attacks made on Bridge Canyon and Marble Canyon Dams are intended to arouse emotional reaction among people who are poorly informed or misinformed concerning the need for and the true nature of the two dams.

If successful, the opposition will block an essential water supply development desperately needed by 23,000,000 people in the 7 States of the Colorado River Basin.

Facts do not support the arguments used to oppose Bridge Canyon and Marble Canyon Dams.

Here are some of the facts needed by the public for understanding why the two dams should and must be built:

NO DAMS IN THE PARK

The site for Bridge Canyon Dam is at the headwaters of Lake Mead, above Hoover Dam, on the Colorado River. It is 80.8 river miles below the western boundary of Grand Canyon National Park, and 53.7 miles below the western boundary of Grand Canyon National Monument.

The lake behind Bridge Canyon Dam will be completely within a narrow canyon that varies from 1,500 to 3,000 feet in sheer cliff depth. At no point would water rise to more than one-third of that depth, and the lake's extreme upstream reach would end well below Kanab Creek, which is a few miles inside the park's most inaccessible area.

The beautiful Havasu Falls are well above the lake's highest level. The only difference Bridge Canyon Dam would make is that more people would be able to visit the falls to enjoy them.

Bridge Canyon Dam and its lake will enhance the value of both Grand Canyon Monument and the park, by making some of the river's most spectacular scenery accessible to a greater number of people by boat.

The National Parks Service reports that "* * * the Bridge Canyon Reservoir would become a new recreation attraction of the region. This wild and presently relatively inaccessible area would be opened to large numbers of people who will want to take boat trips on a fjordlike reservoir set in the incomparable scenery of the Grand Canyon."

THE PRIVILEGED 400

The Sierra Club represents the right of the 400 people who shot the rapids by boat in this part of the river in 1962, and opposes the right of the 500,000 people who the Park Service believes would enjoy the area each year if Bridge Canyon Dam is built. To protect the right of the 400 the Sierra Club would also prevent development of the river's resources so desperately needed by millions of people.

The site of Marble Canyon Dam is above Grand Canyon National Park completely outside the park's boundaries. No water will be diverted from the river at that point. The purpose of the dam is to generate hydroelectric power as a contribution to the financial feasibility of the Lower Colorado River Basin project. To serve this purpose, the water let down from Glen Canyon Dam above must pass through the turbines at Marble Dam and thus continue its flow through Grand Canyon National Park.

The National Park Service officially commented in 1963 that Marble Canyon Dam would have no appreciable effect on Grand Canyon National Park.

With both Bridge Canyon and Marble Canyon Dams built, there will be 104 miles of wild streamflow between them.

Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall, one of the most ardent and effective champions of conservation and wilderness preservation since Theodore Roosevelt, endorses construction of both Bridge Canyon and Marble Canyon Dams.

Opponents of these two dams charge that they are unnecessary because the power to lift and deliver water from the river can be generated at even less cost by steam-powered turbines than by water-powered turbines for which the dams must be built.

Two false ideas are involved in this argument against Bridge and Marble Dams.

HYDROELECTRIC POWER REQUIRED

First. The electricity is not needed simply to operate water pumps. It is required also for sale at a rate sufficiently above the cost of producing the electricity to make a substantial contribution toward repayment of

construction costs of both the water delivery and system and the dams and generators. If this is not done, the cost of the water to the users would be so high that the economy of the area would suffer.

Second. In the power market steam-generated power and hydropower generated at dams are of a very different kind and value.

Steamplants require the burning of some fuel such as coal to heat water in a boiler, thus generating steam which then turns the electric turbines. Efficiency demands that this kind of plant be kept in operation once it is started. Great heat is required, and if the steam is not used to turn the turbines the heat and the expensive fuel are wasted.

Some electricity is always in use, and this market demand is called the baseload. Steam generation of base load electricity is well suited to this kind of demand.

But demand for electricity is not the same at all times of the day or the year. In a predictable pattern the demand rises above the baseload, or average. When this happens it is essential that more power be generated immediately, and that when the demand again falls back to the baseload the supply be reduced to that level.

HYDROPOWER WASTES NO FUEL

The generation of electricity by water flowing through a turbine can be started simply by opening a control valve, and stopped simply by closing a valve. There is no waste of fuel or water.

Electricity produced by water power fills a special need in the market, and distributors pay a higher price for it in order to satisfy their customers. The free enterprise economic law of supply and demand is involved.

Thus, hydroelectric power produced at dams by the power of falling water provides more money than can possibly be provided by fuel-fired steamplants to help pay for water projects and hold the costs of water at a level which its users can afford to pay.

In the desert southwest water is the most basic need of people; more important than electricity. But the two resources developed and used in a financial partnership support and complement each other to the best possible advantage of the people who live in the region.

Electricty generated by fuel-fired steamplants does not meet the requirements of the partnership under existing conditions.

The real issue is further confused by opponents of Bridge and Marble Dams with the argument that water shortages in Arizona, California, and the whole southwest can be met by desalting sea water.

DESALTED SEA WATER NO SOLUTION

There are no facts to backup such a claim. There is no known process at this time by which sea water can be desalted at a cost which permits general widespread use.

The goal of the sea water desalting program in the Department of the Interior is to reduce the processing cost to 30 cents per 1,000 gallons. This goal has not been reached. But if it ever is reached, it means that the cost of desalted sea water would be more than $98 per acre-foot at the oceanside plant site.

This water delivered into Arizona would cost a minimum of $200 per acre-foot in combined processing and delivery costs. At that cost it would be unusable.

Feather River water delivered to the Los Angeles area by the project now under construction in that State will be sold at $75 per acre-foot. It is far cheaper to move large volumes of water long distances from areas of surplus than it is to desalt sea water, and there is no evidence at present of any real breakthrough in the technique of desalting that would reduce the cost to a level competitive with the cost of transporting existing fresh water even over great distances.

Desalted sea water is economically practical only by coastal cities which have no other source of fresh water available. It holds no promise of solving water problems of any inland area in the foreseeable future.

Pilot's Skill Averts Red China Incident

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, acts of valor stir our hearts and quicken us with pride for the achievements of our American military force. Recently there was averted in the troubled Far East by the personal bravery and trained skill of a single man an incident with the most serious implications.

News Reporter Bob Considine has told the story well, and I request permission to insert in the RECORD at this point the article which appeared in the Baltimore News American on March 30, 1965, entitled "Marylander Is Hero—Pilot's Skill Averts Red China Incident."

MARYLANDER IS HERO—PILOT'S SKILL AVERTS RED CHINA INCIDENT

(By Bob Considine)

NEW YORK, March 30.—In the troubled skies of the Far East last week the professional skill and rare courage of a U.S. Air Force fighter pilot averted what could have been an extremely dangerous international incident. The drama took place at an altitude of 5 miles when two F–105 Thunderchiefs were making a routine flight from Kadena Airbase, Okinawa, to Taiwan for a maintenance check.

Lead pilot was Capt. Marvin L. Montgomery of Winter Park, Fla., a veteran jet-man fresh from combat in Vietnam. Wingman was Capt. William B. Burkitt, of Madison, Md.

After passing their second reporting point en route to Taiwan Captain Montgomery failed to make his required position report. Burkitt radioed across the 150 feet that separated the two fighters and asked why. There was no reply. Burkitt edged his Thunderchief in for a closer look.

Montgomery was unconscious. His head drooped over his controls. His fighter, which was traveling at nearly 650 miles per hour, was on automatic pilot. His position had changed. He was headed for Red China. No amount of urgent shouts into his earphones roused the stricken pilot.

Burkitt radioed Okinawa. A flight of F–4 C's scrambled and two airborne KC–135 jet tankers changed course and headed for the strange and frightening scene in the sky. Then Burkitt nuzzled his wing against that of his stricken buddy and tried to change his dangerous course. But every time he managed to pull off this incredibly delicate feat, the automatic pilot put Montgomery's plane back on its original course.

Desperate now, Burkitt tried another maneuver, one based on the aerodynamic principle of disturbed airflow. He moved his Thunderchief to the opposite side, the China side, of his flight leader. Then very delicately, he overlapped wings with the derelict, moved several feet ahead and began a series of very slow turns.

The disturbed airflow over the unconscious Montgomery's wings sucked the wing down a degree or two for short periods, but the automatic pilot would then "correct" the change. Yet bit by bit Burkitt was able to overcome the corrections and the unconscious pilot's plane's course was altered enough to head him out for the open sea.

In the course of this excruciating maneuvering the two F–105's plunged into a thick overcast. The last 10 minutes of the turning operation was flown in weather so bad that Burkitt had to perform his dangerous wing locks while flying on instruments. He led his unconscious buddy until his own tanks showed empty on their gages and barely made a rendezvous with the tankers. When Burkitt landed back at Kadena his eyes were red and moist and his face drawn with fatigue.

"I would have gotten out of the cockpit and walked across that wing to help Monty if it were at all possible," he told his division and wing commanders, Maj. Gen. A. P. Clark and Col. Robert Cardenas. "Monty was one of my best friends. I did everything I could. But I couldn't save him."

The two had flown together in the Air Force for 12 years.

An immediate air search of the estimated impact area turned up no evidence of the 20-ton supersonic tactical fighter and its unconscious pilot.

Without Burkitt's remarkable intervention, Montgomery's plane would have plunged into Red China, with imponderable consequences.

Capt. William B. Burkitt comes from the First District of Maryland, so I take special pride in the courage he has displayed; but all America must share with his native State admiration and appreciation for this act of great personal risk and bravery.

Thomas Jefferson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL D. PERKINS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD, the commemorative address given by Hon. Stanley F. Reed, Associate Justice, U.S. Supreme Court, retired, on the occasion of the 23d annual celebration at the National Jefferson Memorial, Tidal Basin, Washington, D.C., on April 13, 1965, celebrating the 222d anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson, 3d President of the United States. This celebration was sponsored jointly by the District of Columbia Society, Sons of the American Revolution, and the National Park Service, National Capital Parks, U.S. Department of the Interior.

THOMAS JEFFERSON

In grateful remembrance of the contributions of Thomas Jefferson to our country, we gather today at this memorial to mark the 222d year of his birth. By this imposing edifice, erected near those commemorating Washington and Lincoln, our Nation attests its appreciation for the services of this outstanding patriot, whose contributions to the United States enabled him to direct that his tomb should bear the inscription: "Author of the Declaration of Independence; of the

Statute of Virginia for Religious Freedom; and father of the University of Virginia."

Jefferson's family, like other tidewater Virginians of the early 18th century, pushed west toward the mountains and the grasslands of what is now Albemarle County, the site of Monticello, his beloved home. His father died when he was only 14. However, the boy secured a good education for that period, including 2 years of study at William and Mary. This was followed by reading law with the distinguished George Wythe at Williamsburg. Through Wythe, he came to know Governor Fauquier and other political personages of the Capital City. From these contacts arose an early interest in public affairs.

Thomas Jefferson came into prominence in his youth. Of strong features and resonant voice, a handsome figure of a man, well over 6 feet, Jefferson soon was recognized as a leader of men in a State where his contemporaries were Patrick Henry, Madison, Monroe, and Washington. He radiated "calm self-reliance and courage which all instinctively recognize and respect." The problems of the day called for such qualities.

Jefferson at 30 was elected to the House of Burgesses of Virginia.[1] A question there arose as to the transportation to England for trial of colonials charged with opposition to the British Crown. Different colonies had feared deprivation of other "ancient, legal, and constitutional rights."[2] To bring them together on such mutually important matters, three or four members, including Jefferson, cooperated to secure the establishment by the Burgesses of a "Standing Committee of Correspondence and Inquiry," to work in harmony with similar committees from other colonies for mutual protection. Thus colonial cooperation became a reality.

Incidents galling to the Colonies multiplied until 1776. Burdens of taxation for the British exchequer grew.[3] Stamp Acts and Troop Quartering Acts were put into effect. Diverse interests in trade, large infusions of non-English blood from Europe and Africa, emphasized political differences between England and her American colonies. Desire for freedom grew. In Virginia, the British Governor, Lord Dunmore, put his offices aboard an English man-of-war to avoid heightened interference from his angered citizens. The idea of intercolonial union spread. Patrick Henry and James Otis declared, "Government is a contract between king and people." Any violation discharges the other party.[4] The Boston Massacre followed, then the Tea Party, Lexington, Bunker Hill, and organization of American forces. "Common Sense" by Thomas Paine was published.

The Continental Congress at Philadelphia entrusted the drafting of the Declaration of Independence to Thomas Jefferson. The Liberty Bell rang out. Never were the aspirations of mankind for freedom more eloquently expressed. "These United Colonies are, and of right ought to be, Free and Independent States" and for the support of this Declaration, "we mutually pledge to each other, our Lives, our Fortunes and our sacred Honor."

In October Thomas Jefferson returned to the House of Delegates to lead the adjustment of Virginia from its status as a British colony to that of an independent State. Jefferson was chosen its Governor.[5] Soon the new Nation commissioned him as Minister to France, succeeding Benjamin Franklin. "Note," said Mr. Jefferson, modestly, on his arrival, to the French Minister of Foreign Affairs, "I come to succeed Benjamin Franklin. No one can replace him."[6]

Mr. Jefferson's services in France during the period of the Continental Congress received commendation from all quarters. Immediately upon his return George Washington asked him to be the first Secretary of State. He filled that post with distinction.

Jefferson aided Washington in guiding our Nation safely through the international crises arising from the French Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars. During those years France, Spain, and Great Britain, as well as we, had conflicting claims and interests concerning the country west of the Mississippi and particularly that "long and narrow slip of land called the Island of New Orleans." No permanent adjustment was then reached—only temporary shipping privileges for the United States being secured. Later, Jefferson as President, familiar with the problem, was to make one of his greatest contributions to the Nation in securing for a modest sum the Territory of Louisiana.

Mr. Jefferson resigned as Secretary of State the last day of 1793. He and John Adams were the two candidates for the Presidency to succeed Washington. While the electoral vote was close, Jefferson, under the then constitutional procedure, receiving next to the highest number of votes for President, became Vice President.

There being no available guide to parliamentary practice, the new Vice President undertook to devise one—Jefferson's Manual of Parliamentary Law.[7] This work served as the basis for subsequent treatises on the subject. It is not surprising, with his accomplishments in mind, that President Kennedy, while receiving our Nobel laureates at the White House looked them over and quipped, "I see before me probably the greatest concentration of talent and genius in this house except for those times when Thomas Jefferson ate alone."[8]

President Adams being a Federalist and Mr. Jefferson a Republican, naturally a cleavage arose over the alien and sedition laws. Mr. Jefferson brought about the adoption of the Virginia and Kentucky resolutions, driving hard at the alleged usurpation of State power by those laws. This exacerbated the relations between Adams' party, the Federalists, and Jefferson's, the Republicans (since then rechristened the Democrats).

In the election of 1801 Jefferson narrowly triumphed over Aaron Burr. In his inaugural address, Jefferson used those famous phrases: "We are all Republicans, we are all Federalists. If there be any among us who would wish to dissolve this Union or to change its republican form, let them stand undisturbed as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it." "Equal and exact justice to all men * * *"; "the support of the State governments in all their rights, as the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns * * *"; "the preservation of the General Government in its whole constitutional vigor, * * *"; "a jealous care of the right of election by the people"; "freedom of religion; freedom of the press, and freedom of person under the protection of the habeas corpus * * *."

Those precepts guided Jefferson in his administration and through his life. The legacy he left us, of the belief in the democracy he advocated as the strongest force to preserve the rights of the individual, still guides our Nation.

Without limiting our gratitude, it is no disparagement of our other Founding Fathers to say that the eloquence of Adams, the pen of Jefferson, the sword of Washington are the notable individual contributions to the winning of our rights and our freedom. John Adams, breathing his last in Massachusetts on July 4, 1826, said with satisfaction, "Thomas Jefferson still lives." Actually, Adams was mistaken. Jefferson had passed away at the dawn of that fateful day.

We who are gathered here to commemorate Jefferson's services through the great truths of liberty and freedom which he so expressively enunciated and vitalized, can now correctly declare, "Jefferson still lives" through his words and work that continue to influence and aid us in maintaining our country as a free and independent nation.

---

[1] 1 Randall 76.
[2] 1 Randall 79.
[3] 3 Channing 1.
[4] 3 Channing 34.
[5] 1 Randall, c. 7.
[6] 1 Randall 415.
[7] 2 Randall 356.
[8] Reader's Guide, February 1965, p. 10.

Voting Bill Planned in Moscow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a column by Mr. Henry J. Taylor in the Richmond Times-Dispatch of Richmond, Va., of April 18, 1965. Mr. Taylor reveals that the so-called voting-rights bill now under consideration in Congress actually was planned in Moscow as far back as 1956. This is a documented column, and I hope that it will be widely read.

Mr. Taylor, former Ambassador to Switzerland, is an outstanding American and a distinguished author, journalist, and economist.

Although those of us who understand the methods of Communists are not surprised to learn of these facts, the information contained in this column will no doubt astonish and shock many American citizens.

The column follows:

It's astounding, but true, that the Communist Party, U.S.A., actually planned the Johnson administration's Voting Rights Act of 1965.

This is not to argue the merits and demerits of this bill. That's a different topic. Federal intervention may be needed, and this bill is pending. But the veil should be lifted on a fact of history, certainly unknown to our public and probably unknown even to most Congressmen and Senators who will vote "Yes."

They will be voting a 1956 project designed in Moscow.

Soviet attention to our legislation has always been much more constant and effective than we supposed. The pen of Lee Pressman—who later confessed to having been a Communist—trails all through our initial agricultural act and the labor legislation sponsored by the original Congress of Industrial Organizations, of which Pressman was an official.

Well, the Red shadows still breathe and glow.

Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko is the Kremlin's top specialist on American affairs. He knows our country like Mickey Mantle knows the Yankee Stadium. Nobody in the Soviet hierarchy even approaches his staying power. He has survived every purge because of his knowledge of the United States.

I encountered Gromyko's expertness again and again during Geneva conferences. In fact, I came to know this Red leader when his concentration on our country began a full 21 years ago. This was during the 1944 Dumbarton Oaks Conference called to design the United Nations.

He's acquainted with a surprising quantity of American political, trade union, and industrial leaders on an after-hours conversational basis. Some, like Bernard Baruch, whom he respects, always have had his number, but nothing chills this cold man in his search for leverages against our internal stability and especially our legislation.

Gromyko's bland, sphinxlike personality reminds you of a magician who comes on stage without tables or props—just a handkerchief hidden in his hand. Then for 20 minutes he pulls unexpected things out of it.

For example, in an airplane flying the Atlantic Gromyko once suddenly recited to me the foreign-born percentages in our chief trade unions and in our 12 largest cities, and then mentioned in passing that more Czechs live in Chicago than in any city except Prague.

Or listen to Gromyko on another occasion. "Mr. Taylor," he said, "what you Americans call 'law' is really a form of politics."

He didn't just say that. He thinks that. Such are the notes he plays when he calls the tune for Kremlin policy inside our country.

This means Gromyko calls the tune for the Communist Party, U.S.A. In December 1956 that party began a program which it named the "Lincoln project." Its target date for fulfillment should interest us today—1965.

At its inception in 1956 the plan was published in Philadelphia by the respected American Flag Committee and read:

"To implement the Lincoln project, the Communist Party's Central Committee will begin to dispatch agents to 11 Southern States next month (January 1957) to work with local party leaders in surveying 20 counties, any one of which might be ideally suited as a target for disorder early in 1965.

"This survey will continue through 1957, the Central Committee making the choice of 20 counties * * * with the final selection to be made on the estimated most favorable conditions prevailing in 1965.

"The legislation which the party will seek from Congress in 1965 has already been prepared by its legal staff. It provides for elimination of all educational requirements, including minimum literacy tests, as qualifications for voting in Federal, State, and local elections; voids residence with respect to counties, municipalities, and other political subdivisions within a State; and establishes a system of direct Federal supervision and control of the local, county, State, and Federal elective process."

Evidently the House and Senate will pass the Voting Rights Act of 1965 after debate and amendment. To repeat, its merits and demerits are another matter. Nevertheless, penetrating—and exposing—the Soviet's secret interest in any legislation is important to our lawmakers and our public alike. The Lincoln project and the example of this bill is a revelation of the ghostly Reds' eternal presence.

Proudly We Hail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I was very honored to receive from my constituent, Art La Cour, a most attractive and inspiring booklet which he has produced entitled "Proudly We Hail." It is the story of our national anthem in words and pictures. I believe that Mr. La Cour has performed a useful and valuable service in reminding all Americans of the proud history of our Nation's anthem.

He inscribed the first copy "To President Lyndon B. Johnson with great respect," and I have been pleased to forward it to the President.

Opposition To Curtailment of Veterans' Benefits

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, as a strong opponent of the proposed move to close 32 Veterans' Administration facilities, I commend the Veterans of Foreign Wars upon the resolution adopted at its Eastern States conference during the weekend of April 3. The VFW and other Veterans' organizations have presented facts and substantiating evidence in favor of retaining these veterans' facilities.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include this resolution which follows:

VFW EASTERN STATES CONFERENCE RESOLUTION URGING CONTINUED EFFORTS TO OPPOSE CURTAILMENT OF VETERANS' BENEFITS

Whereas the administration has been unable to justify, after lengthy hearings before both Houses of Congress, its January 13, 1965, directive ordering the closing of 11 VA hospitals, 17 regional offices, and 4 domiciliaries; and

Whereas the President, at a press conference held on April 1, 1965, stated "I must in frankness say that some doubt in my mind has resulted from reading their (congressional witnesses) statements;" and

Whereas the President has finally become aware of the national resentment, through hundreds of thousands of letters of protest, against this unwarranted and insidious attack on the veteran population of our country; and

Whereas the uncompromising opposition of the American people to this doctrine must be continued and increased in intensity: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Eastern States Conference of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, comprising the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Delaware, and the District of Columbia, in convention duly assembled in the city of Brewer, State of Maine, on April 3, 1965, That the hundreds of thousands of members call upon our national organization, its ladies auxiliary, and its entire membership of 2 million men and women, other veterans groups, all veterans and their families, to join with it in staging mass meetings and other demonstrations, in addition to letters and petitions to the President and the Congress, thus demonstrating to the President and the Congress the unyielding opposition of the American people to any curtailment of veterans' benefits.

Approved by the Eastern States Conference of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States meeting in Brewer, Maine, April 3–4, 1965.

The Eastern States conference consist of representatives from the following States: Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Delaware, and the District of Columbia.

The Farm Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, a recent letter to the editor which appeared in the Marshfield, Wisc., News Herald on April 22, 1965, merits the attention of all my colleagues who are seriously concerned about the agriculture policies of the current administration. The letter was written by Robert P. Graff, a member of the National Farmers' Organization.

Under unanimous consent, I include the letter to the editor in the April 22 edition of the Marshfield News Herald in the RECORD.

The letter referred to follows:

NFO MEMBER WRITES

Editor, News-Herald: "Farming alone cannot * * * provide a decent living * * * for more than a million farm families." This statement is from the recent budget message delivered to Congress by President Johnson. Since there are currently 3.6 million farmers, this amounts to an undated eviction notice to 2.6 million farmers signed by the President of the United States, the leader in the war on poverty, the founder of the Great Society.

It is downright disturbing that such a significant statement indicating future farm policy by the Federal Government should go unnoticed and unchallenged in the rural press. Why not devote some space to the lifeblood issue of our times—the survival of American agriculture as we know it today?

At this time of the year, with the figures on our income tax forms still fresh in our minds, farmers should be acutely aware that something is wrong with agriculture today. Figure out for yourself how much you have invested in your farm and personal property and multiply this by the 4 percent you could have collected in interest on this amount from your local bank. Then subtract this amount from your net income and you will find how much you made last year on your labor as well as your family's labor.

If this looks small, divide by 52 and find out how much you and your family received for 7 days labor each week last year. This figure may only startle you but it should make most farmers hopping mad to realize that the average welfare recipient in the large cities received more than that for not working and with no investment in the future of America and whose sole preoccupation seems to be in enlarging his stable of dependents in order to fatten his welfare check.

My object in writing this was to get other farmers to think of the problems of agriculture as being as near as their own front door but, more hopefully, to provoke them to the point of investigating the program of the National Farmers' Organization which, I believe, holds the only hope for the future of the family farm.

Help yourself by helping your neighbor work for a healthy agriculture through col-

lective bargaining, put profit back in our rural areas so that a farmer will get a decent day's pay for a hard day's work, fight the war on poverty from the bottom up and before the casualties outnumber the survivors. As un-American as it may sound, the NFO believes that the farmer can solve his own problems without the aid of Federal subsidies. Do you know what I'm talking about? If you don't, why don't you find out?

ROBERT P. GRAFF,
Stetsonville.

Representative Reuss Speaks Out on U.S. Policy Toward Central Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, recently my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin, Representative HENRY S. REUSS, spoke on U.S. policy toward central Europe at a special symposium on foreign policy issues held at Marquette University, Milwaukee.

His remarks received widespread attention in the press and by the public because of their pertinency to important events of our day. His statement was based in substantial part on a visit he made to central Europe in the fall of 1964. During that trip he had an opportunity to go behind the Iron Curtain and see and hear firsthand about changes taking place within the Soviet bloc countries.

One of his conclusions is that the Germans and Poles must be reconciled if a just, lasting, and peaceful settlement is to be achieved in Europe. He has pledged his personal efforts to achieve this goal.

Because this speech by Representative REUSS gets to the heart of many problems and issues in our policy toward central Europe, I commend it to the attention of my colleagues and insert it into the RECORD at this point:

U.S. FOREIGN POLICY FOR CENTRAL EUROPE—A CONGRESSIONAL POINT OF VIEW

(Remarks by Representative HENRY S. REUSS, at the Marquette University Symposium on U.S. Foreign Policy, Life Sciences Building, Milwaukee, Apr. 10, 1965)

No one can visit central Europe nowadays without observing that the days of the monolith are over.

The solid bloc of Communist states taking their cue from Stalinist Moscow in all their affairs is a thing of the past.

The two dominant members of the erstwhile bloc, the less aggressive Soviet Union and the more militant Red China, are fundamentally split.

The rest of the Communist world is coming apart at the seams. Nationalism is stirring in central Europe. Policies of liberalization in economics and more individual freedom are departing from the old centralization and harsh repression.

The Iron Curtain still stands. But, excepting the frontier through divided Berlin and Germany, the differences between the countries it separates are less sharp.

With countries of the East as well as the West asserting themselves and going their own ways, Europe is tending to be again a Europe of nations, not of blocs.

The countries of central Europe obviously don't have free rein. Their independence is limited by Soviet power and the Kremlin's willingness to use it.

So far the successors of Khrushchev have not shown any disposition to backtrack on the de-Stalinization he began, or to take the cold war steps that would be needed to recreate the unity of the bloc.

The United States should look at what is happening in central Europe very carefully. Changed policies are needed to meet changed circumstances.

I

Last fall, in a trip which took me to Czechoslovakia, Hungary, East Germany, and Yugoslavia, I hade a chance to see and hear firsthand about the changes in eastern Europe.

All over eastern Europe I was told about the revolution in economic thinking that is taking place.

Czechoslovakia will start on a new economic program of decentralization this year, and hopes to have it completely effective by 1970. The new scheme is largely the creation of Dr. Ota Sik, director of the Economic Institute of the Czechoslovak Academy of Sciences.

When I visited his office in Prague, he must have seen my eyes rest on the set of Karl Marx' works on the shelf behind his desk:

"Are you wondering about what Marx has to do with my country's new economic program—balanced budgets, sound money, economy in government, decentralized decisionmaking by the individual enterprise, use of the price system, and profit by the individual firm to determine how resources are allocated? You see, Marxism is a dynamic and revolutionary system. It did not stop evolving with Marx' death. Your hero is Thomas Jefferson, who built his society on a sturdy yeomanry and feared the masses that would populate your cities—yet you have no difficulty in adapting Jefferson to your world of today. Why can't we adapt, too?"

Dr. Silk anticipates that the new system will cause some dislocations. He expects it to face resistance from those factory managers who fear competition because of their own failings. But the program has party support, he said, and he believes it will succeed.

Yugoslavia's brand of socialism is extremely pragmatic. It is apparently willing to discard almost all Socialist trappings except the collective ownership of the means of production.

In the Government's 1965 financial plan, 900 billion dinars is earmarked for basic capital investment. But only 250 billion is to be made by the Federal Government. The rest will be supplied by the Yugoslavian banking mechanism.

Banks charge interest, and are prepared to lend to whatever enterprise can pay the interest charge. "Do you mean to say that Government-controlled banks would invest in a frivolous and unnecessary project, just because the firm wanting the loan is able to pay the interest charge?" I asked Dr. Nikola Mincev, general director of the Yugoslavian Institute for Economic Planning.

"Certainly," he replied. "We have learned that even the best plan cannot deal with every aspect of a living society. For instance, a nongovernmental group is building a brandnew football stadium in Belgrade just across the street from a perfectly good existing football stadium. But we prefer one football stadium too many to rigid planning that prohibits everything someone believes isn't the best use of resources.

"Prices, interest, and wages are increasingly being set by market forces rather than by Belgrade. The purpose of our 7-year plan is to create an atmosphere and to set guidelines, not to tell an independent producer what to produce, or how much to sell his product for, and how to invest his profit."

Hungary has also embarked on a course of economic liberalization. When I visited the Agricultural Research Station at Martonvasar near Lake Balaton, Dr. Sandor Rajki, the vigorous young geneticist who heads up the station, described the current Hungarian system of fostering household plots for farmers and of providing profit incentives for cooperatives. "Now the Russians seem to be coming around to our point of view," he added with satisfaction.

Each country claims the new economics as its own. "We in Yugoslavia differ sharply from other Communist countries," said Dr. Jose Brilej, leading member of the Yugoslav Parliament and president of the Executive Council's Committee for Foreign Economic Relations. "We no longer draw economic plans in the classical Marxist sense."

"Czechs think things out carefully, but once they decide upon a course they move ahead on it steadily," said Dr. Miroslav Ruzek, chief of the U.S. desk at the Czech foreign office. "We have recognized the defects of our older system and have decided to make changes. We will now go further than the other countries of Eastern Europe."

And Professor Imre Vajda, economist of the University of Budapest, told me, "Hungary is 2 years ahead of the Czechs in decentralizing our economy."

Will all this economic liberalization lead to liberalization generally—in speech, the press, an independent Parliament, trade and travel? Everywhere the answer I got was yes. In Prague, Dr. Ruzek talked about economic liberalization as a "process to broaden and deepen democracy, and to cultivate public opinion."

Members of the Czech Parliament with whom I met were quite proud of the fact that they were no longer entirely a rubber stamp.

What did they mean? I asked. They replied that they had recently overturned a Government position on the tax on motor vehicles. I checked, and found they had indeed.

And the giant statue of Stalin in Prague has come down. A new generation of younger party leaders is coming to power.

In Hungary, the ruthless suppression which followed the unsuccessful uprising of October 1956, has given way to a more moderate course.

Liberalized travel regulations permitted more than a quarter million Hungarians to travel to the West during the last 2 years. Practically all returned. Indeed, a high Hungarian official of whom I asked, "When will you tear down your barbed wire checkpoints at the border?" replied that he thought they could do this soon if conditions continue to improve.

Food is good and plentiful in Hungary: Hungarians have one of the highest caloric intakes in the world, and a high rate of ulcers. Voice of America and Radio Free Europe broadcasts go unjammed. The Ford Foundation has a cultural exchange program, with both Ford and the Hungarians doing the selecting of Hungarian students.

In Belgrade, Dr. Slavko Komar, Member of Parliament and chairman of its Committee for the Economic Plan, thought that decentralization—he felt that "de-etatization" would be a more accurate term—would lead to more political freedom, too.

Just as there has been liberalization in economic arrangements, and more opportunity to enjoy human rights, so Eastern Europe is showing less dependence on Moscow.

Yugoslavia, defected in 1949 and has not been a bloc member since.

Rumania recently told Russia that she rejected the role as supplier of raw material to the other Communist countries, and would build her own industries if she chose.

Albania, while still Stalinist at home, broke relations with Moscow 3 years ago and sides with Communist China.

Bulgaria and East Germany alone seem to remain firmly under Moscow tutelage.

II

Greater freedom for the East Europeans in their economic life, in the exercise of their human rights, and in their relationship with Moscow seems to me to be what we want.

In the first place, it means a more tolerable life for the Hungarians, the Czechs, the Slovaks, and the other bloc peoples.

Quite apart from the welfare of the East Europeans themselves, liberalizing their regimes hastens the day when an overall European settlement can be attempted.

The problem of a divided Berlin, and of a divided East and West Germany, can only be settled in the context of an all-European settlement. Such a settlement will be a whole lot easier if nations are not too sharply divided along the old Iron Curtain, if there are some real possibilities of a troop thin-out and arms control for all of Europe, if trade is expanded so that the economies of middle Europe are oriented both East and West, if human rights are protected at least in a rudimentary way.

What can the United States do to hasten the process of liberalization in Eastern Europe? Based upon my on-the-spot observations last fall, the most important single action we could take is in trade. Trade between the United States and Eastern Europe is practically nonexistent today by reason of two policies:

1. Except for Poland and Yugoslavia, the United States denies most-favored-nation treatment to imports from Eastern European countries. This means that U.S. tariffs on most Eastern European goods are prohibitively high.

2. There is an almost complete embargo on goods moving from the United States to Eastern Europe.

This restriction is meant to limit the war potential of Eastern Europe. And, because almost anything useful to a modern nation increases its strength in war, the restriction has become very broad.

By our almost total embargo we accomplish two things, neither of which is in our best interest: (1) we help to keep the economies of the Eastern European countries oriented to and dependent on the Soviet Union, and (2) we lose business while the Eastern Europeans get the goods from the British, French, or Germans.

Thus the embargo hurts principally the United States; economically through the loss of business; politically, through the loss of an opportunity to influence the orientation of Eastern Europe.

I believe that Congress would be wise to give the President more flexibility on both aspects of trade. We should permit the President to remove the discrimination, where he sees fit in our tariffs against Eastern European goods. Equally, we should permit the President discretion, on all but really military and strategic goods, to lift the embargo on shipments to Eastern Europe.

But we would make a mistake if we granted governmental long-term (5 years or more) credits. This would be equivalent to giving the Communist bloc foreign aid.

Concessions by us should be used to encourage more independence from Moscow, and more political and economic freedom. Concessions should surely not be granted all at once, or to every country. And in the event to too much backsliding, restrictions have to be reinstated.

Along with trade liberalization can come increasing cultural and social exchanges. On balance, we are better off opening these windows in the Iron Curtain than we are keeping them tightly closed.

This increased exchange of goods, people, and ideas between West and East can pave the way for the middle Europe that we seek when the nightmare ends and the Iron Curtain disappears. That middle Europe envisages a Germany peacefully reunited; a Poland and the other lands to the east secure in its borders and protected against German revisionism; and a whole region in which the brotherhood of man dominates life and thought.

In our democracy, ideas about foreign policy can originate among the people as often as they do in Washington. Here in Milwaukee the Poles and the Germans have lived amiably side by side for a century. Nowhere else in the world have these two diverse peoples collaborated more fruitfully to build a commonwealth. Here a Lewandowski heads our school of art, and a Klotsche our State university; a Zablocki represents the south side, and a Reuss the north.

So here in Milwaukee it is fitting to propose that the United States adopt as a cornerstone of its European policy the reconciliation of the Germans and the Poles (together with their neighbors the Slavs and Magyars). I am prepared to work long and hard at this reconciliation. It must go hand in hand with our other efforts for a just, peaceful and lasting settlement in Europe.

In the last 15 years, the age-old animosity between Germany and France has been largely healed. In the next 15 years, let the United States play the same healing role toward ancient hatreds between East and West. If the Germans and the Poles can be brothers on either side of the Menomonee River, they can be brothers on either side of the Oder.

Let our European policy rise above the tiresome parochialism of the Common Market, the excessive concentration on NATO, the distracting business of always reacting to President de Gaulle's latest breathtaker. Let us instead raise a standard to which men of good will everywhere may repair: the reconciliation of Germany and Poland, and then of West and East.

Teenagers Bridge East, West

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, during the Easter recess in my home district it came to my attention that the spirit of ecumenism is at work among teenagers there, who are bridging the gap between religion and cultures in a youth pilot project conducted by young Presbyterians and members of the Eastern Christian Church.

I would like to call the Members' attention to an article in the Record of Hackensack, N.J., by Wilma Supik, religion editor, which aptly describes this worthy venture in brotherhood.

[From the Hackensack (N.J.) Record, Apr. 24, 1965]

RELIGION IN SUBURBIA—TEENAGERS BRIDGE EAST, WEST; GREEK ORTHODOX, PRESBYTERIANS IN DIALOG

(By Wilma Supik, religion editor)

Last night at the Greek Church of the Ascension in Fairview a group of wide-eyed Presbyterian youth, accustomed to simple rites, looked on as Orthodox Christians liturgically reenacted the burial of Christ.

Yesterday was Holy or Great Friday for Eastern Christians, and the Paramus teenagers were attending the lamentations service as part of a Presbyterian Greek Orthodox ecumenical youth pilot project.

The interchange, which began on April 4 at the manse of Trinity United Presbyterian Church, Paramus, is being sponsored by the United Presbyterian Church Commission on Ecumenical Relations, Youth Department; and the Department of Youth Work of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America.

A NEW EXPERIENCE

Over a period of a month, the young people will have met on six occasions, at services, in study, and in fellowship. About 30 high school youths are participating, and, according to the Reverend Robert Hugh Reed, pastor of Trinity Church, are undergoing a new experience in ecumenism.

On the Greek Orthodox Palm Sunday—which was the Western Easter Sunday—the Reverend Socrates Tsamutalis, pastor of the Fairview Church, explained the meaning of Orthodox Holy Week to the visiting youths. Earlier, the Presbyterian teenagers attended the Greek Palm Sunday services. At an April 11 session Father Socrates explained Greek Orthodox belief to his young guests and also took them on a tour of his church, showing them the church icons and holy books.

"WHO IS JESUS?"

Greek Orthodox youth are also learning about Protestantism in this first project of its kind in the United States. At the opening session in Paramus, Pastor Reed, for years active in the Protestant unity movement and in Catholic-Protestant dialog, discussed the common sources of revelation—the Bible and tradition! After the talk, the youth broke into small buzz groups, probing questions like: What is the Christian faith? Is the Christian faith important to mankind? What is the Bible, what does it say, what does it mean to teenagers? Who is Jesus, what did he do?

The Greek Orthodox youth also attended a Presbyterian Holy Week service at Glen School, Ridgewood, on Maundy Thursday. Pastor Reed outlined the service of the Last Supper, and Greek youth saw how their new Protestant friends receive the sacrament of holy communion.

MAY 2 WRAPUP

Supervising the pilot project have been the Reverend Kyoji Buma, executive secretary of the Office of Youth Relations, United Presbyterian Church, and John Maheras, director of the Youth Department of the Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of North and South America.

Also participating in concurrent exchanges have been youth of the First Presbyterian Church, Lyndhurst, and St. Nicholas Church, Newark; and the Claremont Presbyterian Church, Jersey City, and St. Demetrios Church, Jersey City.

On May 2 the Presbyterian and Greek Orthodox young people will get together at the Paramus manse to take stock of their pioneer project.

Both Father Socrates and Pastor Reed know the youths have learned much about the others' traditions. They are also hopeful that the encounter with each other will bring them all closer to Jesus Christ.

"The Feigner"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH HARVEY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in

the RECORD, I include the following poem entitled "The Feigner," by Harold Hufford, who is retired as a staff member of the National Archives:

THE FEIGNER

I've never seen the Rockies
With their crowns of shining snow;
Nor have I seen our national parks
With their wonders all a'glow;
I've never taken too much time
My land's beauties to applaud,
But, dear friend, I'll have you know
That I have been "abrawd."

Why bother with the breadbasket
That feeds the world and me?
Why stay with good "Old Glory"
As it waves unfurled and free?
I take these things for granted,
And my feelings stay unthawed,
But they warm up away from home,
So, perforce, I go "abrawd."

America just treats me swell,
And provides fine living, too;
I fare much better here, you know,
But I don't like the view;
I spend my dough in foreign lands
That our coffers much have gnawed,
Where they also spend my taxes
That have, likewise, gone "abrawd."

The Pilgrims and the pioneers
Looked forward, up, and out;
They came to this new country
O'er the ocean's trackless route
To find a new life, rich and free,
From Old World ways unlawed,
To build the greatest of great nations,
And so they came abroad.

But, now, soft offspring lolling free,
Midst fruits of their hot sweat,
Feel that this Nation's getting old,
And like spoiled children fret;
So, like the aged who dwell on youth
Of which they're often "jawed,"
They think 'way back to ancient times,
So they go back "abrawd."

I think as they—home's commonplace;
I must acquire veneer;
I must try to be exotic,
And foreign things revere;
And talk about old castles, chefs,
And strange foods that I have "chawed,"
I must feign that "cultured touch,"
So, I must go "abrawd."

Nonchalant, with half-closed eyes,
I'll tilt my head with ease,
And in soft voice I'll utter words
My vanity to please;
A club or two may beckon me
And it o'er them I'll "lawd,"
A'tellin' 'bout that "Pizzah Towah"
A'leanin' "hahd" "abrawd."

And, furthermore, you can be sure
That it will be great fun
A'tellin' 'bout spaghetti fields
A'wavin' in the sun!
Of how I "blew" that Matterhorn
Whose notes us all have awed,
And of grape juice a'squirtin' up
Twixt trampers' toes "abrawd!"

Oh, what a mixed up world this is—
How we do deprecate
The countless blessings here at home
That we don't appreciate;
We've got to climb that fence so high
Into other fields to laud
What they have got, ignore our own,
So, we must go "abrawd."

To "go abroad" means other things
Such as "to go astray;"
And with our dollars flowing out
Let's reduce this needless play
Of tryin' to feign a finish that
Could be no more than fraud,
And keep some dollars here at home
For enough have gone "abrawd!"

HAROLD HUFFORD.

JUNE 1961.

Human Relations and Human Rights in Alabama

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BUCHANAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Birmingham Chamber of Commerce, I am deeply proud of the statement of priniciples that this body recently joined in endorsing regarding human relations and human rights in Alabama. As I have repeatedly maintained on the floor of this House and elsewhere, people of my State are in overwhelming majority fairminded and law abiding Americans, and among the finest citizens of this land. Bad press sustained over a long period of time has created the false impression that the criminal acts of a vicious minority within the South are representative of the whole South. In forceful answer to this libelous image and in confirmation of my own appraisal of my fellow Alabamians, the business community of Alabama spoke up last week in no uncertain terms. The statement of priciples included herein was signed by many local chambers under the leadership of the State chamber of commerce, Alabama Bankers Association, Associated Industries of Alabama, and Alabama Manufacturers Association. It is with deep pride and profound gratitude to the businessmen of Alabama that I place in the RECORD the full text of this fine statement:

"WHAT WE BELIEVE AND WHERE WE STAND"

In light of recent developments in Alabama, we feel that the business community has an obligation to speak out for what it believes to be right.

The vast majority of the people of Alabama, like other responsible citizens throughout our Nation, believe in law and order, and in the fair and just treatment of all their fellow citizens. They believe in obedience to the law regardless of their personal feelings about its specific merits. They believe in the basic human dignity of all people of all races.

We intend to continue working diligently for the full development of Alabama, the welfare of its people, and the maintenance of conditions favorable to the creation of an economy which will benefit every citizen.

For these reasons, we feel that we must publicly declare and reaffirm what we believe and where we stand.

First, we believe in the full protection and opportunity under the law of all our citizens, both Negro and white. Just as we feel every Alabamian inherently has the right of protection, so does every Alabamian have a responsibility to uphold the law. We deplore equally public demonstrations which violate the law, and the actions of those who take the law into their own hands. There are proper procedures for expressing protest in a lawful manner, just as there are procedures for restraining those who would violate the law.

We believe in the basic American heritage of voting, and in the right of every eligible citizen to register and to cast his ballot. We believe, however, that qualification of prospective voters, when properly and equitably administered, is a constitutional responsibility that must be preserved.

We believe in obedience to the law, even though some may question the wisdom of particular laws. Such a law is the recently enacted Civil Rights Act of 1964, which many of our citizens feel contains many unjust and improper provisions. We do, however, have an obligation to abide by it, and this we will do. Where injustices or inequities are indicated, we will seek relief through proper and legal channels.

Our State is faced specifically with compliance with title VII of this law which goes into effect shortly. This provides for nondiscrimination in employment and will call for some adjustments. While many of our employers have been in compliance with these provisions for some time, we call on business leaders all over the State to provide leadership in this matter.

We believe that communication between different elements of our society must be maintained. We urge leaders of both races to improve avenues of communication and understand. While this has been done successfully in many local communities, we suggest that consideration be given to the establishment of positive new vehicles for communications between the races throughout all the State.

We believe that an expanding economy will benefit all of our people. This will provide more jobs and greater income, thus raising the standard of living for all of our citizens—both Negro and white.

We believe that an ever increasing level of education is an important objective. This will better equip our citizens to take advantage of job opportunities and to become qualified voters.

We believe in Alabama, have confidence in its future, and call upon all of its citizens to join together in working for the attainment of these objectives and the solution of the many problems facing us.

Alabama State Chamber of Commerce; Alabama Bankers Association; Associated Industries of Alabama; Alabama Textile Manufacturers Association; Birmingham Chamber of Commerce; Mobile Chamber of Commerce; Montgomery Chamber of Commerce; Huntsville Chamber of Commerce; Alexander City Chamber of Commerce; Andalusia Chamber of Commerce;; Anniston Chamber of Commerce; Cullman Chamber of Commerce; Decatur Chamber of Commerce; Florence Chamber of Commerce; Gadsden Chamber of Commerce; Jasper Chamber of Commerce; Muscle Shoals Chamber of Commerce; Opelika Chamber of Commerce; Sylacauga Chamber of Commerce; Troy Chamber of Commerce; Tuscaloosa Chamber of Commerce; Association of Huntsville Area Contractors.

Judge Sidney C. Mize

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, on Monday morning, April 26, 1965, in his beloved hometown of Gulfport, Miss., a great jurist and a noble man, Judge Sidney C. Mize, a district Federal judge for 28 years, died at the age of 77.

Judge Mize was truly one of the finest characters that it has ever been my pleasure to know. My acquaintance with him began in the late 1920's when he was an outstanding member of the bar of

Harrison County and I was a young district attorney. That acquaintance grew into a long friendship which will always be a pleasant memory.

Few men possess more than one outstanding virtue but Sidney Mize was the beneficiary of many. He was an outstanding lawyer and jurist; possessed of a keen mind; a noble Christian character; devoid of the common sins of man. Moreover he was a devoted husband and father and a friend to mankind. He was the most democratic Federal jurist I have ever known. He was compassionate to the extent that he was sometimes criticized because of his leniency in meting out punishment to those who were convicted of crimes in his court.

Mr. Speaker, one Benjamin H. Hill in 1874 paid an everlasting and well-deserved tribute to the inimitable and illustrious Gen. Robert E. Lee. Among other commendations were the following:

He was a foe without hate; a friend without treachery; a soldier without cruelty; a victor without oppression; and a victim without murmuring.

He was a public officer without vices; a private citizen without wrong; a neighbor without reproach; a Christian without hypocrisy; and a man without guile.

He was obedient to authority as a servant, and royal in authority as a true king.

He was gentle as a woman in life; modest and pure as a virgin in thought; watchful as a Roman vestal in duty; submissive to law as Socrates, and grand in battle as Achilles.

Mr. Speaker, as a longtime, intimate friend, I can truthfully state that these tributes to the great Lee could well and appropriately apply to my departed friend, Sidney C. Mize. His loss to his family, his State, his Nation, and to the law, as well as to his friends will be most difficult if not impossible to replace.

More Caution, Less Speed Badly Needed as Congress Rushes Welfare Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Fort Lauderdale, Fla., News of April 20:

MORE CAUTION, LESS SPEED BADLY NEEDED AS CONGRESS RUSHES WELFARE LEGISLATION

When Congress buckles back down to work following its short Easter recess it is to be hoped that many of the legislators will return to Washington in a somewhat more thoughtful mood than has been indicated up to now during the current session.

From what has happened since the session convened last January, this Congress has given no indication whatsoever that it has a mind of its own in deciding what is good and what is bad in the way of legislation. It has been under the thumb and under the influence of President Lyndon Johnson to such an extent that already the term of "rubberstamp" is not only deserved, but is somewhat conservative in describing the manner in which the legislators are breaking all speed records in doing the exact bidding of the White House.

If the Nation was faced with some kind of an emergency situation which demanded quick subservience to White House demands there might be some excuse for the way Congress has been performing. But there is no domestic emergency facing the country. The Nation is in a healthy and prosperous condition and under this circumstance there is no need for Congress to cast aside its traditional constitutional role in our system of checks and balances and to act like a trained seal jumping through a hoop every time the President snaps his fingers.

Consider, for instance, the manner in which the medicare bill was ramrodded through the lower House. Here was a bill that will greatly affect virtually every person in this country in one way or another. It will sharply increase the social security taxes of millions of wage earners and will initiate a Government welfare program of such magnitude that once it is put into effect there can be no turning back.

How much debate was given to this measure in the lower House? The debate lasted just a couple of days and was conducted under ground rules which barred any amendments to the proposed bill and which left House Members in a position of either approving the bill exactly as it was presented or of being labeled as a foe of our senior citizens.

Under the circumstances there weren't too many House Members courageous enough to stand up and buck the steamroller tactics employed by administration lieutenants. So, like a trained chorus of "yes men," a great majority of the House Members meekly voted their approval of a precedent shattering piece of legislation which will require an outlay of a minimum of $6 billion a year to start with and the cost of which in future years nobody can even accurately predict.

The medicare bill, however, is but one example of this almost frantic haste by House Members to kneel at the throne of President Johnson. The new Federal aid to education bill is another piece of legislation with precedent-shattering and tremendously costly ramifications. It marks a radical departure from previous aid to education bills in that for the first time in our history it puts the Federal Government in the position of doling out Federal funds to private and public schools alike. In past years the argument in Congress was long and bitter on this point but this time the congressional skids were greased to the extent there was virtually no opposition.

Then we have the voting rights bill which was spawned in an atmosphere of political expediency and which carries with it so many obnoxious and punitive assaults against traditional rights long held by the individual States that its constitutionality is sharply in question. Yet, here again, the virtually mesmerizing influence of President Johnson on the Congress is being used with such apparent success that only a mere handful of southern legislators seem willing to stand up and oppose what amounts to nothing less than the imposition of a Federal dictatorship over certain of our States in setting what standards they must use in passing out the privilege of voting. Under this autocratic bill an illiterate who could legally be deprived of the right to vote in New York State could not legally be deprived of that right in the State of Virginia. This doesn't make a particle of sense nor does it add up to justice or fair play, but who cares about such things as these when there are political payoffs to be made and minority groups to be wooed?

It has been estimated that this present session of Congress has already enacted or has just about cleared for sure passage enough new legislation of the welfare state type to increase spending next year by $5 billion and over the next few years by some $30 billion.

That the Nation may not be able to afford this kind of spending seems to make no difference to many of our Congressmen. The Great Society philosophy is to spend now and worry about how to pay for it later and those in Congress who are inclined to question this philosophy are warned what to expect if their opposition brooks White House displeasure.

This Nation was never meant to be run by a dictator in the White House, yet President Johnson has already become the closest thing to a de facto dictator this Nation has ever had. It's time, we think, for the Congress to take a breather in this business of rubberstamping the President as more caution and less haste may serve the Nation far better in the long run than imposing more of the Great Society upon us in the quickest fashion possible.

JACK W. GORE.

A Bill To End Capital Punishment in the District of Columbia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am the sponsor of H.R. 559 to abolish capital punishment in the District of Columbia. This bill has been referred to my subcommittee of the House Committee on the District of Columbia, and I hope to be able to schedule hearings on it in the very near future.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial supporting H.R. 559 which was broadcast over Station WTOP here in Washington on April 14 and 15, 1965:

A BILL TO END CAPITAL PUNISHMENT IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

This is a WTOP editorial.

Congressman ABRAHAM MULTER's bill to end most capital punishment in the District of Columbia is short and to the point. Its key phrases is as follows: "The punishment of murder in the first degree shall be life imprisonment. A person convicted of first degree murder and upon whom a sentence of life imprisonment is imposed shall not be eligible for parole until the expiration of 20 years from the date he commences to serve his sentence."

Sometime in May, Representative MULTER—who is chairman of House District Subcommittee No. 3—hopes to hold public hearings on his proposal, taking testimony from a wide range of witnesses, including the District Commissioners. We support abolition of capital punishment; we think hearings on the Multer bill should be held as quickly as feasible; we hope that the evidence presented at that time will lead Congress to do away with virtually all executions in this Federal city.

District law provides the death penalty for murder, rape, and for causing death by placing obstructions on a railroad or street railway. Federal law which applies nationwide—not just for the District—provides capital punishment for a variety of offenses, including treason, wartime espionage, and kidnaping. These, of course, are distinct from crimes falling under the Uniform Code of Military Justice.

It is our present view that the District should be exempted from all capital punishment, except possibly for treason and war-

time espionage. The time has come, we think, for Washington, D.C. to join the 12 States which already have renounced a barbaric form of retribution posing as law enforcement.

This was a WTOP editorial, Jack Jurey speaking for WTOP.

Chelmsford Man Teaching English in Ethiopia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to hear of the activities of our Peace Corps volunteers. From the fifth district in Massachusetts many young men and women have joined the Peace Corps and have performed exemplary service for their country and for the people they serve abroad.

One such student is Peter Goodwill of Chelmsford, Mass. Mr. Goodwill is teaching in Ethiopia in the province of Adis Quala. He teaches English and also assists with intramural sports. At present he is engaged in developing a textbook for use in the classroom on a day-to-day basis.

Mr. Goodwill is an outstanding example of the commitment of modern youth to the progress of people all over the world. He is a credit to his parents, Mr. and Mrs. John Goodwill, who encouraged his participation as a volunteer, and to his community.

I would like to call the attention of the House to Mr. Goodwill's activities by inserting a recent article that appeared in the Lowell, Mass., Sun in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The article follows:

CHELMSFORD YOUNG MAN TEACHES ENGLISH IN ETHIOPIA

(By James Goldsmith)

CHELMSFORD.—When Peter Goodwill told his parents the next 2 years would be the longest summer of his life he was not just giving them a philosophical opinion—in fact, this young man, who is working for the Peace Corps in Ethiopia, realizes the days will be long and the assignment difficult.

Mr. and Mrs. John Goodwill of South Chelmsford, the boy's parents, hear from their son regularly and learn about Ethiopia, its climate, people and its future. This young man is teaching seventh and eighth grade children English in a Province named Adis Quala. He left the States in January for Ethiopia with 130 other corpsmen and is busy teaching from 9 a.m. to noon and then classes are dismissed until 2:45 p.m. because of the heat. They are resumed until 5 p.m.

Mr. Goodwill's 30-day vacation during the summer will be much like your 2-week vacation; he will travel and learn more about his host nation so that he will be more qualified to teach the youngsters. There are also Peace Corps projects like building roads, buildings, and good will among the Ethiopians, most of whom are Christians.

One of the interesting points that Mr. Goodwill brought out in a letter is the children who he is teaching softball, naturally try to kick the ball rather than catch it as they are used to playing soccer. He is gradually learning Arabic so that he will be better able to communicate with his students. One of the greatest needs, according to this young corpsman, is for books which can be used in teaching English. He uses 200 books including encyclopedias but more books are needed; i.e., not above the English level of a sixth grader in America and down to the level of a second grader. Story books and reference material are badly needed.

This corpsman is working with three other volunteers on a 60–70 page book which can be used in the daily classes. When Mrs. Goodwill was asked why her son chose to join the Peace Corps she replied that, "when Peter was in his senior year at Drake University, Des Moines, Iowa, he met several people who represented the Corps and his roommate is now doing volunteer work in Brazil and another friend is working in Africa."

He graduated from Chelmsford High School in 1957 where he played football, basketball, and baseball. He was captain of the baseball team in his senior year and was class treasurer. Later, Mr. Goodwill attended Cushing Academy where he played football and was given the Ideal Cushing Student Award. At Drake, where he graduated in 1964, he was president of his fraternity. In September last year, he went to UCLA for 3 months' Peace Corps training and spent 2 weeks home at Christmas before embarking on his assignment.

Obviously, his athletic ability coupled with his educational background and desire to help other people less fortunate than himself were important factors in his selection for this work. When asked what her son intended to do at the end of his 2-year assignment in Ethiopia, Mrs. Goodwill replied that he may reenlist, attend law school, or take a civilian job.

When asked if the corpsmen were well received in Ethiopia, Mrs. Goodwill said that, at first, they were not well received but now the Ethiopians are asking for more corpsmen to help them attain a better standard of living. When the Moslem or Christian Ethiopian goes shopping he or she doesn't go to the nearest shopping center; rather they go to the open marketplace and do their weekly shopping as they pass from one stand to another.

One of the human interest sidelights of Mr. Goodwill's story was told in the classroom when one of his students asked the teacher if he had a sister. Mr. Goodwill answered "yes" and the student asked if she would like to write. Even though this seems like a small thing to do, it can show that the people in America do care about people in other lands. Thus, if you would like to adopt a pen pal in Ethiopia, Mrs. Goodwill will pass along your name to her son and, perhaps, a rewarding experience can be forthcoming for both you and a small child.

Elimination of Federal Excise Tax on Passenger Automobiles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include two resolutions recently passed by the Buffalo Automobile Dealers Association, Buffalo, N.Y., concerning the Federal excise tax on new automobiles.

I also wish to include a résumé on the amount of taxes a person pays who owns and drives an automobile. Althought these figures are for Erie County, N.Y., they could apply to almost any county in the United States.

RESOLUTION I

ELIMINATION OF FEDERAL EXCISE TAX ON PASSENGER CARS

Whereas the Buffalo Automobile Dealers Association, Inc., is comprised of 101 franchised new car dealer members representing all domestic and most imported makes of vehicles, located in Erie County, N.Y.; and

Whereas President Johnson has called upon Congress to repeal or reduce Federal excise taxes by $1.7 billion, effective July 1, 1965, in order to "increase purchasing power and stimulate further growth in the economy"; and

Whereas a Federal manufacturers' excise tax of 10 percent is now levied on all new automobiles manufactured for sale in the United States; and

Whereas automobiles have been subject to varying percentages of excise tax over the years since 1917 on a temporary basis, and presumably to help finance military objectives and to restrict their purchase so that all the basic metals, materials, and manpower normally used in their manufacture could go toward the war effort; and

Whereas the need for such restrictions and restraints no longer exist, and in fact their removal would greatly implement the avowed aim of the President; and

Whereas the excise tax on automobiles is discriminatory and not neutral in that it places an additional $1.8 billion burden on purchasers of a recognized necessity, and at a rate twice the rate imposed on most nonluxury consumer durables (the rate of tax on such other durables were reduced from 10 percent to 5 percent in 1954; the excise taxes on such luxury items as furs and jewelry have been reduced 50 percent since the Korean conflict); and

Whereas the automobile is the daily producer of vast tax revenues for local, State, and Federal coffers from the minute it goes on the highway until it goes to the junkyard (see attached list of tax revenues which it is conservatively estimated the automobile owners in Erie County alone will pay in 1965); and

Whereas the elimination of the excise tax on automobiles will lower the price of some 20 million new and used cars now purchased annually, thus lowering the cost of living, lead to increased employment opportunties, the creation of new jobs in industries related to the production and servicing of automobiles, add to the Nation's economic health and to the gross national product; and

Whereas the automobile—the greatest continuing tax producing consumer durable the country has—would, in addition, by its expanding numbers and greater use, generously continue to fill the tax coffers by constant payment of the many other user taxes to which the automobile is daily subject: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Buffalo Automobile Dealers Association in meeting assembled this 13th day of April, 1965, urges the immediate elimination by the U.S. Congress of the Federal manufacturers excise tax of 10 percent on passenger cars as being in the best interests of the citizens of this county, of this State, and of the national economy; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of the resolution, requesting and urging support for the elimination of this tax, be forwarded to each U.S. Senator from the State of New York, and each Representative from the County of Erie, State of New York.

Unanimously approved.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS, BUFFALO AUTOMOBILE DEALERS ASSOCIATION, INC.,
W. A. DIETRICH, *President*.

RESOLUTION II

RETROACTIVE APPLICATION OF AUTOMOTIVE EXCISE TAX REPEAL

Whereas the Buffalo Automobile Dealers Association, Inc., is composed of 101 franchised new car dealers representing all domestic and most imported makes of vehicles in Erie County, N.Y., and

Whereas numerous bills have been introduced in the Congress to repeal or substantially reduce the Federal excise taxes at the urging of President Johnson—there being some bills calling for the repeal or reduction of the present 10 percent excise tax on new automobiles, and

Whereas the proceedings of Congress are widely covered in the press and other news media, and

Whereas the Federal excise tax on new passenger cars averages $225 per car, and is so large an amount as to cause a prospective purchaser to delay purchase until final legislative action is taken on the reduction or removal of Federal excise taxes, thus threatening a serious disruption of our automotive industry, as well as affecting the national economy, and

Whereas knowledge by the public of the fact that any repeal or reduction of the Federal excise tax on passenger cars would be made retroactive to a certain date, would serve to minimize the postponement of contemplated purchases of such vehicles and lessen the probability of serious adverse effect upon the economy: Now therefore be it

Resolved, That the board of directors of the Buffalo Automobile Dealers Association in meeting assembled this 13th day of April, 1965, urges either the immediate enactment of legislation providing for refunds to purchasers of the Federal excise tax paid by them on new passenger cars purchased prior to the effective date of enactment of legislation, if any, repealing or reducing said automotive excise tax; or, in lieu thereof, an assurance, at the time that public announcement is first made of consideration by Congress of legislation to repeal or reduce Federal excise taxes, that if Congress later repeals or reduces the automotive excise tax, such repeal or reduction will be made retroactive to the date of the first public announcement of consideration by the Congress of legislation to repeal or reduce Federal excise taxes: Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution, requesting and urging support for such action by the Congress, be forwarded to each U.S. Senator from the State of New York, and each Representative from the County of Erie, State of New York.

Unanimously approved.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS, BUFFALO AUTOMOBILE DEALERS ASSOCIATION, INC.,
W. A. DIETRICH, *President*.

ESTIMATE OF VARIOUS USER TAXES WHICH PURCHASERS AND OWNERS OF MOTOR VEHICLES IN ERIE COUNTY WILL PAY IN 1965

Excise tax rates: New cars, 10 percent; replacement parts and accessories, 8 percent; motor oil, 6 cents per gallon; tires and tubes, 10 cents per pound; gasoline, 10 cents per gallon.

All, plus 3 percent Erie County sales tax, license plate fees, throughway tolls, operators' licenses, etc.

It has been carefully estimated, on the basis of approximately 350,000 vehicles in Erie County, that the owners thereof will pay, in 1965, the following taxes:

Excise, new cars	$12,000,000
Gasoline tax on average annual mileage of 9,635 with consumption of 774 gallons per vehicle at tax of 10 cents per gallon for 270,900,000 gallons	27,090,000
Erie County sales tax thereon	800,000
License plates at average of $23.20	$8,120,000
Excise on oil, parts, tires, tubes, etc	2,000,000
Erie County sales tax at 3 percent—cars	4,500,000
Erie County sales tax at 3 percent—parts, accessories, etc	516,000
Total estimated	55,026,000

Descalation Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I would like to include at this point two editorials from the New York Times—one from the edition of April 22, and the other from Sunday's edition of April 25.

These articles, in my opinion, emphasize the need for our country to continue and, in fact, to intensify our efforts to seek real peace in Vietnam. We can and we must make progress toward peaceful settlement of this tragic situation, and it is up to us to lead the way in bringing forth new proposals for further discussions and negotiations that might result in achievement of a peaceful solution to this conflict.

The editorial follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Apr. 22, 1965]

DESCALATION NEEDED

The war in Vietnam is to be stepped up, Washington now says. In other words, the U.S. Government is going to continue to bomb, send in more Americans, spend more and commit more lives, money, destructiveness and power—and take more risk. In return, the hope is that Hanoi will act to curb the Vietcong guerrillas in South Vietnam, if it can, and will refrain from sending in more men and arms and orders to the south. The hope also is that Peiping and Moscow will hold off from their own particular methods of escalation.

Those who have all along feared that the course the war has been taking since early February would force the United States into an even greater commitment, leading to ever greater danger to Asia and to the world, are unhappily being proved true prophets. Once a war begins, forces take over which seem beyond control. In Vietnam, on both sides, one step is leading—as if inexorably—to another and then another. Continuance of the present process by the opposing forces could lead to catastrophe.

Nothing is more important for Americans today than to face these hard truths before it is too late. And it is vital that the channels of communication, of opinion and of dissent be kept open—on the floor of Congress, in the press, in the country at large—in the face of a growing tendency to ridicule or to denounce the opposition and to demand unswerving support of further escalation in the name of patriotism.

Bitterness and emotionalism are increasingly entering the discussions on Vietnam in the United States. This is a deplorable development, and so is the polarization of opinion in every country and between blocs of countries. It is as if the battlelines were being drawn all over the world—but for a major war that need not and must not take place.

President Johnson's offer of "unconditional discussions" was a splendid move on the diplomatic-political front, in the effort to achieve a peaceful solution of the quarrel. While it deserved a far better response from the other side than it has yet received, it did mark, as we have previously noted, a beginning to an interchange among the combatants—subtle and indirect, but nevertheless a beginning.

But the continued bombing of North Vietnam makes progress toward a peaceful settlement—however far off it must necessarily be—more difficult rather than less harder rather than easier. We think that as a followup to the President's fine declaration in Baltimore, a descalation of the war is needed, rather than the escalation that we now see imminent.

It is at least worth the effort to see whether a scaling down of the bombing might not evoke a corresponding scaling down of North Vietnamese aggression in South Vietnam. The North Vietnamese incidents in the south are easily measurable; if a diminution of American bombing of the north should lead to a diminution in the rate of incidents in the south, a major step would thereby be signaled toward the "unconditional discussions" offered by the President.

Of course, there might be no such response at all, and if there were not, the bombing would be resumed. But at least a descalation such as we suggest would afford the opportunity to the other side of making a gesture toward peace without losing face. It might lead, ultimately, to a cease-fire and a truce.

President Johnson launched a very tentative but real peace offensive at Johns Hopkins. He has not yet given this policy enough time but the continued bombing has tended to cast some doubt on the sincerity of the U.S. desire for negotiations.

This is clearly a moment of crisis—for Vietnam, for the United States, and for the world. Less bombing, not more, offers some hope of peace—without any weakness of American resolution. By taking such an attitude the United States would show strength as well as wisdom.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Apr. 25, 1965]

AS THE WAR ESCALATES

The pace of the war in Vietnam is accelerating. Time is a relative factor, so that 10 days in this April have been like 10 weeks last year and 10 months in previous years. There is an awareness now—in the world as well as the United States—that the drama is building toward its climax. There is a sense of grim determination on one side and defiance on the other. And there is also the sense that the world may be moving toward a still distant holocaust that is, however, visible on the horizon.

Fortunately, nothing that has not yet happened is inevitable. The debate going on among Americans, and in other countries, is evidence that the situation is as fluid as it is complex. Power alone, in the form of guns and bombs, cannot solve the Vietnamese conflict for either side.

President Johnson showed his realization of this fact by his offer of "unconditional discussions" and a sort of Marshall plan for southeast Asia. However, this offer was accompanied by the steady explosion of bombs in North Vietnam. After a conference of the U.S. leaders in Honolulu in the past week it was announced that the war was

to be stepped up. As the war escalates, so do destruction and danger.

It is easy for the United States to double or treble its Air Force; to send in three divisions instead of one; to spend $2 or $3 or $10 on military might in place of $1. If that would solve the Vietnamese problem, there would be no need to worry. But it would not. On the contrary, it would simply lead to further escalation on the other side, and thus vastly increase the peril.

This is why thought and discussion must turn toward other possibilities. One suggestion, which this newspaper supports, is a "descalation" of the bombing of North Vietnam, a deliberate reduction in the air missions and their size. Hanoi would then be expected correspondingly to reduce the incident rate in South Vietnam. If there were no response to the American peace gesture, the bombing could be resumed.

Another possibility now moving toward the top of official consideration would be to utilize a proposed conference on Cambodia in Phnom Penh to bring together the nine powers which signed or accepted the 1954 Geneva agreements on Indochina. Thus, Americans, North Vietnamese, South Vietnamese, Chinese Communists, Russians, and others could talk quietly about Vietnam without commitments.

Washington, Hanoi, Peiping, Moscow and other capitals have come out in favor of the 1954 accords as a basis for negotiations. But it is doubtful that the agreements as such could settle all of today's problems. The time, the circumstances, the power factors, the climate of opinion are all different in 1965.

Nevertheless, "a return to the essentials of the agreements of 1954," to cite President Johnson, may be possible—if there can be agreement on what the essentials are.

Some details of the 1954 agreements have theoretical possibilities, depending on their interpretation. For instance: no "troop reinforcements"; no "new military bases"; respect for the "sovereignty, the independence, the unity, and the territorial integrity" of Vietnam; no "interference in internal affairs"; "free general elections by secret ballot."

Diplomacy has been sorely lacking in the Vietnamese affair. The United States has the support of some governments whose interests are linked, or are parallel, to ours; but it is not much exaggeration to say that the world outside our borders is against what we are doing in Vietnam.

It is not too late to seek new policies. It is much too soon to lose heart for negotiations. Orientals need have no monopoly on patience. There is nothing to lose by holding open doors to peace—or opening new doors. A greater war is not the way to peace.

Soil Conservation Service Small Watershed Program in Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR CALLAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, no natural resource conservation effort is more important to Nebraska than the small watershed program, authorized by Congress in 1954 as Public Law 566.

Yet the program's potential has been hardly more than tapped. Great and lasting benefits are possible under it, extending beyond watershed protection and flood prevention to water supply and outdoor recreation developments, and fish and wildlife conservation.

Gage County provides an example of outstanding watershed work in Nebraska. Five watershed projects are authorized for operations and three more are in the planning stage. A countywide recreation development is planned as part of the program. Benefits of $1 million are seen when current projects are completed.

In Gage, as in other counties, such as Lancaster, Otoe, Pawnee, and Saunders, the watershed protection and flood contral program has brought a more stable agricultural income, a reduction in highway maintenance costs, urban protection against floods, and gully stabilization.

Much more needs to be done, a fact made clear by these figures:

Nebraska has 247 small watersheds, 187 of which have problems that could be solved by project type work offered under the watershed protection program. Assistance in watershed projects has been requested by 73 communities.

Sixty-four watershed project applications have been approved by the State and sent to the U.S. Department of Agriculture for approval. Twenty projects are in the operations stage, and an additional 13 are getting planning help. An estimated $18 million of Federal funds will be spent in completing projects under construction.

The backlog of applications waiting to be acted on is large. Nebraska's case in this respect mirrors the Nation generally. Federal funds are limited. But more communities should indicate an interest in cooperating in watershed protection projects, and support an expansion of this vital conservation work in this State and across the country.

Henry J. Kaiser Active at 82

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, whether life begins at 82 may be a moot question, but certainly 82 should not be the age of retirement. I am extending my remarks to include the following article from the Honolulu Advertiser:

KAISER JUST CAN'T STAY IN LOW GEAR

(By Bob Krauss)

Eighty-two-year-old industrialist Henry J. Kaiser, ordered by his doctor to stop working 16 hours a day, is as happy about it all as a bear with a thorn in his foot.

"Every day the doctor asks me how many hours I've worked," he snorted yesterday as we drove around Hawaii Kai on an inspection trip in a black-upholstered, air-conditioned Jeep Wagoneer.

"What do you tell him?" I asked.

"The truth," Mr. Kaiser said glumly.

For a long time Kaiser's local doctor has been trying to get him to slow down. But the industrialist, whose worldwide empire is worth over $2 billion, refused to listen until a recent 3-week mainland business trip.

During 1 day of this trip Kaiser arose at his usual 7 a.m., flew in his private plane over a proposed new 87,000-acre Kaiser development near Los Angeles, then continued on to Oakland to spend the rest of the day in continuous business sessions.

Several days later, after he had kept on working, the doctor laid down the law, "Stop working so hard, or else."

"He's been pretty good about it," said Executive Assistant Robert C. (Bob) Elliott yesterday. "Since he came back he's been working at home instead of going to his office at Hawaii Kai."

Yesterday was the first time since his return that Kaiser has ventured off his 7½-acre Portlock estate. He looked very fit in a white sports shoes, white slacks, and a lightweight shirt.

"I want to see the fill," he barked at Jim Nolan, an aid, at the wheel."

"The fill" is a former swamp that is being built up with cinders and coral dredged from the nearby fishpond to serve as land for an addition to the Hawaii Kai Shopping Center.

"They've taken compaction tests. We'll have them by Friday," said Nolan. Kaiser nodded.

Then we bounced back over the bulldozer tracks to a new 750-house subdivision where Kaiser has just spent $1 million installing utilities. Along the way we talked about Kaiser Jeeps. "We sold 200,000 of them last year," he said.

From there we bumped along over a dirt road past a new Hawaii Kai recreation area where workmen were putting finishing touches to an Olympic-sized swimming pool and tennis courts.

We rode along past more swamp that is due for dredging and filling as a marina, then back to the highway where Kaiser pointed out the future location of a large apartment building which will go up at the entrance to Hawaii Kai.

"There's so much work to be done here, so much expansion that is coming," he said. "This year we built 1,000 houses. That's a lot of houses. But not when you think of what's coming. The population of California is 18 million today. In the year 2000 it will be 41 million. That will have a great effect on this area."

"Mr. Kaiser," I said, "I interviewed you about 10 years ago concerning your work schedule. You said you took a notebook to bed with you so you could jot down ideas during the night."

"I don't do that anymore," he answered.

Nolan said, smiling, "Now he picks up the phone and has somebody else take the notes."

"What time do you get up and what time do you go to bed?" I asked.

"I get up at 7 o'clock in the morning and go to bed at midnight," Kaiser answered.

In the back seat, Elliott said, "Before Mr. Kaiser began working from his home * * *."

"Don't call it a home, call it a jail," Henry J. interrupted grumpily. "I don't consider it work. They do but I don't."

I said, "Well, I think you've earned the right to slow down a little."

"What do you want to slow down for?" Henry J. wanted to know. "I don't want to slow down. Now I have 75,000 employes in 125 factories in 27 countries. * * *" His voice trailed off as if he were lost in a wandering thought.

Elliott filled in for him. "The Kaiser Medical Plan now has over 1,200,000 members and there are more than 60 Kaiser hospitals and clinics."

Henry J. came back to us. "I'm going to work this Christmas. Edgar is coming with his family and we'll discuss medical research." Under his breath, he added, "The doctor doesn't know it, yet."

"Mr. Kaiser, have you ever entertained any thoughts about retiring?" I asked.

His voice was curt, "No." Then he added more pleasantly, "I don't see any sense in it as long as you are able to think and give others an opportunity to do things."

As we drove up to the entrance to Kaiser's estate, where an electric eye slides open the iron gate, he said to Nolan, "Be sure and give me those plans for the marina, I want to rest some more."

The USIA, Art and Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that the U.S. Information Agency has decided to stop its sponsorship of American art at the two most important international art exhibitions, the biennials at Venice, Italy, and São Paulo, Brazil.

This decision is somewhat astounding when one considers the record the United States achieved in the two exhibitions in which the USIA participated. In 1963 the American artist Adolph Gottlieb won first prize at São Paulo, and in 1964 Robert Rauschenberg won top award at Vienna.

Whether or not one appreciates modern art, it must be admitted that winning these two prizes is an outstanding accomplishment and can do the American image among the other nations of the world no harm.

It was not long ago, I remember, when the cultural accomplishments of the United States were represented in a German students' parade by a huge, familiar soft drink bottle. The art awards at the biennials have helped to impress the people of the world that our Nation stands preeminent in the arts just as we do in science and technology.

In the face of all this, however, the USIA has decided to quit. It seems a little like a poker player leaving the game after winning two big hands.

Apparently the USIA made the decision in the name of economy. It will cost approximately $111,000 to sponsor the American exhibit at the 1966 Venice biennial and $69,000 for the 1967 São Paulo showing. I am loath to believe that economies could not have been achieved somewhere else which would have allowed continued participation.

After all, every other nation participating thinks it worthwhile to underwrite the cost of its artists' exhibits. Further, private sources have previously attempted to sponsor the U.S. show, with a notable lack of needed funds—and certainly less success than the USIA.

The situation recently was described by Mr. Frank Getlein in his art column for the New Republic. Mr. Getlein, editorial writer for the Washington Star, believes that the USIA terminated its sponsorship of the exhibits principally out of fear of congressional criticism.

USIA officials were, in other words, trying to save us Philistines from ourselves.

Believing that Congress is not antagonistic toward art, Mr. Speaker, I urge that the USIA take another look at the situation to see if the money can be found which would allow continued participation by the agency in these biennials.

At this point, I would like to include the article by Mr. Getlein which appeared in the April 3 New Republic, and urge the attention of my colleagues to it.

The article follows:

ROGER AND THE RABBITS

There used to be a migratory farmworker named Lenny who, in moments of stress, would ask his buddy, "Tell me about the rabbits, George." And George would spin an implausible yarn about the good times to come when the pair would own their own little piece of ground and Lenny would get to take care of the rabbits. And while the story lasted Lenny never noticed that they were out of work and starving, that the rain was coming down or that the angry mob was getting closer.

It is just possible that Roger Stevens, who is shaping up as this country's answer to André Malraux, is really charged with telling us about the rabbits. Stevens, who is chairman of everything in government having to do with the arts, from the John F. Kennedy Center to the new advisory council, is the man L.B.J. instinctively thinks of when he thinks of art and the reason is plain enough. Stevens is second only to the master himself in conjuring up visions of America as the Athens on the Pedernales in the golden time to come even as the men arrive from the finance company to carry off the icebox.

The other day, for example, Stevens enthralled the Nation with a word picture of live theater in every shopping center, or at least in the larger ones. Why should people in Oshkosh have to journey to New York and pay exorbitant prices to see "Mary, Mary" and other works of theater art? Why indeed? Under the Stevens plan they can stay at home, drop in at their neighborhood shopping center and catch "Barefoot in the Park" between the dry cleaners and the supermarket. What's more, it can be done with a $3 top. The sets can be standard and built by local carpenters, thus spreading around a little prosperity and cutting down rehearsal time and shipping costs. There'll be plenty of free parking—eventually, no doubt, it'll be drive-in live theater. And best of all, it won't really cost any money. It can all come out of FHA insured mortgages. The Government provides only the financial confidence needed, not the actual cash.

This general approach has been criticized by some as an over-concern with buildings and a simple unawareness of what goes on or could go on or ought to go on inside the buildings. Fair comment. It is also fair comment to note the characteristic belief that in the arts you really can get something for nothing, that you can carry on like Pope Julius without every laying out any money at all. But it is preeminently futurism, the story of the rabbits.

For while Stevens was staging his chain-store theater scheme, the men from the finance company were closing out one brief and staggeringly successful fling of the American Government in American art. Early in the New Frontier, Stevens' predecessor of fewer title, August Heckscher, persuaded the United States Information Agency to take up the job of American representation at the two most important international art exhibitions, the biennials at Venice and at Sao Paulo. Before that, for decades, the United States had been represented by various methods. The pavilion at Venice, for example, had been built and run by a New York art dealer, Grand Central Galleries, which eventually turned the building and the job over to the Museum of Modern Art, which more often than not farmed out the exhibition to some other institution. This practice contrasted with that of all other nations represented in both shows, for in all cases the capital investment and the expenses were laid out by the several governments. The feeling of foreigners seemed to be that nations as such had a direct interest in their own art both at home and abroad. Until Heckscher, this was beyond the grasp of American Government officials. Now it has eluded them again.

The record of USIA participation has been spectacular. In 1963 they went to Sao Paulo and came out with the first prize, awarded to Adolph Gottlieb. In 1964 they went to Venice and came out with the first prize, given to Robert Rauschenberg.

In recognition of this remarkable record, top USIA officials, presumably working in close collaboration with the Bureau of the Budget under the Johnsonian anti-frill principle and in permanent holy terror of the Congress, dropped the program completely. The 1965 participation of Sao Paulo, since work has already begun on it, will be allowed to take place. But after that, nothing, in either show. It is the opinion of the budget-composer that the responsibility should be given to the American "art community."

Well, of course, there isn't any American art community in that sense. The lobby doesn't exist. If a Government agency or a secretary to the Senate majority wants to do business with the aerospace or vending machine industry, there is a "community" organized and ready for bids. Not so in art. What the budget really means is that the Great Society, in its actual working, doesn't give a damn about American art and is not about to. The "great socialites" will be glad to hit up Mary Lasker for a few free tulip bulbs to plant along the mall. They will also accept as gifts or long-term loans any approved contemporary art that an artist or dealer wants to present free for hanging in our embassies around the world. A recent breakthrough will apparently allow the executive offices to participate in the same free load, even if the artists haven't been dead 20 years. And in the manner devised by Napoleon, we may expect more medals all around as other artists are tapped to join Willem de Kooning as Great Society painter. But money? No.

The money required is about $80,000 a year to finance American participation in both shows. This would come out of a USIA budget of over $170 million and is thus pretty tiny as these things go. Since the budget was drawn up and submitted before the agency decided to close out various of its sacked libraries, it may be presumed that money could be found even without specific budgetary listing in the event that Congress or the Presidency suddenly decided to back up the golden words with one golden deed.

It used to be standard practice to blame Government indifference or hostility to art on Congress and there was a presumption that Congress was, in however crude a manner, fairly representative of the country's feelings on the subject. Those feelings, if we can believe anything we read, are in the process of change and it is probably true that Congress is less hostile to art than ever. Unfortunately, as far as the USIA programs are concerned, we shall never know. All we know is that whatever the feelings of Congress, the feelings of this agency are negative.

The Museum of Modern Art unloaded the program in the first place because its board felt representation was properly a function of the Government—as it is in all other countries showing art in Venice or Sao Paulo—and because the expenses, tiny for

the USIA, were becoming overwhelming for a single museum. The Modern, therefore, is not going to constitute itself the "art community" and pick up the ball from where USIA's economy fiends have dropped it. The American Federation of Arts in theory could represent the "art community," but in this case almost certainly won't. There is some interest within the Smithsonian Institution, the art apparatus of which—under the title of the National Collection of Fine Arts—is showing a vitality unimaginable a couple of years ago, but the obstacles are formidable since representation of art abroad can hardly be called either research or the instruction of American citizens.

There is an excellent chance that the America of the Great Society will be simply unrepresented at the major international exhibitions after 1965, unless, perhaps, Roger Stevens can work out a no-cost method of getting art shows into shopping centers and shipping a shopping center over as a sample of our culture.

First Anniversary of Establishment of United Republic of Tanzania

SPEECH
OF
HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, today marks the first anniversary of the establishment of the United Republic of Tanzania. On this important day, I want to extend my warmest congratulations to that rising young African nation, to its President, Mwalimu Julius K. Nyerere, and to the people of Tanzania. The 26th of April is Union Day in this African nation, rather than Independence Day, because it was on this day just one year ago that the two new African nations of Tanganyika and Zanzibar embarked upon the enormous project of combining their two countries into a single nation.

Nature started Tanzania off with the basic fundamentals with which to build a nation—above all, a vigorous people, important values and traditions deeply imbedded in their society, a variety of mineral and agricultural resources having important developmental potential, and exciting touristic possibilities. Starting with their present endowments, Tanzanians, like our own Nation nearly two centuries ago, have set about working out for themselves the physical, political, and cultural foundations for a thriving new nation.

They, and they alone, have the heavy responsibility for deciding the real future of their nation—the kind of government they want in the longer run; the type of society they should develop as they mature as an independent people in today's world; how much they want to keep of the old and the traditional; how much they would like to bring in of the new and the modern. They must determine how to get the schools, the teachers, the doctors, the hospitals, and the formidable array of other assets they want and need.

As this young nation of Tanzania struggles to create a unified and prosperous nation, we Americans may well feel both nostalgia and admiration. A hundred and seventy years ago and more, we, too, were a small, very new nation going through much of the same struggle with many of the same problems as this young nation now celebrating its first birthday. So today, I ask my fellow Americans to join me in expressing our friendship for the nation and peoples of Tanzania, as they pass this important milestone in their country's history.

He'd Defoliate the Jungle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. RHODES
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the startling resemblance which our actions in Vietnam bear to the recommendations of Senator Barry Goldwater has been noted by more than one writer. It is certainly fair to conjecture as to whether or not the courses of action which we are now taking were contemplated by the strategists of the Democratic Party, even while their spokesmen were loudly crying "warmonger" in the late months of 1964. A "before and after" picture of the situation is clearly defined in the column entitled "He'd Defoliate the Jungle" which appeared in the Chicago Tribune of April 1965. The article follows:

HE'D DEFOLIATE THE JUNGLE

As the Democrats never wearied of telling us, Barry Goldwater was a dangerous man. He would spread the fighting in Vietnam, bomb across the 17th parallel into Communist territory, and—horror of horrors—he even thought of defoliating the jungle. Why, before you knew it, we might find ourselves in a—well, in a war.

But, as Art Buchwald has comfortingly pointed out, we were spared all that, and things are in the calm, competent hands of Lyndon Baines Johnson, who would never think of dropping a nuclear bomb on an innocent little girl plucking daisies. What a relief it is.

But somehow this fellow Goldwater must have snuck by the Secret Service men and got into the White House and pressed the panic button, for here we are informed, with every evidence of pride, that U.S. airmen have tried to start the biggest jungle barbecue in history.

Having first doused the whole forest with chemicals to kill shrubbery so that the fire would burn more swiftly, a fleet of 75 aircraft swept back over the Boi Loi jungle and splattered tons of petrol, jellied gasoline, and incendiary bombs on the woods, starting an immense fire aimed at rooting out the entrenched Communist forces infesting the forest.

The fire was intended to defoliate an area 50 miles square, and got off to a roaring start which caused one happy American military spokesman to chortle that "it was going great." It burned steadily for 12 hours, but then the heat of the flames produced a thunderstorm which doused the biggest conflagration since the Chicago fire. We suppose that this will not discourage Dr. Strangewater from trying again, for, as a certain reckless politician once said, "When you remove the foliage, you remove the cover."

Well, we must join Mr. Buchwald in rejoicing that we have a man in the White House who would never do such things.

A More Accurate Look at the Rayburn Building

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, for some time now since the Rayburn House Office Building has been opened to the press and public, a deluge of criticism has been heaped upon it. The press reports would lead one to believe that the 169 senior Representatives who sought tenancy in the modern building were thoroughly disenchanted and straining to get out.

A more accurate picture of the situation is reflected in an editorial which appeared in our congressional newspaper, Roll Call, on April 22.

The author of the article, Roll Call editor and publisher, Sidney Yudain, is probably one of the most astute reporters of the Capitol scene, having been participating in, observing and interpreting congressional activities for some 15 years. The phenomenal 10-year success of Roll Call and its acceptance by the Congress as its "official paper" is due in large part to its grasp of congressional sentiment and feeling, often beyond the reach of other publications.

I believe Mr. Yudain has done a service to the Congress and to the public in pointing out that aside from a few annoyances common to every new home occupant, Congressmen are, as a whole, well pleased with the beauty, efficiency, and setup of their new functional offices. I believe that Mr. Yudain also voices the prevailing opinion of the taxpaying citizens when he points out that upon visiting these offices they are consumed with pride in the facilities provided for their elected Representatives.

The editorial follows:

IN THEIR HEARTS

Now that the rumbling and grumbling over the Rayburn House Office Building has risen to a crescendo, let's take a good, honest look into what the situation really is.

No doubt the building is expensive. No one denies that costs mounted throughout the construction due to unforeseen changes. Even after construction, myriad faults were found and corrected at additional expense.

But now the lucky 169 Congressmen and a variety of committees have moved into the spacious quarters. What is the honest-to-goodness reaction of those actually occupying the building?

Some few are discontented about some facets of their new quarters. But in their hearts, they know they've never had it so good.

Most of the Representatives are tickled pink over their new quarters. Some staffers

aren't satisfied with their lodging, but then, the offices were built for efficiency first. And with the bountiful filing space, the machine rooms, and roach-free surrounding, staffers are likely to grow to like their new homes almost as much as their bosses like theirs.

The Congressmen's suites are beautiful and impressive, yet not gaudy or ostentatious. Whoever propagated the idea that servants of the people had to be ensconsed in hovels less attractive than the lowliest business executive?

Constituents generally are pleased and impressed with their Congressmen's quarters. After all, as employers of these governmental representatives, they take pride in seeing them comfortable and outfitted with the tools they need to work in their behalf.

Sure, a lot of money was spent, and some of it was wasted. But we have to admit that the end result is a building that represents the majesty and the glory of this rich Nation, a respect for the high office of a U.S. Congressman by the countrymen who benefit by his labors.

Let's have a Rayburn Appreciation Week. Perhaps it could coincide with Let's Be Honest Week.

Pittsburgh Research: Key to Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 19, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of Members of the House to two more chapters in the interesting story "Pittsburgh Research: Key to Tomorrow." These deal with research facilities and research results.

PITTSBURGH RESEARCH: KEY TO TOMORROW

RESEARCH FACILITIES

Pittsburgh is known as the research headquarters for such industrial giants as the United States Steel Corp., Westinghouse Electric Corp., Aluminum Co. of America, Gulf Oil Corp., and Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co.

Considerably more research activity is going on in Pittsburgh. More than a hundred other industrial laboratories, three major universities, two outstanding Federal research facilities, and one of the leading research institutes are in the area.

The area has the most modern pilot plant facility in the food industry at H. J. Heinz Co.; the Nation's newest rapid transit research center at Westinghouse Air Brake Co.; the world's largest manufacturer-distributor of laboratory instruments and reagent chemicals at Fisher Scientific Co.; and a pioneering research and development center for astronomical and missile tracking telescopes at the J. W. Fecker division of American Optical Co.

Bettis Atomic Power Laboratory is the Nation's pacesetter in nuclear power reactor design and fabrication research. The U.S. Bureau of Mines has the most complete research facilities in the mineral industries at its Pittsburgh laboratories.

Each year, Pittsburgh's research and development capabilities are being expanded even further with new or enlarged facilities, such as the new space sciences center at the University of Pittsburgh, process laboratory at Crucible Steel Co. of America, high voltage laboratories at Westinghouse Electric Corp. and McGraw-Edison Co., and the most modern research complex at Alcoa.

RESEARCH RESULTS

The effectiveness of Pittsburgh's research and development efforts has been demonstrated repeatedly through significant basic discoveries, the development of new products and processes, and unique applications of existing knowledge.

University of Pittsburgh scientists, for example, have been responsible for the first industrial applications of spectroscopy, advanced bomb release mechanisms, and the Salk polio vaccine.

Research at Mellon Institute has led to the founding of a number of industries, such as synthetic rubber, plastics, and petrochemicals, and many large companies, including Union Carbide Chemicals Co., Plaskon Co., and Dow-Corning Corp.

Pittsburgh industrial laboratories also have contributed to technological progress. Their developments have covered such varied areas as nuclear power, super alloys, missile tracking systems, high voltage transmission, and scientific instruments.

In the 1963 I–R 100 competition sponsored by Industrial Research magazine, the Pittsburgh area was responsible for 10 of the 100 most significant technical products of the year.

Products cited were: variable transmission glass by Mellon Institute and Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co.; martensitic stainless steel by Crucible Steel Co. of America; distillation gas analyzer and BTDA cross-linking agent for epoxy resins by Gulf Research & Development Co.; neutron gamma spectrometry plates and a low-cost laser by Semi-Elements Inc.; and self-lubricating materials, superconducting MHD generator, high intensity light source, and an epoxy laminate by Westinghouse Electric Corp.

Medicare Victory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. MOSS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 22, 1965

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

[From the Sacramento (Calif.) Bee, Apr. 10, 1965]

MEDICARE VICTORY

Passage by the House of the $6 billion health care-social security bill is a triple victory. First it is a personal triumph for President Lyndon B. Johnson, who wanted positive action before Easter. Second, it is a success for the backers of progress in the field of social legislation. And third, it is a vindication of faith in the principle that government should help citizens take care of themselves.

The 313 to 115 House vote in favor of the bill, almost a 3-to-1 margin, indicates supporters have done their work well. The Senate is expected to follow with similar favorable action, putting into law the greatest expansion and revision of the social security system since the depression.

Under the measure, U.S. citizens over the age of 65 would have access to a hospital plan financed under social security by payroll tax increases. The elderly also would be afforded the opportunity of an insurance plan they can afford, a $3 a month optional program to pay for doctor bills and some other medical expenses.

In addition, the measure would liberalize social security old age benefits.

President Johnson described the triple victory accurately. He said: "This demonstrates once again the vitality of our democratic system in responding to the needs and will of the people."

It also proves the wrongness of the opposition of the American Medical Association which continues to be reluctant to support fulfillment of these needs and this will.

Gardner "Pat" Jackson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, in any generation a man with the courage of his convictions and the daring and wit to express them is a rare phenomenon.

When a man of foresight and vision dares to differ with the majority of his neighbors and friends, he is frequently subjected to ridicule and even outright malice. Only the strong will persist and carry a principle to its conclusion. Such a man was Gardner "Pat" Jackson, whose death on April 17 takes from us a crusading journalist.

Pat Jackson's zealous championship of the underdog brought him hardship, and even physical suffering, but it also brought him the admiration and gratitude of countless people.

I would like to include a summary of Pat Jackson's career and an editorial in tribute to him which appeared in the Washington Post in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The articles follow:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 22, 1965]

GARDNER JACKSON

Gardner Jackson—he was Pat Jackson to everyone who knew him—represented an essentially romantic and crusading tradition in journalism and in politics. The role of detached observer was not for him. He was a part of all that he experienced, a profoundly involved mover and participant. Thus, as a young newspaperman in Boston during the 1920's, he became involved in the Sacco-Vanzetti case and took a leading role in that bitter controversy. As a reporter in Washington during the earliest days of the New Deal, he soon found himself caught up in the excitement of its reforms and directly engaged in its internal struggles. The same course characterized his relations with the turmoil in the labor movement of the 1940's.

To every cause with which he was connected, Pat Jackson gave himself unstintingly. He brought to all that he did an extraordinary exuberance and commitment, a sense of ardor and of passionate conviction. His death at 68 takes from the Washington scene a most colorful and attractive figure. If he belonged somewhat more to an exciting past than to the present, he belongs none the less richly today to those who shared that past with him and cherish him as one of its authentic heroes.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 18, 1965]

STORMY CAREER ENDS FOR GARDNER JACKSON

(By Willard Clopton, Washington Post staff writer)

Gardner (Pat) Jackson, 68, once called "the champion of lost causes" for his zealous

support of the underdog, died early yesterday at Washington Hospital Center.

In 45 years as a newspaperman, public official, and union executive, Mr. Jackson crusaded for such causes as Sacco and Vanzetti, the southern sharecroppers, the Spanish Royalists, the American Indian, the bonus marchers and civil liberties in general.

His persistence cost him several jobs, his inherited wealth, and the sight of one eye.

Born in Colorado Springs, son of a Western railroad magnate, Mr. Jackson had lived in Washington more than 30 years. His home was at 1410 29th Street, NW.

One morning in 1921, when he was a fledgling reporter on the Boston Globe, his wife Dorothy, looked up from the paper and said, "Pat, there's something strange about this trial down in Dedham. Why don't you see if you can find out anything about it."

The trial was that of Nicola Sacco and Bartolomeo Vanzetti, two immigrant Italian anarchists accused of a payroll robbery and murder the year before.

Mr. Jackson became curious about the lack of hard evidence against the two and was soon convinced that they were on trial mainly for their political beliefs. He did much to bring the case to national attention.

He began giving more and more of his time to the case and in 1926 quit the Globe to become secretary of the Sacco-Vanzetti Defense Committee.

After the two were executed in 1927 he returned to the Globe, but came to Washington in 1930 to become correspondent for several Canadian papers.

Three years later, he was recruited by the New Deal as assistant consumer's counsel in the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, set up to help farmers hurt by the depression.

While Agriculture Secretary Henry A. Wallace was concentrating on aiding farmers who owned their lands, Mr. Jackson and some other aids began focusing instead on the problems of tenant farmers.

Their divergent interests led in 1935 to the "Wallace purge," in which Mr. Jackson and the others were fired.

Several years later he was re-hired by Agriculture Secretary Claude Wickard, but in 1943 again was dismissed after pushing too hard for expansion of the Farm Security Administration, which focused its efforts on helping the small subsistence farmer.

An element in both firings was a suspicion that the outspoken official had leaked inside information to the press.

Mr. Jackson had by this time become a confidante of official Washington and his counsel was sought frequently by Cabinet officers, Supreme Court Justices, even the White House.

For several years in the 1930's and 1940's, Mr. Jackson did organizational work for the CIO, first under John L. Lewis and then under the late Philip Murray. He was active in helping to eliminate Communist influence from the organization after World War II.

In 1944, he was attacked outside a Greenwich Village restaurant and suffered a vicious beating, which caused him to lose the sight of one eye. The assault was believed linked to his anti-Communist activity.

The son of William S. Jackson, banker and owner of the Denver and Rio Grande Railroad, Mr. Jackson lived in Colorado until coming East to attend Amherst College.

After 2½ years there he entered the Army, which assigned him to a machinegun company in Georgia until after the end of World War I. He spent a year afterward at Columbia University before joining the Globe.

In the 1940's, Mr. Jackson spent 2 years covering Washington for the now defunct newspaper, PM. In recent years, he had been a freelance writer and labor consultant.

Mr. Jackson is survived by his wife; three sons, Gardner, Jr., and Geoffrey of Boston and Everett of Cape Cod; a daughter, Mrs. Raymond Smith of Hastings-on-Hudson, N.Y., and seven grandchildren.

A memorial service will be held at 11 a.m. Monday at Gawler's Funeral Home, Wisconsin Avenue and Harrison Street NW. Burial will be private.

Mr. Whitten and "Silent Spring"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, over the past several years, much attention has been directed to the pesticide problem. One of those responsible for a greater awareness on the part of the public to the dangers inherent in the use of such chemicals was the late Rachel Carson, author of "Silent Spring."

Her warnings led to reviews and revisions of the methods used in pest control, and it has been conclusively proved that the indiscriminate use of such insecticides and pesticides has resulted in widespread pollution and damage to fish and wildlife.

I was interested, therefore, in reading an editorial which appeared in today's New York Times, and I am inserting it herewith in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so that the contents of the same might be available to my colleagues and to those who read the RECORD.

The editorial follows:

MR. WHITTEN AND "SILENT SPRING"

The report of the House Subcommittee on Agriculture Appropriations, criticizing the late Rachel Carson and her book "Silent Spring," comes as no surprise. Last August, about the same time that he launched his so-called investigation of the pesticides problem, Chairman JAMIE L. WHITTEN of this group described as a "witch hunt" the official concern about chemical residues on foodstuffs.

In his position as chairman of the subcommittee which passes on the billions spent in the Federal farm programs, Mr. WHITTEN has acted through the years as the Department of Agriculture's extension agent to Congress. The Department's pest-control officials, already wounded by Miss Carson's barbs, have been hurt further by the mounting evidence that some of the chemicals they used and so strongly endorsed have been polluting the environment and causing widespread damage to fish and wildlife.

The findings of Mr. WHITTEN's investigators collide sharply with those of the White House Science Advisory Committee, which in May of 1963 issued a report corroborating Miss Carson's warnings and calling for drastic changes in Government pest-control and pesticide procedures.

Fortunately, under prodding by Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman, the Department has been shifting its research emphasis to biological controls and other nonchemical methods. Some Federal agencies that engage in insect control operations, notably Mr. Freeman's own Forest Service, have been changing to safer methods, abandoning in large measure the use of persistent, pollution-causing compounds such as DDT.

Now it will be necessary for Secretary Freeman to be alert to see that some of his departmental bureaucrats do not seize upon the Whitten report as an excuse to revert to old errors.

Merit Means Most for Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK BROOKS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, we have now had sufficient time to observe the appointments of Cabinet members by President Johnson and have had an opportunity to note the type and caliber of individuals that he has called upon to serve in leadership capacities in his administration.

It becomes clear that President Johnson is setting a premium on ability and experience. The American public has also had an opportunity to evaluate these selections and an editorial in the Beaumont Enterprise, an outstanding newspaper published in southeast Texas, reflects the opinion of most thoughtful Americans about the members of the Johnson Cabinet:

OUTLINE OF A CABINET

Henry Hamill Fowler, new Secretary of the Treasury, joins John Connor, Secretary of Commerce, and Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, Attorney General, as Cabinet appointees of President Johnson. Now the outline of the Johnson Cabinet—as distinguished from the Kennedy Cabinet which Johnson inherited—emerges.

The most significant characteristic of the administration leaders is the fact that they are men who can get the job done. Whatever else they are seems second to that. (Doubtless that is why Johnson has retained so many Kennedy men so long.)

That Fowler was such a man has already been proved in business, politics, and government. As Under Secretary of the Treasury in early 1964, his aid in helping to guide the tax reduction bill into law was especially noteworthy. Of course, that he was a loyal Democrat was not overlooked. But Johnson's is not a Cabinet in which politics is an overriding factor.

Conner, former head of a drug manufacturing firm, was registered as a Republican in 1960, though he campaigned for Johnson in 1964. And Robert S. McNamara, Secretary of Defense and undoubtedly a bona fide member of Johnson's Cabinet, though he was a Kennedy appointee, was and perhaps still is a Republican. In fact, more than one member of the GOP, including David Rockefeller, New York banker and brother of New York's Governor, was considered for the Treasury post before Fowler was selected.

It is evident, also, that Johnson is not concerned with gathering around him in the Cabinet old acquaintances. In fact, some of his Texas cronies were rejected for the Attorney General's post in favor of Katzenbach, unknown in Government less than 5 years ago and probably unknown to Johnson until even more recently. However, as Deputy Attorney General under Robert Kennedy, the former law professor proved his capability, and the word from Washington is that Johnson believed he had earned the privilege to succeed Kennedy.

That a Cabinet post can be earned and that it is not necessarily a partisan post, and that the best qualified, not best friends, should hold the top jobs are commendable ideas, carried on from the Kennedy government, but not always evinced in former administrations. We hope future appointments will be made as wisely.

Our Day of Conformity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. F. SIKES
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, on March 31, the Pensacola, Fla., Kiwanis Club held its annual public speaking contest for the members of the 4–H Club. The winner in the boys' division was Eddie Seales, a 17-year-old student at Ernest Ward High School in Escambia County, Fla. I feel that this young man has presented some most important views in his statement, and I think that his speech is extraordinarily good. I am extremely proud of Eddie Seales, pleased with his recognition of the many problems which confront our great Nation, and highly gratified by his devotion to make these United States a better place in which to live. It is with a great deal of pleasure that I submit herewith this young man's speech for reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The speech follows:

OUR DAY OF CONFORMITY

Ladies, Kiwanians, guest fellow 4–H'ers and fellow contestant, in our present day world of hustle and bustle, conformity is sweeping our country. While more and more people want to take seats in the grandstand, fewer and fewer people want to sweat it out down on the field. People today do not want to get involved in anything that might give them a little responsibility or cause themselves a little inconvenience. It seems to me that we are looking for everything to be made simple and easy for us. In the past quarter century noninvolvement has become an accepted way of life for many American citizens.

In New York City—not too many weeks ago—a woman was stabbed several times in the presence of a number of people and not a single person offered to come to her rescue. No one bothered to even call the police. Most of them stated that it was none of their business and why should they stick out their necks? I wonder how those people felt after they had witnessed such a crime and did not even offer to defend this poor victim. I wonder if they slept well after it happened. They probably justified it in their own minds with a lot of cowardly excuses. It seems to me that the consciences of most people today seems to play a very small role in their everyday activities.

Today we are living in a country quite different from the one that our great ancestors loved so much. Some parents have successfully defended in court their children's right to ignore the American Flag Salute. Faculties and student bodies have found it distasteful to publicly take an oath of loyalty to their country, and our Government has taken away the privilege of reading the Bible in our public schools.

These United States was once the greatest exporter of ideas the world has ever known. We created and sold abroad the idea of individual dignity, responsibility and freedom. We created the idea of government of the people, by the people and for the people. But now most people seem to think that an honest man is either a fool or a liar. Many people say, let Jack do it, or what's in it for me?

Today we have a very thought provoking race problem that affects every citizen in this Nation. However, there has been a race problem almost since the beginning of time and almost everyone has a different opinion about it. This country has gotten to the point that Congress or the Federal Government feels that only they have the knowledge, understanding and wisdom to settle the problems of local people in their own local communities. The Supreme Court takes away laws from one group in order to satisfy a few fanatics. They raise a little fuss or lay down in the streets and the Supreme Court or Congress comes forth with a new law in order to keep them happy, content and satisfied. Our rights are gradually being taken from our reach. The Constitution upon which this country was founded has very little meaning any more.

Here in the United States we also have freedom of the press. This is good and very well taken advantage of. The news media publishes only what they can sell. Very often the truth is twisted until there is very little truth left in it. One area of the country releases one story and another area releases just the opposite view to please its readers. I am sure it must be hard to release a news article without being prejudiced toward one group of people over the other.

Nowadays if you love your country you are considered a square. Someone has gone far enough to describe a square as the person who never learned to get away with anything or perhaps he is the Joe who volunteers when he doesn't have to. He is burdened down with old fashioned ideas of honesty, loyalty, courage and thrift. This person may already be on his way to extinction.

It seems to me that the force of government is now directed toward the security of the weak rather than to the encouragement of the strong. In business someone has said that the way to survive is to emulate the turtle by growing a hard shell and never sticking your neck out. Just as a young man in the army was taught by his fellows to keep his mouth shut, his bowels open and never volunteer.

Arnold Toynbee, a famous historian once said that of the 21 notable civilizations, 19 perished not from external conquest; but from the evaporation of belief within.

Today too many of us are still sitting it out rather than sweating it out. Too many of us haven't got the "guts" to stand up and be counted. Responsibilities and problems roll off nice and easy and we travel along the paths with the fewest bumps, being careful to stay in the middle of the road, because that's where the most comfortable ruts are.

Too many of us know the short cuts and too few of us actually know or care where the path leads, too few of us dare to leave the path because the path is always the easy way and the way most people go.

When Ben Franklin was told that the war for independence was over he made this remark: "Say rather the war for the Revolution is over—the war for independence has yet to be fought." And today 179 years later—the war for independence has still to be fought.

Thank you.

The Future of the Great Lakes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 19, 1965

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have included in the RECORD the graphic statement of the mounting demand for stronger action to combat water pollution of the Great Lakes. As the author of one of the most important amendments to the Water Quality Act of 1965, my colleague and friend, the gentleman from New York, RICHARD D. MCCARTHY, is fast distinguishing himself as a real fighter for clean water. The 39th District of New York can be justly proud of the bright, industrious leader that they have sent to Congress. I hope that he will long serve them and us.

The statement follows:

THE FUTURE OF THE GREAT LAKES

(By RICHARD D. MCCARTHY, U.S. Representative, 39th District, New York, at junior chamber of commerce banquet, Cordon Bleu Restaurant, Buffalo, N.Y.)

Tonight, I would like to share with you some of my thoughts on a problem that I regard as the most urgent of our times.

The problem to which I refer, in a word is, water.

Water is the lifeblood of this Niagara frontier. Without Lake Erie, there would be no Buffalo—there would be no Erie County—as we know it. Without Lake Erie many of us would not even exist today. For without it, our forebears would not have had an economic reason to come here, marry, and settle down. In my own case, this is so. It was in 1822 that my great, great grandfather came here to work on the Erie Canal. Since then, all six generations of my family have, at various times, in one way or another, earned their livelihoods from activities connected with the lake.

Water is vital to our commerce * * * to our manufacturing plants * * * to our recreation. Most important, water is vital to sustaining life. Water truly is Buffalo's most precious resource. Lake Erie is like a great goddess, brooding over the vast metropolis she spawned. Brooding indeed, for we have been extremely careless with this precious resource.

Lake Erie is so terribly polluted that it is in danger of becoming worthless for many purposes. And Lake Erie problems are compounded by the fact that the level of the lake is at the lowest point in many years.

Pollution of fresh water supplies is not a problem that is peculiar to Buffalo—or to Lake Erie. This is a national problem.

As the late Rachel Carson observed in her well-known book, "Silent Spring."

In an age when man has forgotten his origins and has neglected even his most essential needs for survival, "water along with other resources has become the victim of his indifference."

Our Nation uses about 300 billion gallons of water per day—out of a total manageable supply of 1,200 billion gallons a day. And our consumption is rising fantastically. It is estimated that by 1980 the United States will be consuming 600 billion gallons of water per day—twice as much as we using now.

We no longer can afford to be indifferent about our water.

The problem in Lake Erie isn't something that is going to reach a critical stage 10, 15, or 20 years in the future. The problem is critical now. We should have acted before this.

Already, some experts are wondering whether it is too late to save Lake Erie.

I am not that pessimistic. I certainly am not about to throw up my hands in despair. But I do believe that we need to pledge all our skills, all our imagination, to seeking solutions to this perplexing problem.

During my campaign for election last fall, I talked a lot about pollution. During the 3½ months I have been a Member of Congress, I have been trying very hard to do something about it.

I have sponsored legislation in the House of Representatives that is designed to

strengthen the role of the Federal Government—and enhance the Federal-State-local partnership—in fighting water pollution in western New York and elsewhere.

My communications with the people of Erie County show that 70 percent of the citizens in the 39th Congressional District agree with me that a strong Federal program is needed.

Yet, the deeper I get into water, the more I question whether even a strong Federal program, intermeshed with State and local programs, will in the long run be adequate to solve all the problems of Lake Erie.

Let's take a quick look at some vital geographical factors.

Lake Erie touches the borders of four States—New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Michigan. A huge portion of Lake Erie's shoreline lies in the Province of Ontario.

Lake Erie is not just the concern of the United States. The fortunes of this body of water are of immense importance to both the United States and Canada.

The fortunes of Lake Erie also are closely tied to the other Great Lakes—Ontario, Huron, Michigan, and Superior. And these other lakes, in turn, affect the well-being of millions of people in other States and other Provinces.

Therefore, it seems to me that when we reflect on the problems of Lake Erie, we must do so in the context of the entire Great Lakes Basin.

Within this huge basin reside 27 million people. Touching these lakes are 15 cities with populations in excess of 100,000.

Pollution is a serious matter in the Great Lakes, but it is not the only problem. Another problem that probably is just as serious is the level of the lakes.

As I reminded you earlier, Lake Erie is at its lowest level in many years. This is a problem that is shared by the other Great Lakes.

Man can be blamed for pollution—but he is not responsible, at least not in a significant way, for rising and falling lake levels. Nature causes this fluctuation, but man must somehow learn to live with it—or perhaps try to do something about it.

Many people—myself included—are disturbed by the present low level of Lake Erie. It dropped almost 5 feet from 1952 to 1964.

This is a serious matter—but it is less shocking when viewed from a long-range perspective.

Lake Erie was lower in 1936 than it is today. When you look at records for the past 100 years, you discover up-and-down trends in rainfall in the Great Lakes Basin—and that the level of the lakes generally follows the precipitation patterns.

Present problems don't stem from the fact that anything unusual is happening to lake levels. Rather, our difficulties stem from our increasing dependence on the lakes.

As more and more people depend on the lake for more and more pursuits, it becomes increasingly necessary that we receive a so-called normal amount of rainfall to keep the lakes at a so-called normal level.

Nature, unfortunately, doesn't operate that way. Wild fluctuations from the "normal" are in themselves normal.

One hundred years ago a sharp drop in the lake levels was inconvenient. Today the same occurrence could prove disastrous.

The problems of pollution and low lake levels are not separate and distinct. They very definitely are linked.

It is obvious, I think, that when the amount of water in a lake decreases, pollution problems are increased.

There are some who think that the ultimate answer to pollution in Lake Erie lies in seeking means to develop faster turnover of the water in the lake.

Preventing pollutants, in the form of municipal and industrial wastes, from entering the lake is an obvious necessity. And the legislation I have sponsored in the House of Representatives is designed to check the flow of wastes into Lake Erie. In time, with local and State cooperation, this can be done.

But—even if this program is completely successful—there are serious doubts that it will succeed in actually abating pollution in Lake Erie. Scientists say that stopping wastes from entering the lake will only prevent the Lake Erie problem from becoming much worse.

There are various possibilities for actually abating pollution—none of them simple or cheap.

Scientists have discovered that the oxygen supply has been depleted in a vast portion of Lake Erie by algae—which apparently are prospering because pollutants, in the form of nitrogen and phosphorus, have given them an abundant food supply. So, one step in controlling pollution would be to dredge the algae from the lake and bury it in adjacent ground. Another would be to recharge the lake's water supply.

More water for the Great Lakes would abate pollutants by flushing them out. The infusion of more water, on a controlled basis, would make it possible to stabilize and regulate lake levels and more water would provide for the increasing needs of the growing United States and Canadian populations in the Great Lakes Basin.

How could such a solution be brought about? Where would we get the water to permit faster turnover in Lake Erie? The only source for the vast quantity of water that would be needed to implement such a scheme is our northern neighbor, Canada.

The ultimate solution lies in diverting water into the Great Lakes from rivers that flow into Hudson's Bay.

The political and economic problems of such a grand scheme are enormous. The technical difficulties that would be encountered stagger the imagination.

The costs, obviously, will run into many, many millions of dollars. And they should be shared by the United States and Canada in proportion to the benefits each would receive. It is obvious that both nations would realize enormous benefits from such a vast project. But only Canada has the water that both countries need.

The problems would be gigantic—but the benefits very probably would be equally gigantic.

We must recognize that we face some very serious handicaps in making sweeping, long-range plans for the Great Lakes.

Basically, these handicaps fall into two categories. On the one hand, we have a multitude of legitimate and reasonable vested interests, both public and private, in the lakes. On the other hand, we have a multitude of agencies that in one way or another are involved in the management of the lakes.

A good many entities—the State of New York, for instance, have both a vested interest and a hand in management.

Sadly lacking is any agency with the authority and the capability to look at the problems of the Great Lakes from an overall perspective and chart overall goals and the means of attaining them.

The need for such an agency is clearly indicated when we consider the deep interdependence of the water users on the lakes. The Chicago area, for instance, depends on Lake Michigan in various ways and would like to divert more water from the lake. Chicago's needs cannot be argued, but if Chicago diverts more water, this will affect the level of Lake Erie at Cleveland, aggravate the pollution problem at Detroit, and reduce power-generating capacity at Niagara Falls. Lower levels in harbors mean that shipping firms cannot load their boats to full capacity—thus increasing shipping costs per ton.

The principal coordinating agency for the lakes is the International Joint Commission, which was created by a treaty between the United States and Canada in 1909. The International Joint Commission's sphere of interest extends all across the long boundary between our Nation and Canada.

I definitely am not critical of the International Joint Commission. This is a distinguished body with many accomplishments to its credit.

The difficulty with the International Joint Commission, as presently organized, is that it lacks effective teeth. The International Joint Commission is an instrument of the United States and Canadian Governments and is empowered to inquire into and coordinate matters referred it by the two Governments.

We might expand the powers of the International Joint Commission or some other agency or agencies. Or we might create a new body. And this is what I propose: A new international agency whose sole concern is the Great Lakes.

One model we might consider using for guidance in establishing a planning and development body for the Great Lakes is the Arctic Institute—a creation of the United States and Canada that has been notably successful.

Setting up a similar institute for the Great Lakes was one of the possibilities suggested by Michel Chevalier in a distinguished treatise he wrote. Mr. Chevalier, who is from Montreal, wrote the paper in connection with research he has been conducting at the University of Pennsylvania.

The Arctic Institute was incorporated in 1945 in both the United States and Canada. Legally, it is two separate bodies. But it shares the same Board of Directors and the same staff.

Strictly speaking, the Institute has no direct link with either Government. But, in fact, senior officials of both Governments have been active in the Arctic Institute.

The Institute is considered the authoritative body on research and planning on the Arctic.

The problems of the Arctic and the Great Lakes are scarcely comparable. But I think there is a possibility that an agency modeled after the Arctic Institute might be a way to grapple with the problems of the Great Lakes.

In any case, present planning facilities for the Great Lakes are inadequate. Something needs to be done—and what we should be doing now is considering various alternatives.

I was heartened by the statements of President Johnson and Canadian Prime Minister Pearson following their recent meeting at Camp David, Md.

They discussed the problems of the Great Lakes—including pollution and water levels—and they considered possibilities of working out an agreement between the two nations to help solve these problems.

It is not my purpose tonight to propose any final solutions.

But I want to stress that the Great Lakes, and the Canadians and Americans who depend on them, face some grave problems. And I also want to stress that as things now stand we do not have the means to cope with these problems. I am hopeful that talks between the executive branches of both countries will lead to agreements and, possibly, to a new United States-Canadian treaty.

My purpose tonight is to focus public attention on the problem in order to stimulate public discussion in the United States and Canada. For it will be public opinion finally that will persuade both governments to reach an agreement for joint, long-range research, planning and development of the future uses of the Great Lakes.

We dare not wait. The threat that the world's largest supply of fresh water will become one vast dead sea is too ominous.

The time for action is now.

Knock on Wood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article by the distinguished columnist, Joseph Alsop, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on April 16, 1965.

Despite unjustified criticism, it should be apparent that President Johnson's policy in Vietnam is having the desired effect.

The article follows:

KNOCK ON WOOD
(By Joseph Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—In a bitter, hard-fought war, and especially in a guerrilla war, nothing is rarer than a reliable firsthand report on the problems and state of mind of the other side. Nothing like this has been forthcoming, in all the many weeks since the first American air attacks on North Vietnam.

Now, however, a remarkably vivid glimpse through the bamboo curtain has suddenly been provided by a series of articles in the Leftwing Paris weekly, "L'Express," by a French newspaperman who has specialized in Far Eastern affairs, Georges Chaffard. These pieces, first spotted in this country by the astute Crosby Noyes, are so encouraging that one hastens to knock on wood as one reads them.

The encouragement is all the greater because a more unexpected source of encouragement could hardly be imagined. Chaffard is even further to the Left than "L'Express" and a hopeful appraisal of American policy in southeast Asia is an unheard of intellectual commodity among European Leftwingers.

Chaffard's appraisal is based, furthermore, on the kind of firsthand observation from which Americans are debarred. On this round, he did not visit Hanoi, but he quite recently spent much time there. On this round, he went to Cambodia, and thence moved up to join the Vietcong in the jungle, and to talk with the leaders of the so-called liberation front at their hidden jungle headquarters.

The headline put on Chaffard's articles by "L'Express"—"The Vietcong Now Fear Defeat"—is a good summary of the total impression conveyed. The first point that Chaffard emphasizes is the way the American decision to carry the war to the north has completely upset the strategy of the Communists, who never believed that this was possible.

Point two is the degree to which this decision has changed the climate. "American determination," says Chaffard, has caused everyone to reflect a bit.

Second thoughts have been especially common in the group of greatest importance to the Communists—the wavering people in the middle who were getting ready to back the Communists because they expected the Communists to win in the end.

Third, Chaffard describes the Vietcong as being forced, by the new American decision, to redouble their efforts at the very moment when American air and other operations are significantly reducing the flow of military supplies and other urgently needed aid from North Vietnam. Chaffard's emphasis on the effectiveness of the U.S. effort to slow the supplyflow amounts to news of the first order; for no one had been sure that this effort was having any effect at all.

Fourth, Chaffard reports Vietcong withdrawal, now in progress, from very large and important areas of South Vietnam, for the purpose of regrouping in the less vulnerable mountainous regions north of Saigon. He actually compares this withdrawal with the Communists' pretended departure from South Vietnam in 1954.

Fifth, Chaffard describes the Vietcong in the south as seriously troubled by the war weariness of some of their adherents. And he portrays the North Vietnamese as fearful, above all, of just the kind of carefully targeted bombing that President Johnson has ordered, which will destroy the fruit of "10 years of desperately hard work and sacrifice."

To this, one must add with great emphasis that Chaffard nowhere predicts abandonment of the struggle by the guerrillas in the south, nor does he forecast acceptance by the North Vietnamese of terms that would also be acceptable to the United States. Instead, he quotes defiant statements by the liberation front and the northern Communist bosses.

He also says, however, that the "facade of intransigence is not lacking in cracks," whether among the guerrillas or in North Vietnam. He shows evidence that in some quarters in the north, negotiations to end the struggle are already desired.

In sum, he does not say that the U.S. effort is succeding now, or assert that it is going to succeed later. But he specifically credits the U.S. effort with getting almost exactly the results that have been hoped for, at this particular stage, by Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara and his planners in the Pentagon and in Saigon.

President Johnson's policy and its implementation to date have not previously received a stronger implied endorsement from a more curious or more convincing source. That does not mean the Vietnamese war will be easily terminated. Much rougher times, perhaps quite serious reverses, may now lie ahead. But it does mean that what Chaffard calls "American determination" is neither empty nor ineffectual.

The Lonely War in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, for more than 2 years, I have been advocating the application of veterans benefits to our fighting men who are serving in combat zones, such as Vietnam.

The situations there are as grave and arduous as those experienced by servicemen in World War II and Korea and these men are to be commended for the gallant way in which they are struggling in southeast Asia and provided with the rewards of a grateful Nation.

This situation is brought home even more clearly than ever in an article by Charles W. Wiley in the May 1965 edition of the American Legion magazine. Mr. Wiley describes the life of American servicemen in the Mekong Delta with clarity and compassion. I would like to share this with my colleagues by inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THE LONELY WAR IN VIETNAM
(By Charles W. Wiley)

(NOTE.—An intimate report on the lives of four GI's at an isolated outpost of the Mekong Delta portrays the new kind of war.)

Americans serving in the field in Vietnam are fighting the most terrible and loneliest war that the United States has ever been in. Outside the cities and large military bases, the GI is in danger every minute of every day. He can never relax. At night he must fight a more-or-less conventional guerrilla war. During the day he must be constantly on guard against a terror attack. It isn't even entirely safe in Saigon or at our largest bases.

This is a new kind of war in Vietnam, unlike anything that we've experienced before. There's no "front" in the sense that we ordinarily think of one—a frontline; then support positions (mortars, etc.) farther back; then, often miles from the first line, artillery; and finally a safe rear area for reserves, rest, command, and supply services. The American military sleeping in the barracks in the big hotel that was blown up in Saigon a couple of months ago were about as "far back" as you could get. Out in the more conventional combat areas, what stands for a normal frontline, are a number of isolated positions, frequently encircled as well as infiltrated. There, infantry, support units, and artillery are all jammed together, sometimes side by side. Each unit is normally somewhat in the position of the Lost Battalion of World War I with respect to its disposition. The enemy is everywhere—and nowhere.

Even worse than the fact that there is no fixed front is the fact that there is no way of distinguishing friend and foe. When an American goes down a country road or walks through a village marketplace, every single person whom he passes may be the enemy. The peasant in the field, peacefully working with a hoe, may be a Communist terrorist with a submachinegun hidden in the grass 10 feet from him. After the GI has passed he may—or may not—get shot in the back. The Vietnamese riding through town on a bicycle may have a hand grenade in his pocket. So might the shopkeeper, or one of the shoppers, or the pretty girl with the wide straw hat and colorful native dress.

Americans have a wry joke about identifying the Communist Vietcong (commonly known as VC): "It's easy to tell a VC from a friend. The VC is the one who shoots at you."

But often by the time the difference is clear it's too late.

Let's look at our GI's in the cities and villages, and then visit a lonely outpost where I spent last Christmas.

GI's are especially good targets for terrorists because they are usually much taller than the average Vietnamese and stand out in any crowd. Even if all they are doing is going to eat in a local cafe, Americans almost always go in small groups or at least in pairs, and in addition to sidearms generally carry automatic weapons and grenades. They never walk side by side, but move instead in a stagger formation, changing the distances between them from time to time, never taking the same route twice in a row. This changing of patterns is very important in making ambush planning more difficult for the VC.

But there are limits to these defense maneuvers, and the GI's all know that the VC can, if willing to take a calculated risk, set up a trap at any time.

To add to their security problem, they are followed everywhere by crowds of happy Vietnamese children. As part of their voluntary job of being good-will ambassadors, the Americans always return greetings from local people. They smile and carry on conversations with friendly Vietnamese while keeping alert for terrorists.

It's a tough job—and one that lesser men would make easier for themselves. The GI's could hide within well-defended positions during the day, but the United States would lose face if it were shown that Americans were frightened by the VC. Vietnamese morale would suffer, so our boys keep the U.S. flag flying by purposely making themselves targets.

This business of being diplomats and good neighbors at the same time that they may be in combat or ambushed, at any moment of the day at any place in Vietnam, is remarkable in itself.

Air Force and Army units stationed at Tan Son Nhut Airbase near Saigon have adopted the Thanh Man Orphanage were war widows and their children have joined hundreds of parentless youngsters. Doctors and a dentist from the base hospital go regularly to treat the children. The GI's provide food and have distributed clothing sent from their families in the United States. During off-duty hours, the Americans have helped construct new buildings. One major project was digging a well for fresh drinking water. Servicemen contributed $2,500 with additional money coming from collections at church services held on the base, for just this one undertaking.

Marine and Air Force units at Da Nang have been involved in similar activities. An orphanage adopted by the Air Force has so impressed the Vietnamese that the Communists issued orders for the assassination of one U.S. doctor who had taken special interest in the project.

Many U.S. personnel have made it a routine to make fatherly visits to Vietnamese war orphans. During the last Christmas holiday season, American units all over Vietnam held parties for the local children. Many of them knew nothing about Christmas, but understood and appreciated the good will and gifts given by the Americans.

One who has almost made a career out of being a good Samaritan is U.S. Navy MM1c. Philip G. Ambrose, from Philadelphia, Pa. He volunteered to extend his tour of duty in Vietnam so that he could carry on his one-man good will mission. Ambrose has "adopted" six Vietnamese military hospitals, plus Vietnamese Army and Navy units. "OK, Joe," as Ambrose is known by the Vietnamese passes out gifts of all kinds supplied by donations from the United States and money taken from his own pocket.

This is not to say that every single American serviceman in Vietnam is a great guy. There are a few—especially in the bigger cities and at larger bases—who behave badly. But most Americans in Vietnam, including most of the support cadres, are dedicated to defending the United States and helping the people of that war-torn country.

I spent the Christmas holidays with four typical U.S. Army advisers in the field. They were attached to the 1st Battalion of the 7th Division, Army of Vietnam (abbreviated ARVN, with the abbreviation converted to the word "Arvin" by Americans in Vietnam who use it when referring to members of the South Vietnamese armed forces—an Arvin soldier). The battalion was stationed in the town of Mo Cay, Kien Hoa Province. It is in the Mekong Delta area, about 50 miles southwest of Saigon, the scene of some of the heaviest fighting in Vietnam.

The Americans were Capt. Roger D. Harms, age 27, of Shenandoah, Iowa; 1st Lt. Kraig U. Hansen, 25, Manhattan, Kans.; Sgt. Ralph M. Shoemaker, Jr., 28, Chattanooga, Tenn., and Sgt. Herbert J. Huston, 30, Marina, Calif.

All four were career men who decided long ago to make defending the United States a full-time job. They were the only Americans in Mo Cay. Captain Harms, an Infantry officer with 10 years' service, came up through the ranks. Lieutenant Hansen, an engineer, trained as an airborne ranger. He was graduated from West Point in 1962. Seregant Shoemaker had 8 years' service in the Infantry. Seregant Huston first spent 4 years in the U.S. Marines, including duty in Korea during the war there. An airborne ranger, he had 8 years of Army service when I visited Mo Cay.

All volunteered to fight in Vietnam. Captain Harms had two boys, aged 2 and 6, and a baby girl born after he left the United States. Sergeant Shoemaker had boys of 5 and 8, and another baby was scheduled to be born while he fought in Vietnam. Sergeant Huston had a 3-year-old son. Of the four, only Lieutenant Hansen was single.

All of them volunteered to fight in Vietnam because they believe that it's their duty to defend the United States, and that the frontline of our defense is in Vietnam. Or as Sergeant Shoemaker put it, "We would rather fight for our country and families here than in our own backyards."

All were proud of being professional soldiers of the United States, and deeply resented any confusion between professional soldiers and mercenaries. They chose careers as military men primarily to serve their country. Army life as a means of earning a living and as a source of adventure were secondary reasons. They did not join the Army to make money, and were bitter about those who claim that professional soldiers could not compete with civilians for jobs.

All four were gentlemen. They were not the type described in cheap blood-and-guts novels. Although they walked with heads held high, befitting men who are proud of their uniform, they did not swagger. Sometimes one of them let go with a mild cussword, but even though they usually were far from anyone who understood English, they did not use foul language.

The Arvin battalion held Mo Cay and a small strip of ground around the town. The total defense perimeter was about 1 square mile, bounded on two sides by narrow canals. The entire area was surrounded by a barbed-wire fence and defense positions.

Outside the town itself the VC was in almost complete control at night except for a few outposts along a key highway leading to the next province. During the day the VC more or less melted away, but it was still unsafe to leave the town other than with a full battle-ready military unit. Daylight ambushes in the countryside, or even along the road, were common, and helicopters were frequently shot at while landing or taking off at Mo Cay in broad daylight.

We at home have read a good deal about the shooting down of some of our helicopter men. To them too it is a unique and lonely war. There is no such thing as being over friendly or enemy territory, and any flight is a "milk run" only if when it is over nothing has happened. The helicopters can even be in battle and not find it out for a while. While Vietcong machineguns (which are deadly at low altitudes) reveal themselves promptly when using tracers, the Vietcong has also developed a system of concentrating tracerless, small arms fire against choppers. The loud noise of the helicopters' engines and whirling blades can sometimes drown out the sound of such gunfire. During a previous flight on the same day that I rode with him, a gunner first learned that his copter had been fired at when he discovered that the heel of his boot had been shot off.

The situation in December in the Mo Cay area was illustrative of the really big problems of the war in Vietnam. The Arvin and American advisers had the responsibility of keeping the local economy moving and improving normal civilian conditions, so that we were always fighting to defend—to keep the roads clear, to keep trade and commerce running, etc. The gates of Mo Cay were kept open to allow peasants and townspeople to carry on normal business—even though it also meant allowing Vietcong terrorists to enter.

We also had to defend the people, because Vietnamese civilians were frequent targets of the Communists whose goal is to so terrorize and demoralize the population that the Vietnamese will eventually surrender on any terms as a means of stopping the torture of their bleeding nation.

The Vietcong, on the other hand, do not defend anything, they only destroy. Under these ground rules, the Communists have a tremendous advantage: they pick the time and place to fight the war. They can mass the necessary forces at the point of contact, while the Arvin are stretched in a long thin line that can be cut at all but the strongest points.

The Vietnamese soldiers, depite reports to the contrary, have conducted themselves well. It is true that Arvin officers sometimes lack initiative, and some Vietnamese have failed to meet the deadly challenge of combat. But the problem of limited initiative is largely due to war weariness, intensified because for a long time there seemed to be no real determination to win a victory against the Communists on the part of the free world. Stepped up U.S. participation and the State Department's white paper on Red aggression of February 26 is the sort of stuff that can make even better fighting men of the Arvin. The failures in combat have been largely among paramilitary units such as home guards. The nonprofessional Vietnamese soldiers have behaved like similar men in armies throughout history; some good, some bad—some excellent, some terrible. The Arvin regulars have done a very commendable job, and Americans who have served in the field with them almost always have high praise for their fighting ability. The four U.S. Army advisers in Mo Cay, and every other American combat veteran that I spoke to in Vietnam, were favorably impressed with these Asian soldiers.

Nuygen Van Duc, who received news of his promotion from captain to major on Christmas, commanded the Arvin battalion at Mo Cay when I was there. He was a 20-year veteran, rated by the Americans as an excellent officer and a fine person. One interesting sidelight is that he was especially kind to the Christians under his command during the Christmas holidays, although he is a devout Buddhist.

The four GI's in Mo Cay lived in a house only a few feet from the defense perimeter where two canals meet. At the closest point it was only about 100 feet across the canal, the other side of which was Vietcong territory. The house had been hit frequently by enemy small arms and mortar fire. The roof was holed, and there were enemy mortar shell fragments in every square foot of the yard. Because they were often in the middle of combat as soon as they jumped from their beds at night, the Americans slept in special uniforms—black pajamas. These are the best, most convenient camouflage for night fighting. (When I complained because they didn't have any black pj's for me, I was chided for my poor sportsmanship. Or as Sergeant Shoemaker put it, "The Vietcong have to have something to shoot at, don't they?")

As is usual in Vietnam, the four men who represented America in Mo Cay served their country as both soldiers and diplomats. They were diplomatic in the way in which they gave suggestions, and they were very well liked by the Arvin officers and enlisted men. They ate local dishes—with chopsticks—and could even speak some Vietnamese. During my short stay with them I saw many examples of their good work.

Action in the Mo Cay area was frequent—and often bloody. On the night before Christmas Eve a VC battalion carried on an all-night attack against a small outpost defended by only 17 Arvin. When the battle was broken off by the Communists at dawn, there were only three Vietnamese boys left standing. But they had held their post.

The day before Christmas, before it was dark, midnight Mass was held at the local Catholic Church. Although none of the four GIs was Catholic, they, and the Buddhist battalion commander, went to the Catholic Church to pay their respects to the priest and worshippers. Then they went to the little Protestant chapel for the same purpose. As dusk blended into darkness, they made their final Christmas Eve calls—the inspection of key defense positions around the perimeter in readiness for night warfare.

Soon after dark, firing started all up and down the Mekong Delta. VC mortars whizzed into Mo Cay. The Americans joined the Arvin gun batteries. They helped direct answering fire in the Mo Cay area, and stood by with advice as lonely outposts in the jungle phoned in to report their condition under attack. Distant flares in the jungle night pinpointed the attacks on perimeter posts from one horizon to the other. The action didn't stop for more than a few minutes at a time all night. During a lull in the fighting, a GI taught English to a Vietnamese soldier as other Arvin sang carols.

Came the dawn and all was quiet. It was Christmas. The town awakened to a "normal" day. I photographed the large pile of used artillery shell casings in front of the Americans' house, all taken from a single gun. I was unable to count the casualties in Mo Cay. In the early daylight hours the Americans caught a little sleep, then awoke to take up their daytime role as armed civic guests in this crazy war.

One of the town's big events took place when a local girl was married. Guests seated at the honor table with the bride's father included these four American fighting men.

Out in town, wherever the GIs drove, smiling children stood along the road waving and shouting "Hello" and "OK." When they went abroad on foot, within a few minutes large crowds of happy youngsters walked along with them. The GIs played with the children, taught them English, gave them presents and otherwise behaved like doting grandparents. Although they were friendly to all, the Americans had several favorites, among them a handsome boy of 12 or 13 who worked at a little cafe the GIs had nicknamed "Howard Johnson's." They had practically adopted a pretty little girl of about 10 who was mute. Her beautiful eyes spoke for her, however, when she was with the gentle warriors from the other side of the world.

On Christmas night it was Christmas Eve all over again. The Delta was alive with artillery—muttering, growling and flashing as 18 separate fire fights developed along the Mo Cay perimeter.

On the day after Christmas I left Mo Cay. The same helicopter that took me out brought in New York City photographer Dan Bucher. The next day all 5 Americans were wounded, Bucher almost fatally, by a hand grenade thrown into "Howard Johnson's" by a VC terrorist.

The GIs had known from intelligence reports that they were marked for assassination, but they continued to make daily appearances throughout the area to keep up local morale and confidence in the Americans. They also knew that the cafe, which was the best of only a couple of eating places in town, was the most likely site for such an attack. They had taken precautions, but the ways in which they could alter their routine were limited when it came to the restaurant. "We have to eat," they had explained to me the last time I'd been in the cafe with them. So the VC knew that if they waited long enough there would be an opportunity for an attack.

When it came it was vicious. In keeping with their terror tactics, the grenade was thrown at the Americans while they were surrounded by Vietnamese children. The handsome little boy who worked in the cafe was blown apart by the blast and was dead when Captain Harms reached him a few seconds later. Fifteen other youngsters were wounded.

The GIs, all of whom received shrapnel wounds, ran outside after the terrorist, but lost him in the narrow streets. When they returned to give first aid to the children, other VC hiding in the area opened fire on them with small arms. They were driven off by Arvin soldiers.

When word of the attack reached me I went to a Saigon hospital where the five wounded Americans had been taken. Bucher, the photographer, was on an operating table, still in critical condition 2 days after the attack. The four GI's were somewhat dazed from their experience, but agreed to a tape-recorded interview.

"Would you volunteer to fight in Vietnam if you had to make the choice over again?" I asked them. Here are the exact answers:

Lieutenant Hansen: "Yes. The only difference that this makes is that once you've seen civilians—especially the little kids—hurt like this, it makes it a more personal thing than it was previously."

Sergeant Shoemaker: "I agree with the lieutenant. When we first came over here, I think that all of us came over for one purpose. We volunteered to come here to defend our own country. But now I think that it's much more personal."

Captain Harms: "You bet I agree. It's the same job, and nothing's changed at all—except that everybody just feels a little bit closer to the whole situation."

Sergeant Huston, quietest of the four, replied with a soft—but firm—"Yes."

When I asked where they wanted to be stationed after they were released from the hospital and returned to active duty, Lieutenant Hansen answered for all:

"Well, I think we are going right back to Mo Cay, the same place, to take up our old jobs where we left off."

A month later, I learned from his parents that Lieutenant Hansen was back in Mo Cay. The others? I don't know. I think they're back there.

These GI's are representative of the American fighting men in Vietnam—in the air, on the sea, and serving on small teams (sometimes only a single GI) in lonely village outposts where they are picking up the check for our freedom. The majority of them resent those at home who would sell out Vietnam. They believe it would be a terrible defeat for the United States, and many think that it would be immoral. One GI pleaded, "How could we face the Arvin, and say that we were running out on them? How could we face ourselves? Do you think anyone else would trust us after that?"

In my experience, the men who had seen the most action felt that way the most strongly. "If we can take it, why can't the people at home?" they asked.

Some of the people at home can take it. When the parents of Navy Lt. Cmdr. Robert H. Shumaker were informed that he had been shot down and captured during a raid on North Vietnam, they assured newsmen that their son would conduct himself in a manner befitting a graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy (class of 1956). The Soviet news agency, Tass, inadvertently confirmed their confidence when it reported on the captured flier's forced appearance at a Communist bayonet-point news conference. Tass said that Shumaker refused to show remorse for his actions and had repeated the hackneyed Pentagon version of the war. In other words, on the loneliest assignment of all, he stood up to the fanatical Communist captors who held the power of life or death over him.

Rear Adm. Robert B. Brown, Medical Corps, U.S. Navy, and Rear Adm. Robert O. Canada, Jr., Medical Corps, U.S. Navy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the House the outstanding leadership that exists today in the Medical Corps of the U.S. Navy.

We have had many great Surgeons General of the Navy in the past and we have had many great Deputy and Assistant Chiefs of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery but, today, the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery of the Navy is headed by two of the most distinguished physicians in America, the Surgeon General, Rear Adm. Robert B. Brown, and the Deputy Surgeon General, Rear Adm. Robert O. Canada, Jr.

Admiral Brown is a fellow of the American College of Surgeons and a diplomate of the American Board of Surgery. He has had an outstanding career in medicine from the days he received his degree from the University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine as a doctor of medicine in 1933.

Admiral Canada has also had a most illustrious career from the day he received his degree as a doctor of medicine from the University of Virginia.

I commend the wisdom of those in authority who selected these two outstanding physicians for the positions they now hold.

I would like to include in my remarks, the complete biographies of Rear Adm. Robert B. Brown, Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery and Surgeon General of the Navy, and Rear Adm. Robert O. Canada, Jr., Deputy and Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery and Deputy Surgeon General of the Navy:

REAR ADM. ROBERT B. BROWN, MEDICAL CORPS, U.S. NAVY

Robert Bruce Brown was born in Meadville, Pa., on June 29, 1908, son of Robert X. and Marion Rose (Canfield) Brown, both now deceased. He attended Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa. (1925–29), from which he received the degree of bachelor of science; was awarded the degree of doctor of medicine from the University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine, Philadelphia, in 1933 and in 1941 received his doctor of science (in surgery) from the University of Pennsylvania Graduate School of Medicine. During the period 1933–35 he interned at the hospital of the University of Pennsylvania.

He had two fellowships at the University of Pennsylvania, the first in thyroid and neurosurgery with Dr. Charles Frazier 1935–36) and the other in general surgery with Dr. E. L. Eliason (1936–41). At the medical school there, he was assistant instructor in surgery (1935–36); instructor in surgery (1936–46) and associate in surgery (1946–51). From 1941 to 1946 he was also assistant in surgery at the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia General, Presbyterian, and Doctors' Hospitals.

Reporting for active duty in the Navy in 1942, he was assigned to surgical service at the naval hospital, Philadelphia, Pa., where he remained for several months. After duty afloat on board the U.S.S. *Solace*, he reported in 1943 as chief of surgery at the naval hospital, Annapolis, Md.

In 1945 he served as chief of surgery on board the hospital ship *Tranquility* and from later that year until 1950 was assistant to the chief of surgery at the naval hospital, Philadelphia. He next joined the U.S.S. *Repose*, which operated in the Korean area of hostilities. "For meritorious service as chief of professional services and as chief of surgical service in the naval hospital on board the U.S.S. *Repose*, in connection with operations against enemy aggressor forces in Korea from September 20, 1950, to July 12, 1951," he was awarded the Bronze Star Medal. The citation further states in part:

"Throughout this period, Captain Brown rendered outstanding services to his patients and directly supervised the surgical treatment of all casualties admitted to his section. Exercising exceptional professional skill and a thorough understanding of the scope and importance of his assignment, he was largely responsible for the excellent care given to the more than 8,000 patients admitted to the hospital and was greatly instrumental in saving the lives of many of the stricken men."

In 1951 he reported as Chief of Surgery at the Naval Hospital, Bethesda, Md., and while so assigned also served as clinical (adjunct) professor of surgery at Georgetown University School of Medicine. In March 1960 he assumed command of the naval hospital, Bethesda. His selection for the rank of rear admiral was approved by the President on August 7, 1961, and in February 1962 he became commanding officer of the National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda. From August 1, 1963, until July 1965 he was Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery for Personnel and Professional Operations, Navy Department, Washington, D.C., after which he served as Deputy and Assistant Chief of that Bureau. On February 15, 1965, he was sworn in as Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery and Surgeon General of the Navy.

In addition to the Bronze Star Medal, Rear Admiral Brown has the following service medals: Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal with one star; American Campaign Medal; World War II Victory Medal; National Defense Service Medal; Korean Service Medal; United Nations Service Medal; Expert Rifleman Medal, and the Expert Pistol Shot Medal. He also has the Korean Presidential Unit Citation.

His official home address is 704 Chestnut Street, Meadville, Pa. He is married to the former Jane Richardson of Pitman, N.J., and has a daughter, Joan Brown.

Dr. Brown is a fellow of the American College of Surgeons and a diplomate of the American Board of Surgery. He is a member of the Philadelphia County, the Pennsylvania State, and American Medical Associations; the Society of University Surgeons; the American Surgical Association; the International Surgical Society; the Philadelphia College of Physicians; the Halsted Society, the Eastern Surgical Association; the Society of Vascular Surgery; the Southern Surgical Association; the American Association for the Surgery of Trauma; and associate member, Clinico-Pathological Society, Washington, D.C.; and Philadelphia Academy of Surgery. In 1962 he received an honorary doctor of science degree from Allegeny College, Meadville, Pa., and in 1963 was awarded the Founder's Medal by the Association of Military Surgeons of the United States.

He is also a member of the following honorary fraternities: Sigma Xi; Phi Beta Kappa; and Alpha Omega Alpha.

REAR ADM. ROBERT O. CANADA, JR., MEDICAL CORPS, U.S. NAVY

Robert Owen Canada, Jr., was born in Grottoes, Va., on July 16, 1913, son of Mrs. R. O. (Mary Crawford) Canada and the late Dr. Canada. He attended Augusta Military Academy, Fort Defiance, Va., and received the degrees of bachelor of science from the University of Virginia, Charlottesville, and doctor of medicine from that university's school of medicine. He was commissioned lieutenant (junior grade) in the Medical Corps of the U.S. Navy on July 16, 1938, after completing his internship, and was subsequently advanced in rank to that of rear admiral, to date from July 1, 1964.

Ordered first to the U.S. Naval Hospital, Portsmouth, Va., he served as ward medical officer there from August 1938 to April 1940, then reported to the U.S.S. *Salinas* (AO–19) for duty as medical officer. He was serving in that capacity when the *Salinas* was torpedoed off Iceland by a German submarine on October 30, 1941, prior to the outbreak of World War II. Detached in December 1941, he served until March 1944, as officer in charge of the naval unit at Fitzsimons General Hospital, Denver, Colo.

During the latter period of the war, he was again at sea serving as senior medical officer of the U.S.S. *Pasadena* (CL–65) from her commissioning in June 1944, until November 1945. The *Pasadena* operated in the Pacific combat area from September 1944 until August 15, 1945, participating in the capture and occupation of the southern Palau Islands in September and October 1944; with the 3d Fleet in the Leyte operation (including Luzon attacks) and the Luzon operation (including attacks on Luzon, Formosa, the China coast, and Nansei Shoto); with the 5th Fleet in the assault and occupation of Iwo Jima, made on Nansei Shoto and the Okinawa operation (including the assault and occupation of Okinawa Gunto); and 3d Fleet operations against Japan. She was in the Tokyo Bay area during the Japanese surrender and subsequent occupation of Japan.

Returning to the United States, he reported in December 1945, to the naval hospital, Sampson, N.Y., where he served as assistant chief of medicine until March 1947. He then had graduate instruction at Cornell Medical School, New York, N.Y., and in October of that year was detached for duty at the Navy Department, Washington, D.C. There he served as head of the tuberculosis control section, Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, until August 1950, when he was transferred to the naval hospital, National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Md., as assistant chief of medicine and head of the chest disease section. In June 1952, he reported as chief of medicine at the naval hospital, Charleston, S.C.

In June 1955 he was detached from Charleston for similar duty at the naval hospital, Oakland, Calif., and in February 1959 reported as Chief of Medicine at the Naval Hospital, National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Md. In June 1961 he became Commanding Officer of the Naval Hospital at the Naval Air Station, Jacksonville, Fla., and in February 1962 returned to the naval hospital, National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Md. He commanded that naval hospital for 2 years and in February 1965 was designated Deputy and Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, Navy Department, Washington, D.C.

Rear Admiral Canada has the American Defense Service Medal with bronze "A"; the American Campaign Medal; Asiatic-Pacific Campaign Medal with one silver star and one bronze star (six operations); the World War II Victory Medal; Navy Occupation Service Medal, Asia Clasp; National Defense Service Medal; and the Philippine Liberation Ribbon with one star.

Married to the former Julia Dent Salter of Anniston, Ala., Doctor Canada has one son, Robert Owen Canada III. His official residence is Grottoes, Va.

Doctor Canada is a diplomate, American Board of Internal Medicine; a fellow of the American College of Physicians and the American College of Chest Physicians; and a member of the American Thoracic Society and the American Medical Association.

Clearing the Backlog of Jury Cases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, so many of my colleagues are members of the legal profession, and crowded dockets are so common to all the State courts, that I am sure there will be wide interest in the writings on the situation in Illinois by the Honorable Benjamin Wham, judge of the circuit court, law division.

I am extending my remarks to include an article by Judge Wham in the January 1965, issue of the Illinois Bar Journal and one in the Chicago Bar Record of November 6, 1964. The former follows:

ILLINOIS POINTS THE WAY TO REDUCTION OF CASE BACKLOG

(By Judge Benjamin Wham, circuit court, law division, 1 North Wacker Drive, Chicago)

The battle of the backlog has resulted in a number of suggestions for their reduction: eliminate jury trials (this overlooks the fact that provisions for jury trials are imbedded in constitutions, and many citizens do not want them removed); modernize practice acts and rules to eliminate archaic provisions brought here by early settlers; use of electronic methods to insure that cases are placed at issue promptly; and others.

IN ILLINOIS

It became all too clear in Illinois that improved practice acts and rules did not bring about a reduction in backlogs.

Thus Illinois adopted a modern practice act and up-to-date rules in 1933 and constantly improved them. Yet the backlogs grew steadily.

Further, Illinois has had in its practice act and rules provision for a number of ways to terminate cases, other than by regular jury verdict: nonappearance of plaintiff at trials is grounds for dismissing for want of prosecution (D.W.P.); nonappearance of defendant is ground for the complaint being taken as confessed and judgment being entered for the plaintiff; verdicts may be directed for the defendant at the close of the plaintiff's case, and, at the close of all the evidence, a verdict, as to liability, may be directed for either side; issues of liability and damages may be split; on posttrial motion a verdict may be set aside and judgment entered for the opposite side; time for selecting juries may be shortened; and others. Yet the backlogs continued to grow.

What really broke the logjam in Illinois was the judicial amendment which became effective January 2, 1964. It combined all courts into one, the circuit court, under the rule of the Illinois Supreme Court. A chief judge is selected in each county—the largest being Cook County. Its chief judge is Hon. John S. Boyle. The former independent

courts are now divisions of the circuit court: Chancery, probate, criminal, divorce, civil jury, and others. The head of the civil jury division is Hon. Harold G. Ward.

Thirty-four judges were assigned to the civil jury division. Jurors were made readily available. A judge is assigned only one case at a time. When it is completed, the judge calls for another.

At the outset of a trial another effort is made to settle the case (pretrials have already been had). If not settled at once, this objective is not lost sight of—many cases are settled during trial.

In the first 6 months (Jan. 2, 1964 to June 30) 2,576 cases were completed, an average of over 75 cases per judge.

One judge completed 192 cases. As there are about 20 civil jury trial days per month, this was an average of 32 cases per month and 1.6 cases per trial day.

Four other judges completed over 100 cases in the 6 months.

We conclude that juries are not necessarily a handicap; that modern practice acts and rules are not the complete answer; and that the full answer must include organization and a dedicated bench and bar.

Following is the article from the Chicago Sun Record:

THE BACKLOG OF CIVIL JURY CASES: HOW CAN THEIR DISPOSITION BE EXPEDITED?

(By Hon. Benjamin Wham [1])

Bar associations, judges, trial lawyers, law school faculties and other leaders in this field have been searching for ways to reduce the growing backlog of pending cases and especially those civil cases in which a jury trial has been demanded.

It should be noted that at least two ways have been found to reduce this backlog somewhat: a requirement that the plaintiff demand trial by jury when he files suit, and the other is the increases in the cost of such demands.

SHOULD WE ABANDON JURY TRIALS?

This question should perhaps be preceded by the preliminary questions whether we can do so, and if so, how soon? The jury system has long been regarded as the bulwark of individual rights. It is so embedded in our constitution that a major educational program would no doubt be required to eliminate it. Do we really want to do this?

Due to these questions let us look at a method which is in increasing use.

THE JURY AS AN AID TO SETTLEMENT

The Illinois judicial amendment is now in force and unites all courts from the Illinois Supreme Court down to the lowest court under the jurisdiction of the supreme court. In Cook County, Hon. John S. Boyle, is chief judge of the combined court and Hon. Harold G. Ward is head of the law division and the jury section. Juries are available for all civil jury cases and may be held by a judge on a standby basis for immediate use if the parties show no sign of settling. In the latter instance the trial is started promptly but the court, having sowed the seeds of settlement in he first conference, loses no opportunity to renew the discussion. Naturally, if a party wants a trial he is entitled to it and gets it.

The writer disposed of 23 cases in 20 jury days in January 1964. A table of these cases showing the method of disposition and time devoted to each appears in the footnote.

As may be observed, four cases went to verdicts, six cases were settled before trial, nine cases were settled at various stages of trial, in one case a verdict was directed, in two cases defendants were defaulted and damages proved up, and one case was dismissed at the request of the plaintiff because he could not proceed. Thus 15 out of 23 cases were settled, and, 3 of the 4 which went to verdicts as well as the remaining cases were disposed of in a minimum of time.

I suggest the jury was helpful in obtaining these results. This is the first experience most plaintiffs have had with juries.

Suddenly they see a jury selected which appears to be bent on doing justice to both sides. They begin to wonder if they would do better to negotiate further with the defendants. This is true of defendants also. Many are insured and the insurance companies are concerned with keeping the amount involved down.

If settlement is not made prior to trial, the most likely time is after the plaintiff has testified and has been subjected to cross-examination. Perhaps they have over a period of years built up an expectation of how well they would do on the witness stand; but now they wonder, even worry.

Occasionally a plaintiff completely upsets all calculations. Thus in one case the plaintiff, a middle-aged woman, had been a waitress in a small restaurant for many years. There was nothing in her history or appearance to set her apart. Yet on the witness stand she showed the personality and qualities of a lady. She was proud of her work. She wanted to continue to do this work, and was not asking for special consideration. But the jury obviously wanted to help her. A substantial verdict resulted.

The reverse may be true and circumstances may favor defendants. Experienced counsel are alert to recognize the changing signs and act accordingly. This double hearing may add to the total time. May it also result in a higher verdict? We seem to have noticed, when the jury has both liability and damages before it, there is a tendency, when liability is in doubt, to assess lower damages to compensate for such doubt.

SPLITTING ISSUES

In negligence cases there are two distinct issues, liability and damages. Liability must be proved before damages may be determined. A verdict for the defendant should be directed by the court if no liability has been proved; but the trial court must in so directing use sound judgment based on the manifest weight of the evidence. Otherwise the question of liability should be left to the jury.

If there is failure to prove liability, then there is a distinct saving in time in not having introduced damage evidence, including medical. If the question of liability is left to the jury and it finds for the defendant, that ends the case. However, if the jury finds for the plaintiff, then evidence must be introduced as to damages.

Federal courts have split issues with some satisfaction. I understand some courts in Illinois are splitting issues. However, the writer has met much opposition and gnashing of teeth from plaintiffs' attorneys. I recommend a court rule or statute in any State in which this device is used.

The Illinois Judicial Conference, composed of all circuit judges in Illinois, has just approved this procedure and submitted it to the Illinois Supreme Court for decision. The proposal suggests that if adopted, the Illinois rule should be modeled after the Federal Court rule.

The Federal rule contains this qualification: "in a proper case." We suggest this is important because it would appear that many cases are not proper for this procedure; for example, it may be difficult to separate liability from damages.

In a proper case, as suggested, this procedure will save time if a no-liability verdict is returned. If liability is found, another hearing on damages is required.

JURY SELECTION

Much time is unnecessarily devoted to pury selection. This may be justified when the case has been widely publized or involves unusual facts and large damages. In the ordidary negligence case these elements do not loom large. The principal search is for jurors who can be fair and impartial. What accidents have they and their families and close associates had? What lawsuits have they or their families and close associates been parties to? Is or has their work been in the field of claims for damages?

Much of this information should be elicited from all 12 prospective jurors in a few questions asked either by the judge or the attorneys. Any juror affected should be asked to indicate that fact so he may be interrogated individually. It should be unnecessary to ask all these questions of each prospective juror unless there has been some indication by him in answers to broader questions.

On the other hand, there are still a number of trial lawyers who have selected jurors over many years and who would be greatly annoyed if such new methods were introduced. This writer has even been told by attorneys that one of their younger partners was on trial but would be available at the opening of court the next day. At the suggestion that we proceed to select a jury such lawyers often reply that this would be beyond their comprehension, i.e., to have a jury selected by other than the trial attorney. Perhaps a rule or statute would help as to this matter.

The author has been trying out ways of shortening jury selection. The method now in use by him is to limit each side to 20 minutes for each of the three panels making 1 hour per side or 2 hours per jury. We have met no opposition so far. Often the attorneys cooperate so well that they select the jury even more quickly.

OBJECTIONS

Objections serve a useful purpose as they often avoid errors. What should the court do when there is a constant barrage of objections? Perhaps counsel may even frequently request hearings in chambers where extensive arguments may be made.

The writer's experience indicates that these objections will lessen and perhaps the case settle down to customary procedure, if the court will be of good cheer, modulate his voice as an example, and rule rather promptly.

We need hardly say that lawsuit is not a contest to choose the best lawyer but is a serious matter to both parties. Dean Pound once suggested that each party should be allowed to tell his story without too much interference.

As there are many precedents which industrious counsel may find but are not always prepared to present, and the court cannot adjourn so he may research minor questions, we suggest the court, out of his experience, both judicial and practical, rule on the basis of what appears to be fair under all the circumstances. We say this because we believe it is important for him to rule rather promptly.

If the court has committed error, and that includes errors of counsel, the posttrial motions, which must be made before appeal, give the court, as our appellate courts have said, an opportunity to correct such errors. In such motions, the court has more time and can ask counsel for briefs as well as oral arguments.

We suggest that the above procedure will lead to prompt termination of cases with fairness to the parties.

Needless to say, other suggestions for shortening jury trials have been and are being made.

FOOTNOTES

We use the writer's completions for 1 month because he only knows the specific details of this list. It should be said that other judges similarly engaged are disposing of a somewhat greater number of cases.

[1] Judge, circuit court of Cook County.

1. *S.* v. *H.*: Verdict, 4 days.
2. *R.* v. *V.*: Verdict directed, 1 day.
3. *M.* v. *K.*: Default and prove-up, one-fourth day.
4. *F.* v. *H.*: Settled, one-fourth day.
5. *O.* v. *D.*: Partial trial settled, one-half day.
6. *J.* v. *C.*: Attorney for plaintiff withdrew, default, and prove-up, one-fourth day.
7. *K.* v. *M.*: Verdict, 2 day.
8. *S.* v. *C.*: Partial trial settled, one-half day.
9. *G.* v. *E.*: Partial trial settled, one-half day.
10. *Z.* v. *P.*: Settled, one-fourth day.
11. *S.* v. *M.*: Plaintiff's attorney withdrew as plaintiff could not proceed, at plaintiff's request case dismissed, one-half day.
12. *L.* v. *B.*: Partial trial settled, one-half day.
13. *P.* v. *S.*: Settled, one-fourth day.
14. *S.* v. *F.*: Settled near end of evidence, 2 days.
15. *H.* v. *H.*: Verdict, 1½ days.
16. *L.* v. *N.*: Settled, one-fourth day.
17. *M.* v. *M.*: Settled, one-fourth day.
18. *B.* v. *C.*: Partial trial settled, 1 day.
19. *C.* v. *C.*: Verdict, 2 days.
20. *F.* v. *H.*: Partial trial settled, 1 day.
21. *F.* v. *C.*: Settled, one-fourth day.
22. *J.* v. *H.*: Partial trial settled, 1 day.
23. *G.* v. *G.*: Partial trial settled, 1 day.

Conservation's Birthday

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on this day 30 years ago—April 27, 1935—this Nation heeded the harsh lessons from vanished civilizations. We recognized the certain and grim fate of peoples who waste the land. We decreed that America for generations to come shall be a land of plenty and a beautiful land.

Three decades ago, the Congress of the United States decided to make the conservation of this Nation's most basic and precious resource—the soil—a national responsibility and a national policy.

The Soil Conservation Act—Public Law 46 of the 74th Congress—was passed by unanimous vote.

Our Government entered a partnership with our farm people.

Today, 30 years later, we are abundantly blessed. We are the best fed nation on the face of the earth. Our lands are conserved, they are protected, they are improved and enriched, and they flourish.

Mr. Speaker, history is replete and tragic with accounts of the deterioration and degeneration of peoples who have neglected and wasted the soil.

Babylon, once a rich and bounteous land, is now desolate; the famous stables of Nebuchadnezzar were discovered in recent years by excavations deep into deposits of sand and debris. The promised land which 3,000 years ago flowed with milk and honey now lies in ruin. North Africa was the granary of Rome in the days of its glory, but today most of north Africa is a desert.

In north Syria among Leppo, Antioch, and Hama lie the skeletons of the flowering villages of Biblical times, the lands about them eroded and desolate. Archeologists dug 18 to 28 feet to reach the tops of the magnificent buildings of the once great city of Antioch where the Apostle Paul struggled to establish one of the first Christian churches.

Looking back across the years, Mr. Speaker, it would seem that we must conclude that no nation ever established a policy more intimate to and promising of its future than was done by the Congress 30 years ago.

I am happy to count myself among the 21 Members of Congress still serving who were in office when the historic vote was taken in 1935 to make conservation a national policy.

In those dark days when the land was being despoiled by wind and water no one in the Congress voted against the measure, and the Soil Conservation Service came into being on a wave of hope that the chaos sweeping over the countryside would be ended with the development of sound soil and water conservation practices. That hope has been justified by the Soil Conservation Service in 30 years of progress.

The original supporters of the Soil Conservation Act remaining in Congress are few in number. But soil and water conservation has, over the years, added new friends in every Congress.

This congressional support has made possible numerous programs and projects designed to meet particular conservation needs. These include the Small Watershed Act, the Great Plains conservation program, the Food and Agriculture Act of 1962, and other soil and water conservation programs which have brought this effort into larger perspective.

I have watched the Soil Conservation Service grow and acquire new responsibilities and stature. I have noted with great satisfaction that this essential Government service continues to be a dynamic agency, bringing new forces into play in behalf of every one of us who depends upon Mother Earth for our sustenance.

Mr. Speaker, in view of what conservation means to this generation and to the generations to follow, it is a matter of consternation to Members of this House that the administration now has submitted to the Congress a proposal that would withdraw the Government from full participation and leadership in the conservation movement.

The proposal would require farmers and ranchers and other rural landowners to pay for technical help in installing soil and water conservation systems—help they have received free from the Soil Conservation Service through the soil conservation districts. It would cut the Soil Conservation Service budget for technical assistance by $20 million, with this cost being saddled upon the soil conservation districts and their cooperators.

Mr. Speaker, it is unthinkable that anyone in this Nation would harm a work that has such a tremendous impact on the welfare of this Nation. It is unthinkable—in view of the increasing demands that industry, cities and our people generally are making on our land and water resources—that anyone could ignore our Nation's conservation needs and say: "Let the farmer take care of them."

We all would lose, for farmers do not have the financial resources or the technical knowledge to do the job without help. We would lose what we have invested in soil and water conservation over the years.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot—we shall not—let this happen.

We Americans are consecreated to the soil. Our accomplishments in these years since April 27, 1935, are many and rewarding.

Mr. Speaker, my message today—on this anniversary—is that our job has just begun—that care of the soil must never cease—so long as the sun shines, the rains come and the winds blow.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

Appendix

Urban Renewal Success of Raymond Rebsamen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. W. FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a fine article—published in the Arkansas Gazette—about Raymond Rebsamen.

Mr. Rebsamen is one of the leading businessmen of my State. He is also one of the public-spirited men who devote so much of their time and talents to the public welfare.

I join my constituents in congratulating Mr. Rebsamen on his fine contributions to urban development and other public purposes.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REBSAMEN: HE MADE RENEWAL WORK

(By Jerry Dhonau)

Raymond Rebsamen, it is said, is fond of telling how the Urban Progress Association was founded.

Arthur Phillips, who is chairman of the board of the M. M. Cohn Co., invited him to lunch one day in 1959 to talk about how plans for downtown renewal were lagging. They ate barbecue and drank buttermilk and decided to do something about shifting redevelopment into action.

Rebsamen gathered a small group of civic and business leaders at his home later. They talked over and formed the association to help the city government execute the elaborate plan that became the Central Little Rock urban renewal project.

Six years later, as even a casual downtown visitor can see, Rebsamen and his associates have been eminently successful. Rebsamen stepped down Tuesday after 6 years as president of the Urban Progress Association, but he insisted that Little Rock was just beginning to rejuvenate itself and nobody could know where the progress would end.

"Our past is interesting," he said. "But yet, it too will become eclipsed and be dimmed by what is yet to come. I'm confident that the achievements of those who follow us may well relegate our progress to date to that of Kitty Hawk in this exploding era of urbanization."

Although the most active part Rebsamen and the association have played in urban renewal was the Central Little Rock project, Rebsamen was speaking of the whole renewal program. Since urban renewal was approved by the voters and instituted 15 years ago by the Little Rock Housing Authority, 15 percent of the city's land area has been turned upside down. In these locations, slums have been wiped away and open spaces and handsome new buildings have appeared.

This has meant an expenditure of $31 million in construction either completed or announced on land bought and cleared through urban renewal and sold for redevelopment. It also has meant $11 million spent in rehabilitation and remodeling by private property owners within project areas.

The 10 projects undertaken have drawn Federal grants of over $30 million. The housing authority itself has spent $4,400,000 on site improvements (streets, curbs, gutters, storm drainage and the like).

These figures show that over $46 million has been spent in the construction industry alone, creating 500 new jobs that have been sustained for the last 10 years.

IT PAYS OFF IN ANOTHER WAY

Urban renewal also has started paying off in another way. Including the Granite Mountain project (which is over 95 percent complete), five projects totaling 285 acres have been completed.

Of the 285 acres, 50 acres have been converted to parks, playgrounds and schools, none of which produce any property tax revenue. Even with this, the tax that governmental agencies—the county and school district as well as the city—receive from the nine urban renewal areas averages 707 percent more per project than before. The average of tax by acre is even more—1,239 percent.

"I challenge you to illustrate any expenditure of public funds which is bringing better returns," Rebsamen says.

The record is considered pretty impressive. National publications have featured Little Rock's urban renewal program. Delegations from other cities have come to look.

The philosophy behind urban renewal at Little Rock through the years has not been that, as some have proposed, of creeping socialism, but the cure of a basic human problem that Rebsamen set as the goal for urban progress: "A city in which no child will go to school from a slum." In addition, it has, indeed, been good for business.

WHAT IS BEHIND HIS SUCCESS?

How has Rebsamen been the most effective force in the business community behind a city government trying to execute the urban renewal projects?

Mostly, say some of his associates and acquaintances, it is through his enormous prestige within the business community ("he motivates others—that's how he's effective") and the drive that has made him successful in business. ("When he decides a project is good for the city then there's no stopping him.")

He was particularly active in pushing for Federal approval of the central Little Rock project, making several trips to Washington and elsewhere to see Federal officials and explain the plans and the need.

Rebsamen also has gone all over the Nation making speeches about urban renewal. He has studied it and is considered to be the most knowledgeable man in Little Rock outside of the housing authority on urban renewal.

Rebsamen, who is 67 and heads several highly successful businesses including an insurance company and automobile dealership, has little time for business leaders who won't participate in efforts to solve community problems.

"I get a little tired of some citizens who sit on their ivory towers and deplore what 'they' are doing * * * or not doing * * * to his city," Rebsamen says.

The end of urban rejuvenation at Little Rock is not in sight.

"The procedure for bringing a city up to date is slow and it is difficult," he says. "But we have come to know that if the city is to survive—to serve its intended functions—then it must be continuously streamlined and modernized."

HOUSING AUTHORITY TALLIED UP SCORE

While Rebsamen and the association have given substantial and unofficial assistance in geting plans put into effect, the planning and execution have been done by the Housing Authority. The authority, which has received considerable national recognition for the job it has done, tallies up the projects this way:

Philander Smith: 9.6 acres, all of it sold to Philander Smith College for campus expansion. This wiped out the $1,250 annual property tax on the acreage. But in the year before redevelopment the share that the city got out of the property tax was only $246.72, less than it cost the city to make five fire runs there during the year. The net project cost was $205,928.

Dunbar: 40 acres in a zigzag pattern between Izard, High, 15th and 19th Streets. The property tax went up from $6,328 to $23,318. The project cost $1,943,851.

Livestock show: 80 acres. Although 16 acres was sold to the Arkansas Livestock Show Association for off-street parking and playgrounds, both tax exempt, the tax yield jumped from $3,161 to $18,611. The project cost $934,735.

West Rock: 53.69 acres and includes what now are the highest priced apartments in the city—in the $400 to $600 a month range. Taxes increased from $3,165 to $42,398. The project cost $747,156.

Granite Mountain: 102 acres, mostly residential. Taxes have increased from $1,615 to $25,268. The project cost is estimated at $1,496,173.

High Street: Planning started in 1958 and the project is still in progress, including $640,000 worth of site improvements. Taxes on the 268 acres have increased from $103,612 to an estimated $110,082, although 156 dwellings were eliminated, a school was built and land was set aside for the East-West Expressway. The project cost is estimated at $6,884,445.

Central Little Rock: Planning started in 1960 and completion is expected in 1972. It is the first urban renewal project in the Nation involving the central core of a city—508 acres between the Arkansas River and 15th Street and Broadway and the freeway. Several major buildings have been completed, are under construction or are planned. The property tax just on land where three major developments are planned is expected to increase 875 percent. The net project cost is estimated at $19,987,223.

University Park: Planning started in 1961 and the project is underway over 282 acres. It was planned right after the area was annexed to the city and its estimated cost is $4,036,307.

Coliseum: Planning started in 1961 and completion is expected in 1967. It covers 196.8 acres. It is the first of four projects to be carried out within the South End General Neighborhood Renewal area and the cost is estimated at $1,200,000.

Capitol view: Planning started in 1963 and completion is expected in 1968. The area of 216 acres is generally west and south of the capitol grounds and part of the project will be devoted to expansion of the grounds, such as the site for the new revenue department building.

The Unfair Burden

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, with the growing interest across the Nation in bringing about a repeal of our excise taxes, I want to call attention to the need to do away with this tax on dues and initiation fees of recreation clubs. The May 1965 issue of Golf magazine carries a well written article by the publisher, Arnold E. Abramson, entitled "The Unfair Burden," and should be carefully considered by my colleagues:

THE UNFAIR BURDEN—HOW MUCH LONGER MUST THE GOLFERS OF AMERICA BEAR UP UNDER THE GROSSLY UNJUST TAX ON CLUB DUES AND INITIATION FEES?

(By Arnold E. Abramson)

For the past 22 years, a Federal excise tax of 20 percent on club dues and initiation fees has drained millions of dollars from the golfers' pockets and has caused considerable hardship to many small membership golf clubs. When the tax was increased to the 20-percent level in 1943, it was deemed a necessary and justifiable measure in view of the fantastic cost of financing the massive war effort. In 1954, most of the excise taxes were reduced to the prewar level. In 1960, the 20-percent cabaret tax was cut to 10 percent. But the club dues tax has remained in force as an unfair and discriminatory measure against golfers and other club members.

The U.S. Golf Association has waged a spirited campaign over the years to have the tax reduced to 10 percent. Last summer, Clarence W. Benedict, USGA president, Joseph C. Dey, Jr., its executive director, and Lynford Lardner, Jr., USGA general counsel, appeared before a hearing of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives in Washington, D.C., with an appeal on behalf of America's golfers. No action was taken by the committee at that time and the future of the appeal is clouded.

Golf magazine is calling on its readers to support the efforts being made by the USGA by bringing to the attention of the members of the Ways and Means Committee the grassroots sentiment in favor of reducing this totally unfair tax. An avalanche of mail from the voting public, it is felt, could produce favorable congressional action.

In order to present the readers of Golf with a clear picture of the history of the tax and its discriminatory character, the memorandum prepared by Mr. Lardner for the USGA on this subject is reprinted as follows:

"A tax upon club dues was first imposed in 1917 as part of the general excise tax legislation of World War I. This tax has always been considered part of the taxes on admissions and been treated in a similar manner. In 1941, the rate was temporarily increased to 11 percent and in 1943 it was again increased with many other items to 20 percent. In 1954, most excise taxes were cut back to their pre-World War II level of 10 percent. This reduction included most admission taxes and taxes on luxuries such as jewelry and furs.

"The House Ways and Means Committee included the club dues tax in this general reduction. The Senate, however, took exception to this proposal; and the dues tax, along with taxes on cabarets and admissions to horse and dog races, remained at 20 percent. When, in 1960, the cabaret tax was cut to 10 percent, this reduction was justified in the Senate report on the ground that the 20 percent rate was discriminatory and that high taxes had restricted employment of musicians and other entertainers. These same arguments are at least as favorable to reduction of the club dues tax.

"The continuation of the discriminatory 20-percent club dues tax is not justifiable on revenue grounds as the club dues tax accounts for approximately $70 million, or less than one-tenth of 1 percent of total tax revenues. The tax has evidently been continued at its high discriminatory rate because of an erroneous belief that the tax is imposed on a luxury of the upper income groups and a failure to understand the positive contributions of private clubs.

"A much more exact analysis of the incidence of the club dues tax and the economic status of club members is contained in the memorandum of C. Lowell Harriss, professor of economics, Columbia University. A few general comments, however, are appropriate. Golf courses are not the playgrounds of the privileged few. More than 6 million Americans play over 15 rounds of golf annually, to say nothing of the very large number who play less frequently. (The most recent figures announced by the National Golf Foundation indicate that this total has increased to 7 million.—Ed.) These figures make golf one of the most popular adult participation sports in the United States. There are over 7,000 golf courses in our country, half of which are owned by private clubs and 2,400 of which are semiprivate. Indicative of the modest character of most private clubs is the fact that over half are only nine-hole courses, which are principally located in small towns. A large number of private courses are located in the less populous and less affluent areas of the country. Representative of the nine-hole courses which account for over half the private clubs in the United States are the 84 private courses in Iowa communities of less than 5,000 which were the subject of a 1955 study. These clubs, representing 75 percent of the private courses in Iowa, had an average membership of 153, and annual dues per member of less than $50.

"Average dues figures are not available and what samples are taken are usually heavily biased in favor of the metropolitan 18-hole courses. Some indication, however, may be found from the number of club members. It is estimated that there are 3.4 million club members, which means the average dues tax paid per member is approximately $20, meaning that the average dues are $100. This is a further indication that the vast majority of the clubs are within the means of the middle class.

"The importance of golf as a sports activity was perhaps best expressed by Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY in the July 1964, issue of Golf, where he pointed out the importance of interesting young people in golf and stated:

" '1. Golf promotes mental and physical tone. It encourages what America needs most—a habit of pursuing excellence—a constant striving to meet and surpass one's highest standards.

" '2. Golf brings our young people exactly where they should be for many, many hours—to the fresh outdoors, to sunshine, clean air, green grass.

" '3. Golf builds men and women. It builds sportsmanship in the best sense.

" '4. Golf is a lifetime sport. Almost uniquely, it is good for health at virtually all ages. Because of this fact, it helps resolve one of the most widespread dilemmas faced by sportsminded Americans as they grow older:

" 'What sport can I turn to, now that high school and college athletics are just a fading memory?

" 'One of the best answers is: Golf.'

"Golf is one of the few active outdoor sports in which persons of nearly all ages and abilities can participate. It affords wonderful opportunities for outdoor exercise, sufficiently arduous to be beneficial without being overly strenuous.

"The demand for these public facilities far exceeds the available supply. Overcrowding on public courses is notorious. A public links golfer in most metropolitan areas, for example, must wait for several hours to play a public course on a weekend or holiday. On some public courses in California over 100,000 rounds of golf are played each year—this amounts to one foursome teeing off every 10 minutes for 12 hours each day, 365 days a year.

"The 9-hole courses in rural areas, such as the 84 clubs in Iowa communities of less than 5,000, are supplying public recreational facilities at private expense. In metropolitan areas, private courses are reducing the burden on public courses. Unfortunately, the private courses' growth is not keeping pace with the demand for golf courses; in fact, there has actually been a decline in private golf courses since 1931. Local governments have nearly doubled the number of municipal courses since 1931 in recognition of their obligation to provide public recreational facilities. The inadequate tax base of most local governments, combined with the expense of establishing a course in a metropolitan area, has meant that demand far exceeds supply.

"The cost of establishing an 18-hole golf course in a metropolitan area is staggering. Land costs in these areas are rapidly becoming prohibitive. Aside from land costs, it requires from $15,000 to $25,000 per hole, or well in excess of a quarter million dollars, to construct an adequate 18-hole golf course (without provision for any clubhouse facility). After initial construction, annual maintenance cost averages $3,000 per hole, or about $54,000 for an adequate 18-hole golf course. Adding to the cost of public golf facilities is the loss of property tax revenues, the magnitude of which is indicated by answers to a survey of one-fourth of our member clubs from which we estimate that the amount of local property taxes and assessments paid by all of our members in 1963 aggregated about $30 million.

"Encouragement should be given to the establishment and continuation of private clubs in order to give some relief to hard-pressed local governments.

"Private golf clubs also serve a valuable function as substantial employers of unskilled and youthful workers—two categories currently presenting serious unemployment problems throughout our country. Total payroll and employment figures for private clubs are not available; but it is generally recognized that payroll constitutes two-thirds of the cost of course maintenance. An analysis of the expenditures by 66 Metropolitan New York clubs for the year 1960 shows that they spent more than $11 million on payroll alone.

"Private golf clubs employ over 250,000 boys as caddies each year. Employment of these caddies represents a particularly valuable contribution by private golf clubs because older boys represent approximately 25 percent of our Nation's unemployed. It is difficult to imagine a more wholesome type of employment for teenage boys than caddying, which involves outdoor work in the company of responsible adults. The caddies' earnings often help finance their future education; and, in addition, various golf associations provide caddies and former caddies with direct scholarship assistance. Last year 1,000 boys were the recipients of caddie scholarships covering college tuition and housing having an average value of $4,000 for a 4-year period or an aggregate of nearly $1 million annually.

"It is inconsistent for the Federal Government to attempt to alleviate unemployment by aiding distressed industries while at the

same time imposing a discriminatory tax burden on private clubs employing a large number of persons whose employment opportunities are severely limited.

"The ability of private golf clubs to continue providing such recreational facilities is being jeopardized by their growing financial difficulties. Since 1931, there has been a 20-percent decrease in the total number of private clubs. Many of these were victims of the depression; but many others simply have been unable to overcome the squeeze between rising costs and the financial limitations of their members' pocketbooks. In nearly every year from 1931 through 1956, there was a decrease in the number of private golf courses. An annual survey by the accounting firm of Horwath & Horwath, which specializes in club audits, shows that in 1962 private golf clubs in general were in greater financial difficulty than in 1961 and could not even cover the depreciation on their facilities. Most of the clubs surveyed were being compelled to increase dues and fees in order to survive financially. The clubs covered by the survey are large 18-hole courses, located in the major metropolitan areas; and it is likely that the financial condition of smaller clubs is even more grave. Indicative of the adverse impact of the dues tax on the growth of private clubs is the fact that during this same period, 1931–63, while private clubs were decreasing, the number of semiprivate courses, which involve considerably less taxable dues, grew from 700 to 2,868—a more than 300-percent growth.

"In appraising the effect of the dues tax, it should be borne in mind that the tax not only constricts existing clubs (many are sorely tempted to solve their financial troubles by converting to residential subdivisions) but also deters the establishment of new clubs to meet the increasing demand now overburdening municipal courses.

"The USGA's basic position is against the discriminatory aspects of the club dues tax. However, if there is to be a widespread elimination of excise taxes, we believe the elimination of the club dues tax is justifiable. The revenue produced by the tax is small and it has posed an administrative problem for both the taxpayer and the Government. The definition of dues has proved troublesome because of the Internal Revenue Service's attempt to apply it to service charges, and the clubs devising more ingenious ways to obtain funds from their membership without raising dues. In addition, the exemptions for capital improvement funds and some swimming clubs have added considerably to the complexity of this section.

"The U.S. Golf Association does not ask for special treatment for club dues, but only that they not be discriminated against. The large club dues tax is an excessive burden to the vast majority of clubs, which are modest operations and continually find themselves in financial difficulties. The large benefits provided by these clubs justify at least a neutral tax policy toward them."

"How the Handicapped Are Overcoming Barriers to Employment in My Community"—Essay by Miss Marybeth Meffert

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CHURCH
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, too often in recent days we have heard unkind words spoken about the attitudes and ideals of our younger people. It is said that they are too glib, too shallow, and without concern for the real world around them.

An outstanding young woman who is proof to the contrary is Miss Marybeth Meffert, who graduates this year from Boise High School, in my own State. Miss Meffert has submitted the winning essay on behalf of the Idaho employ-the-handicapped program. Her insight, empathy, and understanding of the problems besetting the physically handicapped, and her recognition of their ability to do highly productive work, do justice to one far older than Miss Meffert.

I ask unanimous consent that her prize-winning essay be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD; and I commend it to all Americans.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"HOW THE HANDICAPPED ARE OVERCOMING BARRIERS TO EMPLOYMENT IN MY COMMUNITY": IDAHO'S FIRST PRIZE WINNER—1965 ABILITY COUNTS CONTEST

(By Marybeth Meffert, Boise High School)

Not many years ago, the handicapped were seldom seen working competitively with the able bodied. They were isolated, kept away from social contacts, and rejected by society. Employers did not know how to measure the potentials of a handicapped person, and unfortunately they often drew their own conclusions, based on ignorance and prejudice—negative ones.

The handicapped themselves deserve all the laurels for breaking through the barrier of misconceptions and the biased opinions of the ignorant. It was not easy. It took the courage and determination of individuals who refused to give up; who said, "I will," when society said, "You can't." Often through sheer willpower alone, severely disabled persons proved to society that they could take their place in the community as valuable and self-reliant citizens.

Any handicapped person should be able to be employed if he is given the necessary training and proper job placement. Proper job placement is especially important when considered from the viewpoint that anyone, even an able-bodied person, is handicapped if he is placed in a job situation for which he is not equipped. A disabled person should not be considered handicapped in respect to his job if he is capable of doing the work.

Here in Idaho, Live, Inc., has placed approximately 40 handicapped persons per year on the competitive labor market since 1949. Given the chance that time, training, and proper job placement afforded, these individuals have proved themselves to be competent and resourceful.

This year, 13 blind students are attending Idaho colleges. Their textbooks are records with the labels printed in braille. These young people have amazed their fellow students and the members of the faculty with their self-sufficiency. They have also earned the admiration of their school, their community, and their State. They are young men and women who, in spite of their handicap, are learning to take their place in the world of tomorrow.

Handicapped persons are at more of a disadvantage in States such as Idaho than in areas where there is a great deal of manufacturing. Being made up mostly of rural communities, Idaho has little industry, which has often proved to be a source of employment for the handicapped. In communities such as ours an imaginative approach must often be used to find work for a disabled person.

But there are jobs, and for each of these jobs there is a handicapped person who can successfully fill the position. A blind, partially deaf man skillfully handweaves rugs, though his eyes will never see their beauty. A woman who cannot stand because of an orthopedic hip ailment sits, and her fingers fashion lovely wind chimes. A man in a wheelchair sits in the courthouse, administering driver's license tests. A rodeo rider proves to be tough competition in the calf-roping event, despite his two artificial legs. It was not easy for these people, nor is it easy for the other handicapped like them who are striving for independence though they are disabled. These individuals are living testimonies to the fact that handicapped people can lead useful, productive lives.

Once employers would not hire the disabled because it disturbed them to have a handicapped person around. Handicapped individuals who have proved their capabilities deserve the credit for changing employers' opinions. Now the nearly unanimous viewpoint of employers is: "I do not object to hiring the handicapped if they can do the work."

Employers who give the handicapped a chance to prove themselves are seldom sorry. Statistics show that the handicapped make the most reliable employees, having less absenteeism than others.[1]

Because of the fine examples set by handicapped workers, the barrier of employer prejudice is quickly melting away. In this way disabled persons are helping society to overcome its handicap—crippling prejudice and blinding misconceptions.

Yet there is more to be done. Here in Idaho there is a waiting list of handicapped people who need jobs. There are inadequate funds to meet the needs of the State in giving these people the training they need and seeing that they obtain suitable jobs. Progress has been made, but it is not enough. Obstacles have crumbled and fallen away, but there loom more barriers ahead that are yet to be overcome. Judging by the past record of the handicapped in my community, I feel sure they will remain dauntless and undefeated no matter how formidable those barriers may be.

[1] Wishik, Samuel M., M.D., "How To Help Your Handicapped Child" Public Affairs Pamphlet No. 219, p. 23.

Address by Hon. Hervey G. Machen Before Graduating Class of Southeastern University, Washington, D.C., April 24, 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LYNN E. STALBAUM
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. STALBAUM. Mr. Speaker, a neighbor of mine, John P. Maurer, president of Southeastern University here in Washington told me about the inspirational remarks relating to the problems of today made by my colleague, the Honorable HERVEY G. MACHEN, Representative from Maryland's Fifth District, made at the university's annual dinner-dance for the 1965 graduating classes last Saturday evening, April 24.

Southeastern University is completing its 86th year as an operating service of the YMCA of Metropolitan Washington.

It is proud to number Representative MACHEN as a distinguished alumnus. The Congressman received his LL.B. in 1939 and his LL.M. in 1941.

Congressman MACHEN'S remarks follow:

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN HERVEY G. MACHEN, DEMOCRAT, OF MARYLAND

Many years ago I walked the path many of you are now taking by working and going to school at the same time in an effort to make a career and a place in American society. You and I are fortunate that we have had the opportunity, desire, and drive to work and attend school at the same time.

As we all know, there are thousands and thousands of poverty-stricken Americans who cannot or do not have this same chance not only to be gainfully employed but to use spare time—hours that would have been spent in leisure or with our families—to attend school for a better education and improved career opportunities.

Similar opportunities are denied many thousands of people because they either lack initiative as a result of being entrenched in poverty for so many years that all hope of ever climbing out of the well was lost, or for a variety of other causes, such as the breakup of the family unit which I see as becoming a critical problem today and just plain apathy on the part of local citizens themselves.

To conquer this cancer called poverty is where we—in Congress—and you—the citizens—must concentrate our efforts today. To guarantee that every American has an equal opportunity to a decent education and career and the initiative to take advantage of these opportunities is the goal of our generation. We are dedicated to building a new society for our country—a society and a way of life that will be a model for the world and a springboard for even better things for future generations. This feat cannot be accomplished overnight; nor can it be accomplished in a hundred or a thousand days because our society is not malleable like clay; and poverty, lack of education and initiative and generations-old institutions cannot be wiped out with a wave of the magic wand. Instead, our efforts are to be more like a builder constructing a grand new edifice, and we in the Congress are now providing you with the tools and the building blocks.

Let me cite a few of the ones that Congress has already provided: First there is the war-on-poverty bill, known as the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. There is the aid-to-education bill and the Appalachian public works aid program to help bring the economy of that mountainous region into the 20th century.

Now I must caution you that these measures alone are far from the final answer. We already have mass welfare and relief programs which have been underway for decades. It is apparent that they are grossly inadequate. We have some private organizations which are carrying out their own antipoverty programs in various ways. But I sincerely hope that the sun has set on the belief that poverty can be conquered by merely handing out money to every open hand and mouth. It is my strong feeling that now we on Capitol Hill have mapped a course for an attack at the very roots of poverty by means of a comprehensive community program to be carried out primarily by the local citizens and those stricken by environment and circumstance.

The community-action program is the backbone of the antipoverty campaign and calls for participation and coordination by citizens—not bureaucrats—through their service organizations, schools, churches or civic associations. The success of our war on poverty lies in the hands of the citizens who—with the tools we in Congress have provided—must now go to work.

You who are here tonight have exhibited that incentive which is so necessary for success in almost any endeavor. This same incentive can and should be turned toward action against poverty in your own community where you could work through your churches, schools, service organizations, and citizens associations to implement what Congress has already done.

An excellent example of voluntary citizen participation is a growing program in Beltsville being carried out by a high school teacher and several students who are working with preschool youngsters who may be qualified as culturally deprived. This group is operating on its own initiative and with whatever funds it can raise locally for material. I feel their work is inspired and should be strongly encouraged and cited as the type of local voluntary antipoverty campaign which is striking at the roots of this cancer. I know there are a few other groups I could mention like the one in Beltsville. By this time next year I sincerely hope there will be hundreds of them.

I do hope you do not feel that we in Congress have placed the sole responsibility for the war on poverty with a brandnew growing bureaucracy which is already enmeshed in redtape and controversy. The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 specifically calls for community action programs and major participation by local groups and citizens. This is where you and your friends fit into the picture.

If these broad new programs are nothing more than a bureaucratic power grab which is fed by citizen apathy, then I can see nothing but disaster for the antipoverty campaign and for the people we are trying to help. But I am optimistic that this will not happen as long as you do your share in this great effort. In this complex society what we really will have to do is concentrate on rebuilding family responsibility and church and community responsibility. This can be done only by the individual and not by the Federal Government or any of its programs.

Tonight should be a happy occasion for you who are graduating. It was for me when I was working my way through law school years ago. I want to close by saying that in this brief message it is my earnest hope that I have been able to impress on you some of the duties incumbent on you if we are to create a truly Great Society. I wish you all the best of everything.

The Future of Pennsylvania's Urban Communities—Address by Governor Scranton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on April 20, 1965, Gov. William W. Scranton, of my Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, delivered a most moving and eloquent address to a joint session of the Pennsylvania General Assembly, in Harrisburg, on "The Future of Pennsylvania's Urban Communities." The problems and needs of our cities and urban areas are among the most important challenges facing America today; and I ask unanimous consent that Governor Scranton's address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MESSAGE ON THE FUTURE OF PENNSYLVANIA'S URBAN COMMUNITIES

(By Gov. William W. Scranton, before a joint session of the General Assembly. Harrisburg, Pa., Apr. 20, 1965)

Mr. Lieutenant Governor, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the general assembly, my fellow Pennsylvanians, we come here today in behalf of the 9 million Pennsylvanians who live in our big cities, our suburbs, our smaller cities, our growing towns.

We seek to design an effective local-state partnership to build better communities in a better Pennsylvania.

We shall talk of people—and of their homes and their schools, and of their fight against juvenile delinquency, and of their struggle for good communities, for public health and public safety.

And when we have finished, Pennsylvania will be on her way to another chapter of greatness.

Four thousand years before the birth of Christ, somewhere in the lush valleys of the Mideast, ancient man staked out a permament site for what had been a wandering village of nomadic tribesmen.

And thus was born the first city.

Its name has long since been forgotten, but the legacy of problems and paradoxes which it initiated lives on to challenge man to this very day.

For of all human creations none is more perverse than the urban community. It gives with one hand, and takes away with the other.

Cities exist, for example, to provide otherwise impossible opportunities for economic advancement. Yet, they also spawn the cruelest poverty.

Cities are for the common safety of their inhabitants. Yet, they simmer with crime, delinquency and violence.

Cities are for health and happiness. Yet, there are places in Philadelphia where babies die at three times the normal rate.

Cities are for convenience. Yet, the suburban commuter is one of the most inconvenienced men in all America.

Cities exist so that man can savor and supplement his cultural birthright. Yet, even the basic education of the young becomes more difficult each year.

So, man creates urban communities to nurture and shape his civilization, but he must wage a perpetual struggle lest they succeed only in twisting and brutalizing it.

And the enemies of the urban community are legion.

Overcrowding. The sordid press of too many people into rundown, shoddy neighborhoods. The monotonous crush of stone, steel, and brick, until God's green earth is blotted out and it almost seems as if man was made to serve the buildings.

The squalid ghettos of penned-in humanity, ill equipped by ignorance, prejudice, and disease to break the chains of poverty.

Overrapid growth. And, even in more prosperous communities, the failure to provide community facilities in sufficient quantity or quality to serve a burgeoning population.

Or lack of growth. And the growing cobwebs of decay it spins off.

One or more of these malfunctions of modern society has taken its toll through all the urban communities of Pennsylvania. The big cities, the suburbs, the smaller cities, the towns—none has completely escaped, and all are endangered in the future.

Juvenile delinquency in Pennsylvania's urban communities has increased as much as 30 percent since 1959.

Over 300 Pennsylvania communities still dump raw, untreated sewage into the streams and rivers of our State.

Though the average density of population in Pennsylvania is only 252 persons per square mile, there are neighborhoods in Philadelphia where nearly 63,000 human beings per square mile are squeezed in.

Each year, some 20,000 children in Pennsylvania's urban communities drop out without completing grade and high school.

There are sections of our larger cities where the unemployment rate surpasses 20 percent, and among young people in certain neighborhoods it rises to more than 60 percent.

And, in Pennsylvania, over 65 of every 100 single-family urban homes are older than 25 years—and that's 16 percentage points higher than the national average and higher than any of our neighboring States.

All this is clear testimony that Pennsylvania's urban communities have deep problems that must be solved.

And the government of this Commonwealth must be prepared to become a full partner with the local communities in the labor that lies ahead.

We have started.

First, we recognized that for the individual communities of Pennsylvania to be strong and prosperous it was necessary for the State generally to be in that condition.

So, 2 years ago we made a new beginning.

It has been startlingly successful.

The sleeping industrial giant that was Pennsylvania has been aroused from slumber and now strides rapidly forward to new heights.

By last October, you will remember, Pennsylvania's unemployment had been toppled below the national average. And this past winter was the best economically of our generation. In March, for instance, unemployment in Pennsylvania was at its lowest point for the month since the Korean war.

And—perhaps most significant of all—the economic improvement of Pennsylvania has been at a faster rate than that of the Nation generally.

These figures reflect the growing economic strength of the Commonwealth—a strength that has spilled over into every section of the State and into our local communities.

What is more, this new wave of prosperity, in harness with sound management of the State government, has made it possible for the Commonwealth to greatly increase its contribution toward the vital services which are provided our citizens on the community level.

The budget I presented to you earlier this year provides for an almost 30-percent increase in the State contribution to local school districts, as compared to the year before we made the new beginning.

And we have been able to dramatically raise the State's contribution in a score of other fields—from libraries to industrial development, from urban renewal to hospitals—that are of fundamental importance to our local communities. And in the case of urban renewal we presently have before the general assembly a request to increase next year's budget by another $2 million.

We take quiet pride in our on-going participation in the redevelopment of the Delaware River Port area; in the full State payment for the first time in history toward the cost of local sewage disposal; and in the imaginative new approach to public assistance which has had dramatic success in getting people off the dole and into useful employment. And, the allocation of funds to the communities for open spaces under Project 70 has also moved rapidly along. Concurrently, as part of the same war against uncontrolled urban sprawl, the State planning board is swiftly completing a total statewide plan for open spaces. And in the all-important task of attracting new industry and new jobs we have forged the most successful State cooperation with local communities that has ever existed anywhere. Clearly, this effort will continue and be expanded.

But now there is much more to be done.

And that is why I come here today to propose a new era in the relationship of our State and our communities.

I propose a dynamic new partnership of State and local governments to make the urban areas of Pennsylvania the most livable, the most progressive in all the Nation.

Such an alliance requires that we adopt two broad and bold approaches.

The first of these is to assure that the local communities are strong enough to carry their end of the partnership.

And, second, the State government must embark on a series of new and expanded programs that hit as rifleshots at the most serious problems facing local communities today.

Consider the first of these two approaches:

Local communities are creatures of the State. In fact, the relationship historically has been almost that of parent and child. But a wise parent knows that when the child has reached maturity he must be given more of a voice in the conduct of his own affairs and those of the family.

For the communities of Pennsylvania that time has come. And to effect it I offer four specific proposals.

First, I ask the general assembly to create a new cabinet-level department of community affairs.

This will give the communities of Pennsylvania a fair voice and a long overdue voice in the highest councils of the State government.

At long last, 9 million persons who live in Pennsylvania's urban areas—whether big city, suburban area, smaller city, or growing town—will have a major department of the Government interested specifically in the experience and problems of urban living.

The enabling legislation, which will shortly be put before you, will call for the transfer of some existing State agencies into the new department.

These will include the bureau of community development from the department of commerce, the public service institute from the department of public instruction and the functions of the bureau of municipal affairs and the bureau of land records from the department of internal affairs.

The new department will also assume the Commonwealth's responsibilities for coordination of the antipoverty and Appalachian programs.

Because the need is so urgent, I will ask you to make the department's creation effective immediately. But to provide for an orderly transition, I will ask that transfer of functions from the department of internal affairs not be made effective until January of 1967.

When finally assembled the new department will have under its jurisdiction all of those programs and areas of responsibility which are of paramount importance to the urban communities of Pennsylvania.

These will include not only the compilation and dissemination of statistical and professional information of importance to the communities, but also such programs as urban renewal, mass transportation and community planning.

In addition, the new department will have jurisdiction over the Commonwealth's efforts to encourage the development of housing for our citizens. For that purpose the Pennsylvania Housing Agency, which was activate by this administration, will also be transferred to the new department.

Summed up, the department of community affairs will provide a clearinghouse for solving the common problems of Pennsylvania communities, an opportunity for those communities to be fully represented in the State government, and a one-stop agency to carry out the programs which are of vital importance to the urban areas of the Commonwealth.

The second great need, if our local communities are to develop the strength they ought to have, is for the general assembly to enact sweeping reforms in the election laws of the Commonwealth.

Fair and honest elections are imperative at every level of American politics, but nowhere more important than in the conduct of local government which, after all, is still the front parlor of our Republic.

If local elections are controlled by any force other than honest men casting honest ballots, local government will soon perish amid the complexities of the modern world.

I will, therefore, put before you legislation to reform the conduct of elections in Pennsylvania.

It will call for a new method of selecting election district officials and will provide for their training. It will reform the existing absentee ballot law. And it will provide improved procedures to guarantee every citizen's right to vote without coercion and to have his ballot honestly counted.

The third need to strengthen our local communities is for more of them to voluntarily enter into regional planning and related activities with their neighbors.

The independence of local communities traditionally has been highly regarded in Pennsylvania. And that independence, if not misused, can be a force for good. But surely it is self-defeating for any local community to arbitrarily refuse to cooperate across municipal lines when certain problems can only be solved by a cooperative approach.

The State planning board is currently conducting reconnaissance surveys of each region of the State. These, plus the other work of the planning board, will identify common regional problems which will only yield to regional solutions.

I am requesting the planning board, therefore, to make its studies and all other possible aid available to the local communities. And I urge our communities to undertake the widespread practice of voluntary, cooperative regional planning and related activities.

And, finally, the fourth proposal I am making to strengthen our local communities is this:

We need to strip away all of the old, outmoded restrictive State law which has piled up over the years. Nearly two centuries of legislative accumulation overcontrols our communities, stifles their initiative, and reduces their ability to produce viable local governments.

First and foremost, we must remove from the State constitution itself some of the old-fashioned and unnecessary restrictions and anachronism which it forces on local government.

A constitutional amendment to accomplish just that is already before the general assembly as part of this administration's constitutional reform package. I urge you to pass it speedily.

Furthermore, we need to reexamine the whole body of local government restrictions enacted through the years by the general assembly.

I am appointing, therefore, a high-level and bipartisan task force—including representatives of State and local governments, of the general assembly, of local government associations, and of other interested groups—to begin immediately the task of reviewing existing law.

When this task force completes its labor, the results will be presented to the general assembly, along with recommendations for change, repeal, and modernization.

These four proposals then: Creation of a department of community affairs, reform of the election laws, encouragement of regional

planning, and clearing away unnecessary State restrictions on local government—these four proposals can make Pennsylvania's urban communities strong enough to carry their half of the dynamic local-State partnership I am proposing.

But to provide for strong communities is to meet only part of the challenge.

The government of the Commonwealth also must now take on an ever more fierce determination to strike out at the common enemies of its communities and itself.

I propose, therefore, that we undertake new programs aimed at five great problems facing our communities, but which are beyond their ability to tackle alone.

These five great problems are: education, housing, crime and delinquency, mass transportation, and health.

First, education.

In 1 week I will put before you the results of an exhaustive 2-year effort which untangles the present maze of State subsidies for the support of local schools.

I mention it today because the new system will be of great benefit to the schoolchildren of Pennsylvania's urban areas.

The details will come in the education message, but in broad outline the schools of our urban areas can expect three major benefits:

1. The new subsidy plan will propose a multimillion dollar increase in total State aid, and much of this will go to schools in urban areas.

2. The new formula will correct inequities which have stood for many years against the fair sharing of State aid, and many of these inequities have been suffered by urban school districts.

3. The new plan will provide special subsidy help to those urban areas where the heavy density of population, with all its attendant difficulties, is creating acute educational problems.

Besides the new subsidy formula, there are two more vital educational measures I urge you to enact. One will give youngsters from the slums a fair chance at an equal start. The second will replace wornout school buildings in our heaviest populated areas.

The first program is already before you. In my original budget requests I included, and I urge you now to act favorably on it, a request for $1 million to provide preschool training for children from the slums.

These are the children who, without special early help, will drop out of school before the eighth grade. Their deprived backgrounds guarantee that without this preschool training they will not be able to keep pace with more fortunate children. I believe they deserve our special help.

The second program—to replace wornout school buildings in our heavy populated centers—will be detailed in next week's education message.

In a nutshell, however, what I will suggest is that the State heavily invest, through its long-term borrowing capacity, in the modernization of Pennsylvania's most outmoded school buildings.

In Philadelphia alone, there are 99 school buildings which are more than a half century old. Some of them are firetraps. Nearly all of them contribute to second-rate education. I propose that we do something now about this condition.

The second great need of Pennsylvania's urban communities is housing.

I am concerned about the general level of new home construction in Pennsylvania.

We know that the average age of housing in Pennsylvania is older than the national average and older than our neighboring States. And we know, too, that the number of new housing starts in the Commonwealth has been down in some recent years.

Obviously, the decades of economic plight in Pennsylvania, reflected in what until recently was an unemployment rate far higher than the national average, did have and might still be having an adverse effect on the housing industry.

But what no one knows is whether this completely explains the less than ideal construction level. We must find out.

I shall name, therefore, a cabinet-level group to work in close touch with the homebuilding industry to determine what the Commonwealth might do to stimulate the private construction of housing. If indeed there is need for governmental action, it shall be promptly made known to the general assembly.

Meanwhile, there is one vast segment of Pennsylvania's housing need that we can and should move immediately to meet.

We need nearly 30,000 middle-income homes and I propose an imaginative and unique program through which the Commonwealth will stimulate private enterprise to fill that need.

These homes would sell in the $10,000 to $17,500 price range and would be purchased by Pennsylvanians at the $3,600 to $8,000 annual earnings level.

The largest single obstacle now preventing these families from owning their own homes is the income requirements under presently available financing.

The detailed program I will shortly put before you will remove that obstacle by lowering the interest on mortgages and thus reducing the family income needed to meet monthly payments.

The money to finance this plan will come from bonds issued by the Pennsylvania Housing Agency. The mortgages it finances will be fully insured. The bonds will be repaid over the years as the mortgages are reduced by the families purchasing the homes.

In all, this proposal means more homeowning Pennsylvanians, stronger communities, and a shot in the arm to a vital segment of the State's economy. And, finally, it is worth mentioning that it would put Pennsylvania far in the lead of any other State in the imaginative coupling of public and private capital to fill the middle-income housing need.

The third great urban problem which I propose we tackle is crime and juvenile delinquency.

You will soon have before you a new plan to improve Pennsylvania's outdated system of corrections and rehabilitation for adult criminals. But today I want to concentrate on juvenile delinquency, which is of particular concern to the urban communities.

I urge you to enact a $3 million proposal which, added to our existing effort, will provide Pennsylvania with a juvenile delinquency program second to none in the Nation in its ability to rehabilitate young delinquents and at the same time protect society from youthful lawlessness.

Here are the details:

1. We will provide within a matter of months, to fill what is an emergency need, institutional facilities for an additional 600 juveniles.

2. We will double the present State contribution toward local juvenile police units.

3. We will double the present State contribution toward juvenile court and probation services.

4. We will increase the professional staff working on the effective placement of offenders in institutions and other aspects of correction.

5. We will increase by 50 percent our efforts at juvenile gang control.

6. We will establish, perhaps at the Pennsylvania State University, a badly needed training school for those who work in the field of delinquency and control.

The fourth great problem of our urban communities lies in the field of mass transportation.

Several weeks ago the administration presented to the general assembly what is Pennsylvania's first major program in this important area. I urge you to adopt it without delay.

When you do, you will have made it possible for us to help unclog the transportation arteries of our communities: by helping to purchase needed transit equipment, by aiding in projects designed to ease the current inadequacies of commuter trains, by participating in programs to encourage public use of mass transit systems, and by establishing a State agency to specialize in mass transportation problems.

If you now provide for this program, which was developed after consultation and study across the State, you will have given Pennsylvania an immediate start on solving a grave problem that can only grow worse if ignored.

And, finally, the fifth great area of need for our communities which I ask you to meet lies in the field of public health.

I ask you specifically to do two things:

First, authorize local communities to establish district health offices so that through cooperation they can better meet the public health needs of Pennsylvania.

Second, provide $2 million as the State's share in a program with local and Federal financing to make available $10 million in community centers for the mentally ill and the mentally retarded.

These two proposals have within them the potential to make our communities healthier, happier places in which to live. Even more important, their potential to relieve human suffering and need is gigantic.

So, there you have it. An ambitious, but very practical plan to weld a dynamic new partnership between the State and local governments.

The formula is very much to the point: Provide strong local governments and then back them with the resources of the Commonwealth.

In behalf of the 9 million Pennsylvanians who live in Pennsylvania's urban communities, I ask you to adopt it.

If you do, we indeed shall have better communities in a better Pennsylvania.

In fact, as we have now begun to do so often, we can in this, too, lead the Nation.

A Citizen's Tribute to Winston Churchill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, since the Congress of the United States not long ago designated Sir Winston Churchill as an honorary citizen of the United States, I think my colleagues would be interested to know about a moving tribute to him from the city of Paterson, N.J., which is in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent.

Mr. Harry B. Haines, who is the publisher of the Paterson News, originated a type of memorial which directly involved the participation of the schoolchildren of the city, whose world was so greatly shaped by the late and beloved British leader.

Mr. Haines conceived the idea of a condolence message to Lady Clementine Churchill and the people of Britain signed by the schoolchildren of the city.

The response was so great that it became necessary to make a signature book which was ultimately signed by 16,000 boys and girls of the city's public, private, and parochial schools. The book itself was an attractive work of art in royal blue embossed with the seal of the city of Paterson in gold. On its front page it carried the seal of the Churchill family.

The book was delivered to the U.S. Ambassador in London by Brig. Gen. Robert J. Goewey, commander of the Eastern Transport Air Force of the Military Air Transport Service at McGuire Air Force Base, and the Ambassador has transmitted it to Lady Churchill.

In these days when so much is spoken despairingly about juvenile delinquency, it is heartening to witness such a splendid demonstration of juvenile decency. I think that Mr. Haines and the Paterson News are to be congratulated on their worthy project.

The condolence message signed by the 16,000 schoolchildren reads as follows:

To Lady Clementine Churchill and the People of Britain:

As you and your great nation mourn the passing of your beloved husband, world statesman and honorary citizen of these United States, Sir Winston Churchill, we, the 15,000 students and educators of the public and parochial schools of the city of Paterson, N.J., United States of America, offer our tribute to his memory and a prayer for your comfort and strength.

Over each of the 3,000 miles this message has traveled, our hearts and minds reach out to you and reflect on your wonderful 57-year union in holy marriage to this peerless man whose matchless courage and superb inspiration carried the free world to victory over tyranny.

Your invincible partnership, through peace and war, has helped to make this world a better place for all.

The spirit of your beloved husband has outlived his mortal life. The impact of what he has contributed to Great Britain and to the world will outlast the pyramids.

In every time of crisis, in every age of uncertainty and despair, God has given to mankind one man above all others to guide His people through their trying ordeals.

Such a man was Sir Winston Churchill, whose life and deeds will ever serve as an inspiration to all who follow for centuries.

In grateful salute to his deathless memory and in earnest prayer for your continued good health.

THE SCHOOLCHILDREN OF THE CITY OF PATERSON, N.J.

Tribute to State Representative T. F. Terrell, of Pocatello, Idaho

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK CHURCH
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, one of the truly outstanding lawmakers in my State of Idaho is giving up his seat in the house of representatives to take a new position. Ordinarily, this would be of concern only to those of us from Idaho. But this man, State Representative T. F. Terrell, has for 12 years served his neighbors with such distinction that his loss to the lawmaking body of Idaho is going to be sorely felt. I am honored to be numbered among his close personal friends over the years, and I can attest to his courage in meeting oftentimes unpleasant, but needed, measures, when he felt they would benefit all Idahoans. He has done this on many occasions, at risk to his political career. This has not deterred him; and improved Idaho education and sounder fiscal foundations can be largely credited to his foresight and courage.

The Idaho State Journal editorially regrets his leaving his lifelong home of Pocatello, for his new position, and pays tribute to Representative Terrell. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial of April 11, 1965, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENTLEMAN FROM BANNOCK

Few men have ever left a vacancy in this community as State Representative T. F. Terrel will when he departs 3 weeks from now for a new position in Boise. And that is because few men have contributed as much to this community as he has.

Terrell, who has lived here for virtually all of his 44 years, leaves at the end of this month to become the first director of the new State public employees retirement system. He was selected from among 50 applicants. He takes with him more than 20 years' experience in the insurance business, but he has more to offer Idaho than mere vocational background. He has shown a talent for public office. He is a person who has a gift for both the broad view of things and attention to detail.

However, what he undoubtedly will accomplish after he leaves is of less concern here than what he has accomplished already. The legislative system is such that rarely can one man take full credit for any single action, but Terrell deserves more credit than many for the accomplishments of the remarkable session just ended. He ran for election as a sales tax advocate in the mid-1950's at a time when other candidates didn't dare mention the unpopular plan in Bannock County. Terrell felt it was the only honest answer. It is no accident that Bannock County, the home of Tommy Terrell, is today considered a stronghold for the tax and the progressive Idaho its massive revenue can bring. The budgets of the public schools, the State institutions and the other branches of Gem State Government are more nearly adequate today because of Terrell and other legislators of equal vision.

Those are accomplishments any man could take pride in, but Terrell leaves a gap in this community for an even more important reason. The political stage requires performers of every kind, and most prominent among their numbers are the spirited spokesmen for the many shades of political philosophy. Their opposition to one another, their conflicts, produce the consensus that could not come about in any other way. But among them must be the less inflamed who can draw the conflicting elements together and produce the compromise. Terrell, a man of tact with a low boiling point, has served that function as much as any other legislator in the last 10 years.

And the reason is simple. It is the practice in a legislative body for the lawmakers to preserve dignity and reason by referring to even their worst political enemy as "the gentleman" from such and such a county. In Terrell's case, the term is more than parliamentary formality.—B.H.

A Society of Sheep

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES D. MARTIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, a great society was founded in the United States of America when the Declaration of Independence was approved, when our forefathers were willing to lay down "their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor" to perpetuate liberty. This was the new idea of government. This was a society which guaranteed all men a way of life which would enable them to attain fulfillment of all their dreams according to their willingness to work, to strive, to learn, to accomplish. This was the great society which gave the greatest number of human beings a better way of life, greater opportunity and has contributed more to all mankind than any other system ever devised by man.

Now we are being asked to abandon the kind of society through which we have achieved our present greatness. We are being presented a bogus system, billed as the Great Society, but which in actuality we are being asked to become a society of sheep, blindly following a Judas sheep. Under the promise of security of relieving us of all responsibility, aand of holding out the hope of reward without achievement, the people are being led to the slaughter of constitutionally limited government, the end of private enterprise and the substitution of a Socialist state where the uncommon man must conform to the norm of mediocrity.

Mr. Speaker, it is not yet too late to return this Nation to belief in and the practice of the principles upon which it was founded.

The Federal Government cannot, and should not, assume responsibilities which freemen must assume for themselves. The Federal Government cannot, and must not guarantee food, clothing, housing, jobs, medical care, and all the necessities of life as well as the luxuries for all regardless of what the individual is willing to do for himself. God grant that we never live in a society that is deaf to the plight of those who suffer misfortune through no fault of their own, but we should pray also that we never encourage the shiftless, the lazy, the dishonest to reap the rewards produced by the labor of the industrious, the ambitious, the builders.

Lyndon Johnson's so-called Great Society can result in only one dismal end: the destruction of individual freedom in America and throughout the world.

The following editorial from the Wall Street Journal of April 21, 1965, points out the fallacy of governmental practices

which seek to treat the people as perpetual children:

REVIEW AND OUTLOOK—IN PERPETUAL CHILDHOOD

Although not all parents practice it, most would readily acknowledge their duty to prepare their children for the hardships as well as the rewards of life; in a word, to guide them to maturity. It is instructive to observe how the prevailing theory of Government stands this fundamental obligation on its head.

Governments everywhere, and not least in these United States, increasingly assume the parental role but are inherently incapable of providing parental wisdom. Call it the welfare state or the Great Society or what you will, it is almost as if the whole idea were to ward off maturity, or, as Tocqueville foresaw more than a century ago, to keep men "in perpetual childhood," with minimal need to act and think on their own.

The more obvious purpose, to be sure, lies in the lower reaches of politics: To garner votes by sowing money in every possible field, to build power by promising solutions to all problems. But that process of Government aggrandizement cannot go unaccompanied by some weakening of individual will. It is necessary only to note how placidly many Americans today accept Federal intrusions that would have been unthinkable a generation or two ago.

Federal largess, moreover, is by no means the sole agent of the alteration, even at a time when the subsidies are proliferating at a remarkable rate. There is also a pervasive pseudo-philosophy preached both in and out of Government, a creed of irresponsibility.

In this dark dogma security becomes the paramount value, overriding thrift, prudence, self-reliance, self-respect, intelligent accommodation to the complexities of existence and often indeed simple morality and honesty. People are not merely to be helped when in need; they are to be supported no matter what they do or do not do.

It could hardly be more symptomatic of the attitude that in our era serious discussion is granted to the proposition that income should be divorced from work, which means everyone should have a guaranteed and comfortable income regardless of whether he chooses to work. That, if anything could be, is a headlong flight from adult responsibility and straight into the arms of the all-mothering state.

To look askance at the trend is not necessarily to bewail an impending despotism, at least in the usual sense. As Tocqueville also perceived, the dangers confronting democracies are more subtle. In a degenerated democracy, the central authority is not wholly exploitative but wishes the people to be happy, so long as they don't think, and it actually tries to supply their wants and necessities.

To function at all the "tutelary power" must nonetheless cover "the surface of society with a network of small complicated rules, minute and uniform, through which the more original minds and the most energetic characters cannot penetrate, to rise above the crowd."

Thus, in Tocqueville's view of the danger, "the will of man is not shattered, but softened, bent and guided * * *. Such a power does not destroy, but * * * it compresses, enervates, extinguishes, and stupefies a people, till each nation is reduced to nothing better than a flock of timid and industrious animals, of which the government is the shepherd."

How near or far the American democracy is today from that denouement, and what could realistically be done to prevent its materializing—these are questions without answers. What is clear is that we have already moved some considerable distance toward that society of sheep and that the pressure of much public policy and preachment seeks to push us further toward it.

Apart from diminishing the dignity of man, one of the unhappy aspects of the flight from responsibility is that it is a delusion. In our world no one and nothing can guarantee security or wash away all sorrows and difficulties. Time and again the federal government has proved its incompetence to solve the myriad problems it takes on.

But no matter what a government attempts, it cannot forever shelter a people from the abrasive realities of personal, economic, and moral imperatives. To the extent a state succeeds in keeping a citizenry in perpetual childhood, it can only assure them a more painful awakening to manhood.

Attack on Filth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, on April 14, I introduced H.R. 7465, a bill to set up a commission to be known as the Commission on Noxious and Obscene Matters and Materials.

I think that the magnitude of the problem posed by the availability of pornography, is obvious to anyone who casts his glance on any newsstand in America. On all sides we are assailed by blatant, hard-core pornography. The danger that this filth poses to our teenagers and subteens is a clear and present one. In every corner of this Nation, decent citizens are demanding that action be taken to prevent these peddlers of filth from putting their dirty wares in the hands of our youngsters.

Last week, my bill received strong support from James O'Neill, Jr., the widely read columnist of the Washington Daily News. In his hard-hitting way he has taken issue with those who argue that the right to sell filth is guaranteed by the Constitution. I would like to include at this point in the RECORD, Mr. O'Neill's column on April 21, 1965:

ATTACK ON FILTH—OBSCENITY PEDDLED ALL OVER TOWN STAGGERS THE MIND

(By James O'Neill, Jr.)

There is a bill before the House to establish by Presidential appointment a Commission to look into the matter of obscene and obnoxious matter being pushed out by all sorts of media to titillate the youth of America and to acquiesce to the constant and insatiable demands of the lovers of prurient material.

At this distance one cannot but admire such a bill, though whether it will be effective in a Nation governed by such a magnificent Constitution as ours is a matter which will have to be closely investigated.

The bill was introduced by Representative DOMINICK V. DANIELS, Democrat, of New Jersey, who asks a study group of 15 members, drawn from the motion picture industry, Congress, Government agencies, the clergy, publishers, and radio and television, who would begin a full study of the obscenity trade "in order that a concentrated attack at all levels of government may be made" to ward off the "ever-increasing bombardment of our young people by unscrupulous purveyors of filth."

Well, sir, if the Commission is established and the President makes his appointments, I trust the members will feel free to call upon me to furnish some of the information I have at the tip of my tongue, for I have not been wandering the streets of this lovely town for 20 years with my head in the sand.

APPALLS

The filth which is offered, advertised, and sold all over town is something to stagger the mind. Heaven knows, I am no pure, lily-white young thing who shocks easily. I've been over the course. But what is peddled these days, in the open and with full knowledge of even those who get a regular shoeshine, appalls a grey-haired, tired old party like this one.

But I wonder if commissions and investigations and all the rest can do much to control the outpouring of filth?

All of a sudden some gentleman in a civil liberties group stands up and hollers "what about free speech? How are kids going to learn how rotten some things are without we should have dirty books, filthy movies, and television shows which are designed to be shown to the young to advise them of the delights of a detergent soap opera?"

BLESSING

And then the gentlemen will consider the words of the civil liberties folk and shortly a blessing will be paced on the dirty movies, because they are guaranteed free expression, and the idiot box will add a few more hideous programs, and the book publishing finks will shoot out 50 more titles, with paperbacks covered with naked broads.

Responsible theater management, tasteful advertising men, writers more interested in their craft than the fast buck made on a hunk of garbage and shopkeepers with some guts are more important than commissions or investigations.

However, I heartily concur with the efforts of Representative DANIELS. I only hope his Commission is fruitful.

With a house full of growing sprats I can easily see the dangers of the sort of idiocy which the Congressman seeks to eliminate. A good, healthy sex life is as important as a good diet or a good job, but what is offered in some areas to our young is neither good nor healthy.

I trust the Congress passes Representative DANIELS' bill. And if he needs me, I shall offer more hot advice than a mother-in-law.

Seizure of Mail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DURWARD G. HALL
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, on April 15, 1965, Mr. Edward P. Morgan, commentator for the American Broadcasting Co., discussed the increasing tendency of big Government to invade the privacy of American citizens. These comments were carried on the evening news, sponsored by the AFL–CIO.

As the Member who, on April 5, 1965, first exposed the practice of seizing and searching first-class mail by two agencies of the Federal Government, I am indebted to Mr. Morgan for his further comment before a national audience.

The transcript of his remarks follows:

EDWARD P. MORGAN AND THE NEWS

Even in an open society like ours, the big brother of bureaucracy can rear his head with ugly arrogance unless he, too, is watched. The Federal Government has been caught invading the public's privacy a little too aggressively of late and it is time to list a bill of particulars and raise a loud cry of rightful indignation. The bureaucracy is not only watching us, sometimes through peepholes, it turns out, but listening in increasingly on our conversations, probing the sexual history of stenographers and other citizens applying for Federal jobs, telling people where they cannot travel and even, in some instances, seizing and reading their first-class mail.

Day before yesterday it was revealed that the State Department had refused permission to editors of 13 college and university newspapers to send student journalists on Easter vacation assignments to report on life in Cuba.

In their written request campus editors from Yale, Harvard, Princeton, and other prominent schools had said: "A knowldege of the conditions within Cuba is prerequisite to our forming intelligent opinions as to our relations with that country. As student editors in a free and democratic society, we consider the freedom to travel a necessary condition for the freedom to learn."

Their request was rejected by the Department's Administrator of Security and Consular Affairs, Abba P. Schwartz, on the questionable technicality that they were not "legitimate newspapermen" and implying that anyway, their presence would somehow impede U.S. efforts to isolate Castro's dictatorship from the rest of the hemisphere.

To which the New York Times angrily replies:

"The right to know and the right to travel—except in wartime—ought to be sacred * * * Americans should be swarming over the island with magnifying glasses. * * * The American public in general has a right to know what is going on in Cuba; and so—obviously—does every segment of our society, including the residents of college campuses and the readers of college newspapers."

In a recent report by the House Committee on Government Operations critical of the use of lie detectors by the Federal Government, Representative CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER, Democrat, of New Jersey, termed compulsory polygraph tests unconstitutional, said they should be discontinued immediately until proved "infallible." Recalling his own testimony that a 17-year-old girl, just out of high school had been subjected to humiliating questions about sexual matters when she applied for a typist's job with the National Security Agency, GALLAGHER charged that "the threat of outright voyeurism runs throughout too many of the cases that have come to my attention regarding the use of the lie detector."

A Senate Judiciary Subcommittee, headed by Missouri's Democratic Senator EDWARD V. LONG, investigating Federal invasion of privacy, questioned the use of mail covers—a process of checking on—without opening—the mail received by a person under suspicion of some criminal violation. The subcommittee was also concerned about a Post Office Department practice of spying on employees through peepholes. Last month, Chairman LONG said Postmaster General Gronouski had agreed to improve controls over mail cover procedure and plug up the peepholes—which had been used to prevent depredation of the mails by postal workers.

But on April 5, still another practice came to light. Congressman DURWARD G. HALL, Republican, of Missouri, revealed on the floor of the House that the Internal Revenue Service was opening the first-class mail of delinquent taxpayers. He charged a "collusion" involving the Treasury, the Post Office Department, and the Director of Internal Revenue had resulted in 14 such "levies" since 1962. Today HALL's office said the Post Office now admits 34 cases are involved. One person—a "tax deviate" might be the bureaucratic term for him—allegedly had all his mail withheld for a month. Revenue Commissioner Sheldon Cohen wrote HALL citing one case in which a delinquent had been "persuaded" by seizure of his mail to pay up his tax liability in full.

The Government argues this practice is legal. But several Members of Congress, Missouri's HALL foremost among them, maintain it is an outrageous violation of privacy, comprising, in effect, unwarranted search and seizure and demand new legislation specifically outlawing the practice.

On Tuesday a somewhat contrite Government lawyer, Deputy General Counsel Harvey H. Hannah of the Post Office, told Senator LONG's committee, "we've been doing it wrong, no question about it."

Manifestly, the Government has been doing a lot of things wrong in respect to the private rights of citizens. Human beings, unhappily perhaps, are not always saints but if somebody isn't constantly watching the Government agencies, watching their foibles, there can be the Devil to pay.

This is Edward P. Morgan saying good night from Washington.

Should Tobacco Industry Be Subidized?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DAVID S. KING
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring to the attention of the Congress and the Nation an editorial which appeared in the Star Valley Independent of Afton, Wyo., on April 8, 1965. Its timely praise of the gentleman from Wyoming, Congressman RONCALIO, for his stand against tobacco subsidies reflects the growing public awareness of the folly which the Government practices by continuing to subsidize tobacco production in the face of the mounting toll of life and health which has been traced to tobacco products. Both the gentlemen from Wyoming and the Star Valley Independent have my highest respect and commendation for the stand they have taken. The editorial follows:

SHOULD TOBACCO INDUSTRY BE SUBSIDIZED?

The comments of Congressman TENO RONCALIO in voting against a bill to amend the Agriculture Adjustment Act of 1938 to provide for acreage-poundage marketing quotas for tobacco we believe will be of interest to our readers and are worthy of editorial comment. He states:

"Our Government supports the price of a commodity that cannot possibly be classified as beneficial to humanity. With one hand of the Government spending millions of dollars in research which links smoking with cancer and other diseases, it seems that the other hand should not subsidize the tobacco industry. The economy of these tobacco-growing States should be shifted into healthier channels by incorporating the job-creating provisions of the poverty and Appalachia programs already enacted."

While we don't necessarily agree that the administration's poverty program would take care of the economy problems of the tobacco-growing States, we do agree that the tobacco industry should not be subsidized, and would join in in encouraging some sort of realistic approach to shifting the land to other uses by the tobacco farmers, Government, and all others concerned.

Hon. Oren Harris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, this week the American Good Government Society honored one of our most dedicated and able colleagues by presenting its 1965 George Washington Award to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Unfortunately, because of a longstanding commitment for a speaking engagement, I was unable to be present at the dinner at which our good friend, the gentleman from Arkansas, OREN HARRIS, received this award. However, in making the formal presentation, our former colleague, the Honorable Harold O. Lovre, quoted a tribute which I paid to our chairman of the occasion of the hanging of his portrait in the committee room.

What I said then is still true. OREN HARRIS has been a chairman of tremendous balance and judgment whose fairness is a hallmark of his character that has been noted time and again by every member of our committee whether he sits on the majority or the minority side of the committee table.

This is borne out in the presentation speech of Harold Lovre, a former Republican Congressman, which I include here under leave to extend my remarks:

I am delighted to have the singular privilege of presenting one of the 1965 George Washington Awards to a grand American who epitomizes sound constitutional government in its finest form.

My pleasure is enhanced by having known him personally since 1949, and having served with him in the Congress of the United States. Over those year, I have watched him in action in the committee room and on the floor, and I earnestly believe him to be one of the greatest legislators and public servants of our time.

He has achieved this high standing largely because of his unswerving dedication to the principles laid out for us long ago by the revered founders of this glorious Republic. He is sincere of purpose. He is loyal to his people and his country. He drives himself to the limits of his endurance, and he has an uncommon capacity for looking objectively and in great depth at all sides of an issue. His judgments, when finally passed, reflect logic, a keen sense of fair play and, above all, the courage of his convictions.

Born in Arkansas, he received his law degree in 1930 from Cumberland University in Tennessee. Three years later he became deputy prosecuting attorney of Union County in Arkansas. Then he was elected prosecuting attorney of the 13th Judicial District of Arkansas, where he served until 1940.

In that year, the people of his district elected him to represent them in the Con-

gress of the United States and they have been reelecting him ever since.

He currently is in his ninth year as chairman of the important 33-member House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. Established in 1795, this is the oldest continuous committee of the Congress, and has the broadest jurisdiction of any committee in the House.

Among other things, this great committee deals with legislation affecting communications, securities, petroleum, natural gas, and public health.

It also handles all matters relating to commerce and transportation, which are the lifeblood of any nation, and under his chairmanship we have developed a remarkable transportation system that is the envy of all the world.

Chairmanship of such a committee is a man-sized job, but the gentleman from Arkansas does not stop there. He also directs the activities of four subcommittees and, in addition, heads the special investigative subcommittee which looks into and exposes such things as rigged TV quiz shows, payola, and similar unfunny funny business.

His work has carried him all over the world. In 1957, for example, he headed a study and investigation in connection with the International Geophysical Year which took his delegation to both the North and South Poles, including a week in Antarctica observing the scientific expedition of the National Science Foundation, which was established by his committee. More recently, the committee took a leading role in the authorization and development of the Telstar communications satellite.

He has been given awards and accorded honors too numerous to mention, so we are by no means the first group to recognize his outstanding service.

While he is human enough to cherish all of these awards, I suspect that he might be most proud of something that was said about him sometime ago on the occasion of a presentation of his portrait to the committee. Among those who volunteered a few remarks that day was the Honorable WILLIAM SPRINGER, a ranking Republican on the committee.

BILL SPRINGER's remarks that day paint a vivid picture of the gentleman we honor tonight, and here is what BILL said:

"I came on the committee some 8 years ago. OREN at that time was about third, or fourth, and I was sitting at the small table down near the end.

"As the years passed, I came to have a tremendous respect and admiration, for not only the mind of this man, which is keen in itself, but also for his thoughtfulness in his treatment of the other members of the committee, and, especially since he has been chairman, of those of us who have been across the aisle.

"I think our committee has been in many respects a nonpartisan committee. I don't know that I could use the word 'bipartisan,' although we seem to bring a lot of legislation the the floor which comes with the approval of both parties * * * but certainly it has been a nonpartisan committee * * * and largely through the chairmanship of OREN HARRIS, we have made exceptional progress in the past 3 or 4 years.

"It takes that kind of chairman, if you are going to get real legislation coming out of a committee where the economics of American life and the competition between the various economic segments is so keen. Only a chairman with tremendous balance and judgment could accomplish what he has in the time he has been chairman of this committee."

In those few words, BILL SPRINGER just about said it all, and I shall make no effort to gild the lily.

Therefore, I shall now exercise what I consider a very high privilege and present on behalf of the American Good Government Society the 1965 George Washington Award to the Honorable OREN HARRIS of Arkansas.

A Sound Voting Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BARBER B. CONABLE, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of interest and concern around the country about the kind of voting rights legislation which Congress will pass this year. Now that there has been time to study and evaluate the President's proposal in this area, there is a broad concensus developing that Congress should fashion a more appropriate, precise, and effective bill to deal with discrimination wherever it exists. There is strong support, too, for preserving traditional basic literacy requirements which are recognized as essential to having an informed electorate.

One of the leading newspapers in our State of New York, the Rochester Times-Union, recently examined the many factors important to this issue and supported a reasonable course of action. I would like to submit for the RECORD a copy of the Times-Union editorial of April 19, entitled "Here's How To Get Sound Voting Rights Bill."

AS WE SEE IT—HERE'S HOW TO GET SOUND VOTING RIGHTS BILL

When President Johnson made his dramatic appearance before Congress last March 15, the issue seemed simple enough.

The time had come to guarantee to Negroes the right to vote in areas where that right had been systematically denied. New legislation was needed so that the Federal Government could enforce the century-old provisions of the 15th amendment in all elections.

Since then, however, Congressmen have been arguing over the language of a bill.

Some southerners want no legislation at all. Some northern liberal Congressmen have been tossing in amendments which would wipe out almost all State voting qualifications, including those in Northern States like New York which do not discriminate against Negro voters.

Serious doubts have been raised, even by some pro-civil-rights lawmakers, about the constitutionality, not to mention the wisdom, of procedures spelled out in the administration bill and in the liberal amendments.

Some kind of voting rights bill is needed. But legislation now proceeding through Senate and House committees includes highly dubious provisions which would:

1. Trigger a takeover of local elections by Federal registrars if voting statistics in the 1964 presidential election indicated discrimination against Negroes.

2. Abolish literacy tests and other voting qualifications when the Federal registrars run elections, and abolish any poll taxes for local elections in Southern States.

In the first case, the argument is that statistics showing low voter participation in elections may indicate not only discrimination but geographic problems or just plain voter apathy, perhaps as the result of one-party rule.

It's also argued that the percentage figure set as a trigger in the administration's bill excludes many States and counties from its coverage, even though discrimination exists there. Mr. Johnson's home State of Texas is in this category.

In the second case, it is argued that the U.S. Constitution gives States the right to set voter qualifications, and that these cannot be removed except by constitutional amendment. The most recent illustration of this point was the 1964 ratification of the 24th amendment to abolish State poll taxes in Federal elections.

As cartoonist Conrad cleverly indicates below, a voting rights bill may founder in a filibuster or in the courts, to the delight of southern segregationists, unless these objectionable provisions are removed.

A sensible new approach is provided in a voting rights bill sponsored by more than 50 House Republicans, including Representative BARBER B. CONABLE, JR., of the Rochester area.

It would set up Federal registrars to enforce Negro voting rights in any State or political subdivision if as few as 25 persons complain to the U.S. Attorney General that they are qualified to vote but have been prevented from doing so because of race or color.

This would establish a legal pattern of discrimination. Other Negroes wishing to vote then would be registered if they simply affirmed their belief that they would be denied the right to vote if they applied to local authorities.

As Representative CONABLE explains it, this law would protect Negro voting rights in any area of the country, not just those with large Negro populations where States have a particularly bad record of discrimination.

It would rest Federal action on the solid legal foundation of complaints, not on statistics subject to controversial interpretation.

The GOP bill would make a sixth-grade education satisfactory proof of literacy. And it would rule out voting qualifications which provide that would-be voters must have a voucher from another registered voter.

But such other State-imposed qualifications as residence or ability to read and write would be preserved by Federal registrars, provided they could be applied equally to all voters and did not discriminate against Negroes.

Republican-sponsored bills don't have much chance in today's Democratic-dominated Congress.

But if the Democratic congressional leadership wants a bill that will guarantee voting rights while avoiding constitutional pitfalls and assuring responsible voting, it should adopt the principles of the Republicans' substitute legislation.

If in an emotional stampede, Congress accepts an everything-but-the-kitchen-sink approach, it may wind up with a bill that could do more harm than good in solving the voting rights problem.

If I Were the Devil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

IF I WERE THE DEVIL

(An excerpt from a sermon entitled "Four Foundations of Freedom," by Rev. Kenneth W. Sollitt, minister of the First Baptist Church, Midland, Mich.)

If I were the Devil and wanted to turn American into a Communist hell, I think I would do something like this:

I would cultivate among the people the idea that the individual is nothing, the indiscriminate mass of people everything. I would also seek the convince Americans that God and Christian ethics and an honest desire to make one's way in the world are old fashioned.

I would get elected to office on the promise of helping everybody at someone else's expense.

Then I'd treat the Constitution as a sort of handbook on the philosophy of government to be referred to only if it served my purpose.

I would increase the size and scope of government in every way possible, going into every conceivable business in competition with established enterprises, paying the State's business losses out of the treasury. I would try to keep hidden how this could lead at the right time to the nationalization of industry.

I would thus create a government strong enough to give its citizens everything they want. Thus I could create a government strong enough to take from them everything they have.

By a combination of inflation and taxes I would rob the very people I pretended to help until, if they ever should want to return to freedom, they couldn't—but would be dependent on the state.

Next, I would gradually raise taxes to 100 percent of income (we are one-third of the way now)—so that the state could have it all. Then I'd give back to the people enough to keep them alive and little enough to keep them enslaved.

In the meantime I would take from those who have and give to those who want until I killed the incentive of the presently ambitious man and satisfied the meager needs of the rest. The police state would then be required to make everybody work—and the transformation of America from a republic to a second-rate Communist nation would be complete.

Do you see in this similarities to what we have been doing for 30 years?

Pressure for a Bad Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it is evident the President is determined to get his voting rights bill through Congress, by whatever means, as a punitive measure against the South. Every effort to improve the bill is being thwarted and ridiculed in most of the news media.

I hope the Congress, in at least this instance, will have the courage to stand up to White House pressure and refuse to be stampeded into passing bad legislation. We should have adequate debate on the bill and full opportunity to amend it on the floor if the committee refuses to allow improvements before it reaches us.

In the following column, written by Marshall McNeil, of the Scripps-Howard newspapers, the need for a better bill is eloquently explored:

SOME OF THE BAD FEATURES—A BETTER VOTING BILL IS NEEDED

(By Marshall McNeil)

WASHINGTON.—With the Senate now debating the voting rights bill, it should be pointed out that the means proposed in it for enforcing the 95-year-old guarantees of the 15th amendment to the Constitution are clearly open to argument and hopefully, to change.

The bill's terms are drastic, some think the most drastic ever proposed to a Congress by a President.

But after nearly a century when constitutional voting-rights guarantees have been evaded, violated, or ignored in several States, mostly southern, the contention can be sustained that drastic means are required.

However, to insist upon drastic remedies to correct old faults does not mean they have to be unfair, punitive, sectional, or violative of other sections of the Constitution.

Several sections of the bill can be so variously described.

There is the provision which allows the elimination of all voting qualifications in the States, allowing persons who are not required to understand "any matter" to cast their ballots if they are otherwise eligible. For the Federal Government thus to uphold the idea that all illiterates are qualified electors is clearly open to question.

There is the provision that outlaws the poll tax in State and local elections. It is most difficult to prove that the poll tax has been an instrument of racial voting discrimination; and if it is not discriminatory, it cannot be outlawed under the 15th amendment.

There is the provision which brings under terms of the bill any State where less than 50 percent of the residents of voting age were registered voters last November 1, or less than 50 percent of such persons voted in the last presidential election.

Irritated and frustrated by court delays in earlier efforts to enforce voting rights, the administration's bill, as revised by the Senate Judiciary Committee, is framed to permit executive action to guarantee these rights.

But in so doing it has conferred unusual, maybe even dangerous, powers on a political appointee, the U.S. Attorney General. A vindictive man in that job might misuse these unique new powers.

For these reasons, among others, the country should welcome the Senate debate that started Thursday.

Even though 66 of the 100 Senators—46 Democrats and 20 Republicans—are cosponsors of the measure, they should open their ears and minds to proposals for making the bill as fair as possible.

Full and free debate—even bordering on filibuster, if necessary—will help to illuminate the issue and the proposed remedies to the Nation.

Then, after the country—and the Senate—understand what it is doing, the result is most certain to be a better bill.

And a better bill is needed.

"Youth Wants To Know"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, when the need for a better understanding of the crucial issues of the day is so essential to the American people, it is gratifying to know Theodore Franik's award-winning public affairs television series, "Youth Wants To Know," is regularly presented to the greater metropolitan area of New York City over WABC–TV. It is seen and heard in other cities throughout the country on other commercial and educational stations.

On Saturday, April 3, Dr. Albert Bowker, chancellor of the City University of New York, appeared as a guest on "Youth Wants To Know." The questions and answers proved so dynamic and spirited that I commend the full text of the transcript of Dr. Bowker's appearance for reading by all Americans. The frank, unvarnished answers of Dr. Bowker to the student's penetrating questions on the crucial subject of education was an enlightening experience for all.

The education of America's young people is one of the most critical issues in the United States and this lively question-and-answer session permitted our students, the ones most deeply and directly concerned, the opportunity to discuss education and their future with an expert in education.

Dr. Bowker has an outstanding educational and professional background. Prior to becoming chancellor of the City University of New York, Dr. Bowker began his professional career as a graduate of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and received his Ph. D. from Columbia University after serving as a research assistant in mathematics and statistics. Dr. Bowker was a professor in mathematics and statistics at Stanford University and served for 5 years as the dean of the graduate division of Stanford University. His membership in professional, academic, and honorary societies is too extensive to enumerate in detail. Included among them are past president of the American Statistical Association and past president, Institute of Mathematical Statistics.

I would like to add a personal note here. Theodore Granik, who produces "Youth Wants To Know" for WABC–TV and for other commercial and educational television stations, is, I repeat, an old and dear friend of mine. I was the first guest on his "American Forum of the Air" 37 years ago, the progenitor of "Youth Wants To Know." On many a night Ted and I struggled to bring these programs into being and my colleagues in the House and Senate have joined me in recognizing the proud record created by both these programs.

From my vantage point of 43 years in Congress, I say to Ted and Dr. Bowker, "Well done."

At this time I should like to include in the RECORD a complete transcript of Dr. Bowker's appearance on "Youth Wants To Know":

YOUTH WANTS TO KNOW

(Created and produced by Theodore Granik, Apr. 3, 1965)

("Youth Wants To Know" presents Dr. Albert Bowker, chancellor of the City University of New York.)

MODERATOR. "Youth Wants To Know"—the searching, provocative questions of today's young people, created and produced by Theodore Granik.

Question. Dr. Bowker, must members of college faculties publish or perish?

Question. Dr. Bowker, are American colleges and universities today adequately preparing our generation for the cybernetic revolution?

Question. Dr. Bowker, how far should the educators allow free speech to go on campus?

MODERATOR. In just a moment, Dr. Albert Bowker, chancellor of the City University of New York will answer these and other penetrating questions on "Youth Wants To Know."

(Announcement.)

MODERATOR. Ladies and gentlemen, welcome once again to Theodore Granik's "Youth Wants To Know." Our guest today, Dr. Albert Bowker, who is chancellor of the City University of New York, began his work in statistics and mathematics as a research assistant in the math department of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, where in 1941 he received his B.S. degree. After a Ph. D. from Columbia University in 1949, Dr. Bowker was consultant in the Statistical Engineering Section of the National Bureau of Standards. His professional career also includes classroom and administrative assignments at Stanford University, where he was until last year, dean of the graduate division of that university. He is now, as I said, chancellor of the City University of New York.

Dr. Bowker, it's a pleasure, sir, to welcome you to "Youth Wants To Know."

Dr. BOWKER. Thank you. So far, I'm glad to be here.

MODERATOR. I said, sir, that you began your early work at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in the research department. Actually, it began earlier than that, in Washington at Woodrow Wilson High School, I understand.

Dr. BOWKER. That's right. I'm a local boy.

MODERATOR. So, panel, here you have an opportunity to ask Dr. Bowker a little close at home. Now if we might, let's meet our panel of questioners, and we'll begin with Ted.

(Panelists: Ted Winfield, McLean High School; Farley Newman, Yorktown High; Steve Dansker, McLean; Sherrill Burke, McLean; Axel Adamyet, Yorktown; Barbara Travers, Yorktown; Alice Justice, Yorktown; Nina Sara Brenningkof, Yorktown; Sandy Blade, Yorktown; Becky Kibret, Yorktown; George Tyson, Yorktown; Bob Hand, Yorktown.)

MODERATOR. Thank you, panel. Dr. Bowker, I think it's interesting to note that Axel Adamyet, who said a moment ago he was from Yorktown High School, is actually, I believe, an exchange student. Correct, Axel?

AXEL ADAMYET. Yes. I'm a foreign exchange student from West Germany. I'm in the American field service program, and I've been here since August last year.

MODERATOR. Well, it's a pleasure to have you on our panel, and this is your opportunity to ask about American education from an expert.

AXEL ADAMYET. Thank you.

MODERATOR. Now if we might, let's begin our questioning of Dr. Bowker with Alice.

Question. Dr. Bowker, are American colleges and universities today adequately assuming their role of preparing our generation for the cybernetic revolution in the future?

Dr. BOWKER. I don't know exactly what you mean. Certainly one of the great strengths and great movements in American higher education has been the development of technology and science and instruction, particularly since World War II. Whether we know all the social and political implications of these developments is perhaps not so clear, but it's certainly very much on everyone's mind.

Question. Within this cybernetic revolution, do you think we will ever develop computers that will be capable of programing other computers?

Dr. BOWKER. Oh certainly.

Question. Is there any possibility that students will be assigned to colleges by computers?

Dr. BOWKER. Well, I don't know what you mean by assigned. I think people will go to the college of their choice, but whether they get in or not may be computed on the basis of scores, and things of that sort.

Question. How far do you feel, Dr. Bowker, that these computers can go? You indicated an affirmative answer to the fact that computers might program computers. Do you feel they will be applied completely to education, or will there still be an individual element in the system of higher education?

Dr. BOWKER. Well I hope. Certainly a person-to-person relationship is critical in education. Most people think so. At the same time I think there will be a great growth in teaching devices of all sorts, including television, I might say, which has not been as yet fully realized.

Question. Isn't modern technology primarily applicable to the sciences? Can it be used in the humanities?

Dr. BOWKER. Anything you can learn by rote you can learn by machine. Language instruction is very susceptible to gadgetry.

Question. If this cybernetic revolution takes place, what will be the use of education?

Dr. BOWKER. I don't see anything in the future that is going to replace the human brain or the human being.

Question. Well, I mean, if nobody has to work, why get educated? I mean, what would be the purpose of being educated at all?

Dr. BOWKER. Well, I don't think it would be that no one has to work. Indeed, in a certain sense education for leisure and for scholarship might be considered more important than education for specific vocational purposes.

Question. Dr. Bowker, in our effort to accelerate the sciences and mathematics, do you believe we have neglected the humanities?

Dr. BOWKER. Well, I think somewhat. There's been a good deal of increase in languages, and I would say language instruction today and competence is much greater than it was 20 or 30 years ago in institutions of higher education. It may seem strange to you. And there's been a tremendous growth in interest in the arts and music, and so forth, in universities. The humanities—philosophy and literature, and so forth—have not, I should say, made the same forward thrust as science and the other fields have.

Question. How would cybernetics affect the relationship between science and automation?

Dr. BOWKER. Well, I don't know quite what you mean.

Question. For instance, between the biologist and the engineer.

MODERATOR. How would technologic advances affect that relationship between those two areas? I think that's what she means.

Dr. BOWKER. Well, certainly—well, not a great deal—certainly the techniques of one science now are very much used in another, and chemistry and a lot of the—for example, one of the most important subjects for a modern biologist—the equipment that's coming along from engineers is used a lot in medicine and biology today. But I think that although certain things evolve from one discipline to another, the actual pursuit of knowledge is increasingly specialized. But I don't think we are reading research scientists who are generalists very much.

Question. Sir, getting back to the humanities and technological education, do you believe that a liberal arts education adequately prepares one for a career now, seeing as the society has become more and more technical?

Dr. BOWKER. I think—well that's a complicated question. Obviously, no, and it isn't intended to. There are many things you can do directly with a liberal arts education. But more and more I think professional and specialized education is being put into graduate schools, or into community colleges for the people who do professional or technical training short of a 4-year program.

Question. Has the President's request for a community college—does it reflect a national trend, do you suppose, in education?

Dr. BOWKER. Well, yes. The President has asked for a new 4-year public college, and a new community college in Washington, D.C. And this is really one of the few areas in the country where students are not eligible for low-cost public education. I think in general there's been a big move of State universities and State institutions into cities. My own institution is expanding, but of course we've been in New York a hundred years. But the University of Massachusetts has just gone into Boston, the University of Wisconsin into Milwaukee. Cleveland has public education. This sector of education—the 4-year public institution, and the community colleges are growing very rapidly in cities around the country. And it's, in my view, high time that Washington had such institutions.

MODERATOR. The universities in New York, particularly your institution, is unique, is it not, in the fact that the citizens of New York have free—the youngsters have free tuition—which I don't think the President is proposing for the District?

Dr. BOWKER. Well, I believe they're either free or very low cost, yes. I think the general trend is to have community colleges very low cost or free around the country, and they are.

MODERATOR. As a matter of fact, you're involved right now with the controversy surrounding this free tuition problem?

Dr. BOWKER. Yes. Well of course the city colleges have been tuition free for a hundred years, and the public colleges in the rest of the State are now charging tuition—a small one, but still tuition. And this is one of the very explosive and emotional political issues in New York. The city government is firmly committed to a free tuition policy, and all of us associated with that institution, and as you know, when I say that institution, we have 10 colleges, are firmly committed to it. But this is one of the controversial issues in New York State. It's more an upstate-downstate argument, perhaps, than anything else.

MODERATOR. This doesn't make education a bargain does it, Doctor?

Dr. BOWKER. No, certainly the standards of these institutions, like City College, Hunter College, Queens, and so forth, Brooklyn, are known throughout the country. When I was a graduate dean I was always glad to take a graduate of those colleges, I can assure you. They're very—indeed they are the leading source of Ph. D.'s in the United States.

Question. How do the new colleges recruit their teachers besides raiding other universities? Or what attracts the new teachers—salaries or possibilities of research?

Dr. BOWKER. I think both—salary, reasonable physical conditions, possibilities of, if not research, at least a scholarly life of some sort, are important. Graduate work is expanding very rapidly, and though there are some growing pains, we think we'll be able to man most of the colleges planned with competent faculty. They won't all be the best in the country, of course.

Question. Well, you just mentioned—Axel just mentioned, as a matter of fact—the possibility of new avenues of research attracting new teachers. I'm wondering, do colleges plan to change their attitudes—some of them have this attitude now that they would be more inclined to favor professors who would be resident professional scholars rather than resident professional teachers. What's the

possibility of the latter thing opening up in the future?

Dr. BOWKER. Well I think this is one of the issues that is being debated very hotly right now. Most institutions, certainly all those that I've been associated with, and that would include Stanford, which is a very active graduate school, and the City College system, which is starting graduate work, but is primarily an undergraduate institution, give a lot of weight to teaching ability in promotion and in hiring. I think this whole thing has been a little bit exaggerated. However, some of the institutions which aspire to become simultaneously great universities and great colleges do have a conflict.

Question. Federal aid and Federal subsidies usually mean Federal regulation and Federal control. Do you think that increased Federal aid to colleges will result in interference in college affairs by the Federal Government?

Dr. BOWKER. Well apparently they that have been established so far, and they really are enormous, if you look at the amount of aid given to science, have not tended to have the Government have much leverage or influence over the colleges. So far, it's been more the other way around, I think. The university community has become very influential in the Government.

MODERATOR. Dr. Bowker, you, sir, are a statistician as I noted. Do you feel that we can believe the statistics that we read to the effect that students—perhaps these students—will not be able to get into college within the next 10 years, and not receive an education?

Dr. BOWKER. Unless we expand fairly rapidly, there's going to be a shortage. It depends on how many people we think should go. Nowadays something on the order of half of the high school graduates aim for further training. And in order to keep up that standard with the growth in population, we have to move pretty fast between now and 1970. The next 2 years aren't so bad. This June is the worst of all—that's ever been in the history of the country.

MODERATOR. Wait until June after next panel.

Question. What about the possibility of making college education tax deductible in order that more well qualified students can afford to go to college?

Dr. BOWKER. Well I have tended to favor that, but most people don't, the argument being that a Federal policy should really concentrate on the lower economic group, and that the people that are around worrying about tax deductions are probably not in that group to begin with.

Question. Dr. Bowker, how far should educators allow free speech to go on campus?

Dr. BOWKER. Well I think that most educators and college officials believe that students should be given very very wide latitude in discussing any social or political or economic question. There is perhaps less latitude generally associated with moral questions. And certainly freedom of speech on campus does not mean freedom to say things that would not be tolerated off campus.

Question. Doctor, do you think there is a moral decay on our campuses today?

Dr. BOWKER. No. No, I think indeed if any thing the student of today is more serious and more purposeful, perhaps more dedicated to study and to social issues than when I was a boy.

Question. Doctor, do you feel that some of the demonstrations and riots on campuses today are due partly to the fact that the college leadership is not closely involved enough with the students' affairs?

Dr. BOWKER. There's been some failure of communication on some campuses, I think. There is an estrangement of young people as represented both by group activities and by the fact that a lot of students move around from college to college now. It seems to be a restless period. Those are some reasons I think.

Question. Well I know that one of the complaints of undergraduates at many of the large universities is that their own undergraduate education receives a certain deemphasis because of their association with a larger and perhaps more famous graduate and professional schools.

Dr. BOWKER. Well I don't think a place like Berkeley, for example, has changed very much in 20 or 30 years. It is a big institution, so is the University of Wisconsin. A student, though, in an institution like that usually finds some community of a smaller sort with which he will identify, maybe a resident's group. maybe a club, a fraternity, a group of majors in his own department, and so forth. And I think that the educational institutions today are very much concerned about building—taking a series of steps, so that there will be a community in which students will become in more contact with faculty and other kinds of adults.

Question. In general, sir, is the university today a mere brain factory or an educational community?

Dr. BOWKER. Well hopefully it's an educational community of students and faculty. As I say, building a sense of community, I think, is one of the difficult jobs. In our institutions, for example, we don't have any residencies, so we have all kinds of steps that we take to build this relationship with the students when they're there during the day. In the residential colleges, in some senses, it's easier.

Question. Doctor, do you feel that conformity is becoming a strong factor on today's campuses?

Dr. BOWKER. It doesn't look so to me. Quite the reverse.

Question. Sir, are students going to college today to receive an education or are they using colleges as an employment agency?

Dr. BOWKER. Well, I think some of both. Certainly for any new economic group in this country, education has been a major source of social mobility. And I think the fact that education is so widespread does give opportunities for poor people to become professionally trained and really to improve themselves. And that's an important function.

MODERATOR. Dr. Bowker, part of the President's War on Poverty is involved with education. This seems to be the core of it. Do you feel that higher education has any part to play in helping these people who are supposedly economically deprived?

Dr. BOWKER. Yes, really an extraordinary amount. In fact, I think if you look at the California educational system we can see that with the community colleges, junior colleges, the State college and the university, they have extraordinary importance in giving opportunity to large numbers of people who wouldn't have it in a State which doesn't have as big an educational plant.

MODERATOR. It shouldn't be limited, in other words, to vocational schools and such.

Dr. BOWKER. No indeed.

Question. Back to this factor of conformity or nonconformity on campuses. Is this really an unhealthy factor—the nonconformity?

Dr. BOWKER. No, I don't think so.

Question. Dr. Bowker, you said that morals were not declining. And if not, why is everybody screaming so much about it and why are all these articles being written, and this sort of thing?

Dr. BOWKER. I think that every generation has said that the younger generation is going to the dogs, and this has been true since Roman times. This is a standard fact of life.

Question. Well one thing here, I don't think morals is as pressing a problem, I think—I know my parents don't—as the fact that students are having more and more difficulty in getting into college. I'd like to know, how can a large university, such as your own expand their facilities to accommodate the growing numbers of students who seek admission, and yet keep their campuses from losing a personal touch which is vital to students environment?

Dr. BOWKER. Well, of course, we don't have one single large campus. We have 10 campuses, and our biggest college—City College—is about approaching what we consider the optimum. One thing we intend to do is try to start additional institutions fast enough to keep the scale in human terms. In a lot of places—the University of California, for example, is experimenting with all kinds of things—house plans, faculty associates, and a number of devices, in order to try and keep the communication up.

Question. Doctor, do you feel that the recent demonstrations, such as the one at Berkeley, give the students a powerful weapon of intimidation to gain whatever they want from the administration of the college?

Dr. BOWKER. Well, no administration is terribly happy with large demonstrations like that. I think certain things were gained by the students there. I doubt if there's much more to be gained by this technique.

Question. Sir, what are the most important problems considered by the administration and the faculty of a college when faced by a demonstration such as just happened in Berkeley?

Dr. BOWKER. Well, I think first to see if the demonstration does focus around a legitimate issue. I think most people feel the big failure has been to keep the channels of communication open with the students, so that issues such as the issue which started that riot—the banning of political demonstrations from inside the gate—would not reach riot proportions before they were resolved and discussed. I think that is perhaps the main conclusion to be drawn from that particular incident.

Question. Sir, as evidenced by the Berkeley demonstrations, would you say that the students today have too many liberties and that it's causing the detriment of their own education?

Dr. BOWKER. Well, I think Berkeley was hurt by that. But I wouldn't say that was a general proposition.

Question. Dr. Bowker, do you approve of the honor system, such as they have at the Air Force Academy?

Dr. BOWKER. No, I've never been very enthusiastic about that.

MODERATOR. We have one honor, excuse me, Bob, that we always have to adhere to and that's time, Dr. Bowker, and our time is almost up, but we will have time for a few more questions, panel, in just a moment right after this message.

(Announcement.)

MODERATOR. Dr. Bowker, we do have a couple of minutes for some more questions, and I know there are some. Steve, I think you had one.

Question. Dr. Bowker, I asked you at the beginning of the program a question. Must members of college faculties publish or perish?

Dr. BOWKER. Well, in the trade we say we think the big problem is most of them don't do either.

Question. What about foreign students? Are you in favor of more foreign students in the United States in our colleges and universities?

Dr. BOWKER. Yes, I think they have a great value. Perhaps they should be wider spread. They tend to concentrate in a relatively small number of institutions.

Question. Sir, would you like to see the Federal Government take a more active role in education?

Dr. BOWKER. Well, I think it's inevitable, if we're to have the kind of educational system we have here, largely because of the

limited taxing ability of States, and the better taxing ability of the Federal Government.

Question. Sir, what would you do about aid to foreign students? I believe there was an incident in which students from Iceland were going to the Soviet Union for higher education because they could not pay the cost of going to school in the United States.

Dr. BOWKER. Well there are a good many thousands of them here. I wasn't aware that their financial support was a critical problem. But certainly we have many programs that support them. They probably could stand some expansion.

Question. Sir, don't you feel that we should take care of our people at home first, perhaps work more on financing the education of the people in this country, to our underprivileged in this respect, before we go overseas to help out more?

Dr. BOWKER. Probably you're right, it should be given higher priority than it has been given. Yet there are great benefits, I think, to education in associating with people of different cultures.

Question. Dr. Bowker, as a mathematician, would you explain the difference between the old mathematics and the new mathematics now being taught in high school?

Dr. BOWKER. Yes. I think the new mathematics is more general and has much more the sense of mathematics. The older mathematics was more rote and drill.

Question. Sir, do you feel that the scholastic and social pressures in college today are such that the average or below average student is forced to cheat to succeed?

Dr. BOWKER. No. But this is one of my reasons for lack of enthusiasm for the honor system.

MODERATOR. Dr. Bowker, sir, it's been a pleasure. It's been a very quick half hour and a most interesting one. Thank you for being our guest.

Dr. BOWKER. Thank you.

MODERATOR. Thank you sir, and to you panel for some interesting questions, and you ladies and gentlemen for being with us. This is Bob Johnson inviting you to join us next week at this time for "Youth Wants To Know."

Cornell University—A Symbol of Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, as a graduate of Cornell University and of its Law School, it has been a matter of especial pride to me that, for the past 2 years since congressional redistricting in New York, I have had the opportunity of representing Tompkins County, (N.Y.), and, thus, the Cornell community here in the House of Representatives.

It was with pleasure, therefore, that I noted the following editorial commenting upon Cornell's centennial year as set forth in the New York Times edition for Tuesday, April 27, which—under leave to extend my remarks and include extraneous material—is hereinafter set forth:

CORNELL AT 100

Cornell University, which received its charter 100 years ago today, has marked its centennial year by underlining its commitment to, and involvement in, the full range of intellectual endeavor. Earlier in the year the focus was on the arts, when Cornell took over Lincoln Center in this city for an entire week of performances and discussion; this week, on the Ithaca campus, leading scholars will appraise the contemporary world's reliance on the natural sciences, the social sciences, and the humanities.

It is a measure of the Nation's growing maturity that hundred-year anniversaries of its universities are getting to be less than extraordinary occasions, although few have been marked by the special quality of Cornell's celebration. What gives this observance extra significance is the place occupied by Cornell in America's educational history.

Cornell is Ivy League, the trademark of higher education's exclusive sector; but it is also a land-grant institution. It is thus a participant in the homegrown tradition which represents American faith in the university's capacity to serve intellectual as well as pragmatic ends of the open society. Although the amount of land-grant money was small, it made Cornell a partner in that great enterprise out of which the State university systems were also born.

Today the Ithaca campus combines the best of private university development with units of the State University of New York. Thus Cornell stands as a symbol of cooperation between the American systems of private and public higher education.

National Volunteer Fireman's Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have just been informed by the city manager of Alexandria, Va., in my congressional district, that the Alexandria City Council has officially expressed its approval of House Joint Resolution 350, which would provide for authorization for the President to proclaim the week beginning on the first Sunday in August as "National Volunteer Fireman's Week." I am pleased to include herewith a copy of the Alexandria city manager's letter to me, as well as the resolution adopted by the city council. It is my sincere hope that communities across the Nation will join Alexandria in this effort to honor some of America's unsung heroes:

ALEXANDRIA, VA.,
April 21, 1965.

CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am pleased to forward to you the enclosed copy of a resolution adopted on April 13, 1965, by the City Council of the City of Alexandria, Va., in support of House Joint Resolution 350 which authorized and requested the President to proclaim the week beginning on the first Sunday in August of each year as "National Volunteer Fireman's Week."

Sincerely,

ALBERT M. HAIR, Jr.,
City Manager.

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF ALEXANDRIA, VA.

Whereas Alexandria has long had the services of volunteer firemen who have made valuable contributions in preventing and fighting fires; and

Whereas Alexandria is known for its historic interest in firefighting equipment and in volunteer fire companies, particularly since George Washington organized a volunteer fire company in Alexandria; and

Whereas the Honorable JOEL T. BROYHILL, Congressman from Virginia, has introduced House Joint Resolution 350 which authorized and requested the President to proclaim the week beginning on the first Sunday in August of each year as "National Volunteer Fireman's Week": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the City Council of Alexandria, Va., does hereby endorse the House Joint Resolution 350, introduced by the Honorable JOEL T. BROYHILL, requesting that the President proclaim the week beginning on the first Sunday in August of each year as "National Volunteer Fireman's Week" in recognition of the unselfishness and devotion to duty of the volunteer firemen of the United States in protecting lives and property in their communities; and be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk of the city of Alexandria, Va., be directed to send a certified copy of this resolution to the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Given under my hand and seal this 13th day of April, in the year of our Lord 1965.

FRANK E. MANN,
Mayor
(On behalf of the City Council of Alexandria, Va.).

Attest:

PATSY ALTIZER,
Clerk.

Address of Massachusetts Attorney General Edward W. Brooke Before the National Press Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, this noon, the distinguished attorney general of Massachusetts, Edward W. Brooke, addressed the National Press Club. He gave one of the most sensible and forthright analyses of the current political situation that I have heard.

The attorney general, who must be ranked among the Nation's leading political figures, pointed out that the real loss in the 1964 election was not to the Republican Party, but to the American people because of the failure of that campaign to provide a meaningful debate of issues.

He pointed out that we are paying for what he called "our fling for the sake of the American political neurosis" in terms of vacillation and lack of clarity in our current policies.

I think that every thinking American should have an opportunity to read Attorney General Brooke's superb address and for that purpose, I wish to include the text in the RECORD at this point:

ADDRESS OF MASSACHUSETTS ATTORNEY GENERAL EDWARD W. BROOKE, BEFORE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 28, 1965

"After the fall" of the GOP last November, "the winter of our despair" was filled with analysis, psychoanalysis, dissection, and diagnosis, studies in depth, critiques, surveys,

polls, research reports, factfinding, one-man and any-man opinions, searching looks which were meant to penetrate and describe what has been called, from time to time, "the agony of the GOP," "a party in crisis," "the GOP struggle for survival," "dialectic Republicanism," "the Republican election trauma," "can the elephant forget?" and the "Republicans after the debacle," with each report usually coming to the brilliant conclusion that the Republican Party was in a bit of a mess.

As a Republican, I would like to take this opportunity to thank all of those who contributed in such a thoughtful and well meaning way to starting us off on the long road back and if they have run out of salt for our wounds, I would be glad to replenish their supply.

I am not trying to minimize the extent of rethinking and the tough policy and leadership decisions that will be necessary for the GOP to win elections again. It's not every year that a party loses over 500 seats in State legislatures across the Nation along with key Senate and House seats.

But I do not foresee the 1964 Goldwater candidacy as the Republican's albatross, relegating the party to minority status for years to come. Neither do I believe it represented a strictly indigenous attitude of the Republican Party.

The American concept of conservatism is not confined to one political party. The particular attitude which dominated the 1964 Republican Convention has lain under the surface of American political activity for 20 years, since the inception of the cold war.

It has been the reservoir of frustration resulting from our necessary international role, and the repository of fear, mistrust, and insecurity which are products of the social and economic adjustments since the war.

If the election was supposed to offer a choice, it was 20 years too late, and if we wanted the candidates to embody that choice, the American public missed its chance in 1952 when it failed to match Adlai Stevenson and Robert A. Taft, two articulate representatives of opposing philosophies.

The possibility of a liberal-conservative confrontation passed from the sublime to the ridiculous and 1964 witnessed a campaign billed as a great confrontation of America's past with its future, between two men who were probably personally in more general agreement on more issues than any two opposing candidates in recent history.

Frankly, I am less concerned about the supposed "cost" of this election to the Republican Party than I am about its cost to the American people.

It deprived us of the necessary and serious exchange of views on the alternative ways of dealing with the difficult problems this country faces, both at home and abroad; of exploring the meaning and extent of our involvement in South Vietnam; of debating and examining the proposed programs to eradicate poverty, to provide medical care for the aged, aid to public, private, and parochial school education and the myriad other problems that majorities of both parties recognize and are committed to resolve.

In short, the American people were deprived of the opportunity to judge a campaign that bore some relation to the real world and its very real problems.

Instead, we watched TV spots with people tearing up their social security cards; the projected image of a choice between good and evil, black and white, war and peace—not that it wasn't ripe for presentation along those lines and the obvious image for the party in power to exploit, but what was the result after the Nation went through the motions of registering their choice. What was the result after the computers predicted the winner within one-tenth of 1 percent accuracy 10 minutes after the polls closed? What had happened, or rather what had not happened?

The administration, the incumbent, had not been put to a test; he had not been challenged; he did not have to defend the policies and programs he had set before the Nation and was proposing for the future. What did he have to defend them against? His program for aid to education against no program? His background as a leader in civil rights against that of his opponent?

We did not learn very much about the way the President would react under the pressure of an articulate and well-directed opposition to whom the public was listening and to whom he would be expected to reply.

Discussion of the whole area of foreign policy took place under a mushroom cloud which prevented the public from giving serious consideration to what else the President must do besides refrain from "pushing the button."

We are facing some of the consequences of the lack of public debate in this area right now. The public was ill informed and unprepared for our present policy in Vietnam and the temper of the man who is directing it. The campaign was supposed to have been between a dove and a hawk. The dove won. So, what's he doing acting like a hawk?

The campaign distorted the issues and the candidates, and in the end, not only did Goldwater lose, but Johnson lost and the American people lost. Why? Because the presidential process failed to work. It failed to force a presidential candidate to win the Presidency. It was left to him by default and we didn't accurately judge the man who won.

Our fling for the sake of the American political neurosis cost us more than the election and I am more distressed by that than anything else.

In terms of practical politics, the Republican Party need not ask of Goldwater and the ensuing election disaster, in the words of an old popular song, "Is you is, or is you ain't my baby?" It's our baby, all right, although many of us question the parentage.

At least there is one thing upon which all Republicans can agree, and that is that the party's major task between now and the 1966 congressional elections is to project a positive Republican image in keeping with the true traditions of the party.

In 18 months the Republican Party will again face the electorate, and we must face the electorate with a constructive record of accomplishment.

I suggest with pride that the Republican congressional delegation has distinguished itself in the two critical areas of foreign and domestic policy with honor and good judgment.

Senator DIRKSEN and Representatives FORD and MCCULLOCH have played and are playing an admirable role in the effort to write an effective and problem-solving voting rights bill.

Almost without exception, the Republican congressional delegation has given loyal and valuable assistance to the President in regard to the crisis in Vietnam.

In the matter of foreign policy our responsibility as Republicans, as the loyal opposition, is a particularly important one and a particularly delicate one.

The Republican Party has a special obligation in the Vietnam crisis and in all other foreign policy crises to insist that the minority voice, the voice which challenges administration policy is heard.

If there is anything that is more troubling than the problem of Vietnam itself, and the role of the United States in Vietnam, it is the increasingly hysterical and thoughtless tone which has characterized public discussion about Vietnam.

I think, in such a crisis, that the minority party, the Republican Party must be the undeviating ally of the press as you and your colleagues seek to supply the Nation with the facts about Vietnam.

It is no reflection on the good faith, the good intentions, or the ability of those charged with the execution of U.S. policy in Vietnam to remind them and the Nation that the public and the minority party also have a vital role to play in this crisis.

All need to know the plain truth about what is happening in Vietnam. We need to know the good news and the bad news. We need to know our strengths and our weaknesses.

When overzealous, oversensitive men—civilian or military—attempt to impose a news blackout from Vietnam, try to conceal what is happening there and elsewhere in southeast Asia, I submit that the Republican Party has the responsibility to speak out loudly and clearly in favor of your right to gather the facts and the public's right to know them.

A party that controls neither the White House nor the Congress is in a difficult position to take the lead in offering new ideas and programs to deal with such problems as health, housing, education, transportation; the increasingly important and complex problems of our growing urban centers.

A party's programs and goals in these areas are formulated at its convention and hammered into its platform.

Unfortunately the Republican Party's 1964 platform committee and its product did not impress upon the American public the commitment and resolve of the party as a whole; to devise thoughtful and effective programs to meet the needs in these areas.

This lack of a realistic and meaningful action program for the party is the major obstacle to our presenting the Republican Party to the American people in 1966 as a serious alternative to those presently in power.

When I was asked by reporters on election night, what I thought might be done to begin to overcome the disasterous defeat we had suffered, I suggested then, and still believe, that, it was important to hold a national Republican convention or conference, in this off year, to formulate a sound Republican position on the host of foreign and domestic problems which confront the Nation.

There is precedent for such an off year conference in both the Democratic and Republican Party.

I am of the opinion that a conference of this nature would go a long way toward chystallizing both leadership and policy within the party, giving new direction and vigor to our coming election efforts.

It has been asked, "what good is a political party unless it is serving some great national purpose?"

Out of power the Republican Party must be an articulate and informed opposition and when we assume national leadership the party must pursue our goals at home and abroad with programs that show a deep concern for the individual. If the Democrats call themselves the party of the people, then we are the party of the individual, concerned with the place and dignity of man; his rights and his welfare, his future in a free society. A party demonstrating this concern will deserve the support of the American people. A party demonstrating this concern will win the support of the American people.

The Growing Threat of Soviet Seapower

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the 1965 annual report of the Shipbuilders

Council of America carries a most interesting and revealing article entitled "The Growing Threat of Soviet Seapower."

I recommend a close analysis of this succinct article to each of my colleagues for I feel we have been lax in recognizing the significance of Russia's advances:

THE GROWING THREAT OF SOVIET SEAPOWER

Also included in last year's report was an official assessment of the condition of the U.S.-flag merchant fleet prepared by the Deputy Chief of Naval Operation (Logistics). This showed that our merchant fleet is in even more critical shape than the naval fleet. Over 90 percent of the dry-cargo ships and 55 percent of the tankers in the fleet will shortly reach the end of their economic lives simultaneously. There has been no improvement in this situation.

In addition, the active fleet, which numbered 1,950 ships totaling 22.4 million deadweight tons in 1951, has contracted steadily and now is composed of only 900 ships aggregating 13 million tons.

Any significant improvement of the future outlook for the private shipyards must await official recognition of the deteriorated state of this Nation's seapower resources. This day of reckoning cannot be delayed or postponed much longer. Time is running out.

Budgetary expediencies adopted for too many previous years account for the alarming block obsolescence problems which now afflict our naval and merchant fleets. Our shortsighted policies also have taken their toll on the private shipyard industry, as evidenced by the fact that 18 private shipyards have been forced to close their gates permanently during the past 10 years.

Of necessity, our national planners ultimately will have to face up to the block obsolescence or this Nation will lose its sea power capability by default. We believe the former alternative will prevail. Hopefully, the required remedial action will be taken before further contraction in the size of the private shipyard industry occurs.

The sharp contrast in the priorities which Russia and the United States have assigned to seapower again was all too evident during 1964.

Russia's naval strength continued to grow and her enormous merchant fleet expansion program was further accelerated. In this country a welcome increase in naval ship construction occurred. However, the volume of new orders fell far short of the level required to prevent further magnification of the U.S. Navy fleet's alarming block obsolescence problem. The construction of merchant ships, as has been noted, continued at such a low level that the quantitative and qualitative deficiencies of the American merchant marine were further accentuated.

As a naval power, Russia is second only to the United States. The U.S. Navy's fleet is better balanced and possesses more versatile striking power. Russia, whose naval stratgey stresses the submarine as the major element of her fleet strength, boasts the largest submarine fleet in the world. "Janes Fighting Ships," the authoritative naval journal, says the U.S.S.R. fleet comprises more than 430 submarines—a growing number of which are nuclear-powered attack and missile-firing types. The U.S. Navy has only 175 submarines, of which 51 are nuclear-powered units. As a point of reference, Hitler, in the early stages of World War II, decimated the Allies' supply lines with a total fleet of only 57 submarines.

The remarkable expansion of the U.S.S.R.'s merchant fleet stems from a series of continuing shipbuilding programs, which since 1950 have increased the fleet size from 432 ships of 1.8 million deadweight tons to 1,200 vessels totaling 8 million tons today.

Currently underway is a 5-year plan (1965–70) which is programed to increase the merchant fleet's tonnage to 15 million deadweight by 1970.

By mid-1966 Russia's merchant marine, which already possesses more ships, will surpass the American fleet in terms of total tonnage. More importantly, the Russian fleet will be composed predominantly of new, efficient vessels while the U.S. merchant marine will be composed overwhelmingly of obsolete ships in the 25-year-old bracket.

The U.S.-flag fleet has been contracting steadily for the past 15 years. In 1951 it numbered 1,955 active vessels totaling 22.4 million deadweight tons. Today, this Nation has only 900 ships aggregating 13.5 million tons in active service.

The accompanying table, which compares the level of shipbuilding activity generated by the American and Soviet merchant marines, vividly reflects the contrasting maritime objectives.

Because Russian shipyards are heavily engaged in naval construction, 3.9 million of the 6.5 million tons of shipbuilding will be built outside of Russia.

Merchant ships building or on order

	Number	United States, deadweight tons [1]	Number	U.S.S.R., deadweight tons
Mar. 1, 1962	61	878,000	225	[2] 2,263,400
May 1, 1963	47	697,660	236	[3] 3,032,100
May 1, 1964	47	725,400	441	[3] 3,461,800
Nov. 1, 1964	43	650,000	673	[4] 6,450,000

[1] U.S. data: Shipbuilders Council of America.
[2] U.S.S.R. data: Marine Engineering/Log, New York, N.Y.
[3] U.S.S.R. data: Fairplay Shipping Journal, London, England.

Better Explanation of United States Vietnam Policy Than Anything Administration Has Put Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, the April 24, 1965, issue of the Economist of London has a better, clearer, and more enlightening explanation of the U.S. position and policy in Vietnam than anything put out by anybody in the Johnson administration. I commend the Economist explanation to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress:

ALL WARS ARE FILTHY—BUT THE VIETNAM ONE IS GOING TO BE SETTLED BY CAREFUL PERSEVERANCE, NOT BY WRINGING ONE'S HANDS

That "filthy Fascist war" in Vietnam, as Mrs. Anne Kerr called it in Trafalgar Square on Monday, has reached a stage where high-pitched simplicities like Mrs. Kerr's have long since been overtaken by events. The honorable but confused member for Rochester and Chatham presumably wants the Americans to stop bombing North Vietnam, thus returning matters in South Vietnam to where they were at the beginning of February (which was two-thirds of the way down the slippery slope to a Vietcong victory). So do the rather haphazard collection of her fellow Labor Members of Parliament and other Labor Party supporters who assembled at the annual jamboree organized by the cooperative movement at Blackpool on Sunday. On the other side of the hill, there may be men in Washington who still believe the war will be ended by somebody in Peiping flicking a switch and turning off the flow of revolutionary current that runs through Hanoi to the Vietcong. But it ought to be plain that the positions taken by the United States and China in the past 11 weeks virtually rule out both these extreme possibilities. Neither of the two great patron powers is in a mood to throw in the sponge completely without a major struggle.

What has been happening in the 11 weeks since the Americans started bombing North Vietnam is a gradual narrowing down of the range of likely outcomes, though the range still runs from the tolerably acceptable to the very undesirable. The central question is the part the rebels in the south will play in any future political settlement. Most people, looking at the guerrilla wars of the last 20 years, suspect that the Vietcong rebellion is probably too well established to be totally extirpated. It is entirely possible, on the other hand, that if it can be cut off from its sources of nourishment in the north it can be brought under control, as a fire sometimes is, without being actually put out. In that case the rebels' share in a future political settlement can probably be kept small enough for South Vietnam to remain outside the Communist camp. Other small countries with half-assimilated Communist minorities, like Finland and Burma, have managed to do just that, though the trick is harder to turn in Asia than in Europe. But if the attempt to cut the Vietcong off from its northern roots fails, it will pretty certainly be the Communists who dominate the final settlement. The only question then will be the speed with which it happens, and the degree of humiliation inflicted on the United States in the process.

(It might alternatively, as the optimists hope, be the beginning of a general retreat north of the 17th parallel, but nothing else the Communists have been doing confirms this hopeful reading.) The attempt at a showdown might come at an American base like Pleiku or even, if the Vietcong is ready to "try a Dienbienphu," at the Marines' laager at Da Nang. One rather hopes it will; Da Nang, on the coast, is not Dienbienphu in its pocket of hills, and the Americans are not the French. Or, alternatively, the attack might take the form of an attempt to cut communications between Da Nang and the south across the middle of the country.

If a major Vietcong offensive in the wet weather that begins soon does succeed in capturing an American base or cutting South Vietnam in two, the result will be more or less a foregone conclusion. Morale in the south, which has been rising in the last few weeks, will drop again; the old routine of coups d'état will be resumed; and the Americans will find themselves frighteningly near the end of the gangplank. If, on the other hand, the outcome is a big battle that the Vietcong loses, it will be North Vietnam's turn for an agonizing reappraisal. For the North Vietnamese would then face the prospect of being steadily bombed to pieces while the rebels in the south slowly pulled themselves together, regrouped, and thought out their tactics afresh. In that event the Americans' tactics would have been triumphantly justified: by forcing the Vietcong into a decisive battle before it was really ready, they might in effect have won the war.

The North Vietnamese have made it clear that the American bombing is not yet hurting them enough to persuade them to stop helping the rebels in the south. However, it is certainly hurting them enough for them not to want it to go on indefinitely. This gives them a powerful motive for urging the Vietcong to have a last great fling at winning the war in the south as soon as possible. The reported withdrawal of rebel forces from the southernmost part of the country may well be the sign of an impending last fling further north.

But it is quite likely that the rainy season will bring no decisive victory for either side. In that case the range of possibilities will narrow still further, and the conflict will settle down into a war of attrition that might drag on for a long time. The outcome of this war of attrition will depend, first, on the extent to which the recent rise in South Vietnamese morale can be put to practical use (Mr. McNamara, the American Secretary of Defense, has been arranging in Hawaii this week to train an extra 100,000 South Vietnamese troops). It will depend, second, on the extent to which the flow of aid to the Vietcong from the north can be diminished. If the North Vietnamese can be jostled into reducing the supply of recruits and arms in the hope of limiting the aerial pounding they have to take—or if they simply cannot get the supplies through because the bridges are down and the railway broken—time will probably work on the side of the Americans and the South Vietnamese. The Vietcong, deprived of its northern support, would gradually be cut down to its proper size as a native southern rebellion, and the way might at last be open to a political settlement that is not merely a case of the Communist north swallowing the south.

In this long and delicate operation, timing will be very important indeed. The sensible idea has been put forward—and informally approved of by the United States, Russia and Britain—of holding a conference about Cambodia's problems during which the interested parties could draw the conversation round to Vietnam. Cambodia said primly on Tuesday that any such conference should deal with Cambodia alone, but delegates in conference corridors have a way of getting round difficulties like that. No conference held in the near future is likely to produce a clear-cut solution of Vietnam's problems, unless one side or the other changes it position in a hurry. But informal conversations would be useful as a means of delaying the moment when either the Chinese or the Russians might feel obliged to involve themselves more directly. (Both have lately as good as said—the Russians on April 17 and the Chinese on April 20—that they will not send volunteers to North Vietnam unless the American bombing goes beyond its present limits.) Better still, the conversations could provide a way of delicately discovering what mixture of military stick and diplomatic carrot would be most effective in getting the North Vietnamese to cut down their aid to the Vietcong.

Senator FULBRIGHT called on April 18—echoing an earlier suggestion by Canada's Prime Minister, Mr. Pearson—for a pause in the bombing of North Vietnam. The trouble with this course is that there is no evidence that the North Vietnamese would interpret it as anything but a sign of American vacillation; and, if an openly announced pause failed to bring a response from Hanoi, and the bombing started again, there would be a natural reluctance in Washington to repeat the experiment later on, when a halt might well be more fruitful. But these objections do not apply to a privately dropped American hint, whispered on the back row of a Cambodia conference, that the bombing might just stop for a week or so, without any public announcement whatever, to give the North Vietnamese a chance to reply in kind with an equally unpublicized halt in their assistance to the Vietcong. The same whispered conversation might include a spelling out of President Johnson's remark on March 25 about the conditions in which "the people and Government of South Vietnam" should be "free to settle their own future." This would begin to define the terms under which the southern rebels, once they were confined to real southerners, could join in the political dialog.

Shrill denunciation is simply no longer relevant to the Vietnam problem. The need now is for a careful use of military strength and diplomatic ingenuity, of determination coupled with an awareness of the value of treading cannily. The evidence suggests that President Johnson knows what is called for. One hopes the other side does too.

Right-To-Work Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Robert H. Feldkamp, one of the Nation's outstanding political writers, recently commented in his column in the Akron Beacon Journal about my position in regard to the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act.

The column follows:

THE POLITICAL PARADE

(By Robert H. Feldkamp)

Representative AYRES, of Akron, has decided to vote for repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act—which may raise some eyebrows.

The is the controversial section permitting States to enact their own right-to-work laws—laws which bar compulsory unionism.

AYRES, a Republican, confides he will be taking a position contrary to that generally expressed by his party on the touchy subject of right to work.

Couple AYRES' position with the fact that he is the ranking Republican on the House Education and Labor Committee—where the repealer will first be considered, most likely this session—and it adds up to smooth sailing once the bill is thrown into the hopper.

This is doubly significant because labor has wanted to repeal 14(b) for nearly 20 years, but could never muster the strength in Congress.

This time, with AYRES' help, repeal is imminent.

AYRES and ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, the New York Democrat who heads the Education and Labor Committee, are working together.

POWELL, in fact, is part of the reason that AYRES will support repeal.

The New Yorker knows that the bill probably will pass easily once it is reported out of committee. Democrats hold an overwhelming edge in Congress and most will go for it. And of the 435 House Members, only 124 come from the 19 States now having right-to-work laws—so no great opposition will develop there.

POWELL knows that his greatest bargaining power comes while the bill still is in committee. So do labor chieftains, who dearly want repeal.

AFL–CIO President George Meany has a pledge from President Johnson—in return for a lot of help from labor during the last campaign—for help in killing 14(b).

Meany, however, must contend with POWELL and that is what is happening now.

POWELL, a Negro, long has been unhappy about the virtual exclusion of Negroes from union apprentice training programs. AYRES also has said publicly that qualified Negroes should be allowed into these programs.

Meany, it is understood, has promised POWELL he will do all he can to break down these racial barriers—in return for fast committee action on 14(b).

This is where the matter now stands, and is part of the reason AYRES will line up with the Democrats.

He knows, too, that the Southern States now having right-to-work laws are using them as a magnet in attracting northern industries.

"Come on down," these Southern States are saying, "and you won't have to face compulsory union shops."

AYRES also remembers 1958 in Ohio of course, when Republicans who favored right to work were overwhelmed by labor-backed Democrats in almost every instance.

"The people of Ohio spoke out on this then, and were very clear," he says.

Mr. Speaker, I do not differ from the conclusions as drawn by Mr. Feldkamp; rather, I would elaborate and give the background of my position.

In 1958, when a right-to-work amendment was placed on our Ohio ballot, I publicly stated that I would not vote for it. I further stated that I felt that the U.S. Congress should face this issue.

Let no one feel that this is a reversal of position. I am a firm supporter of the Taft-Hartley Act and took a major part in the conference that brought about the enactment of the Landrum-Griffin Act.

I have always supported labor legislation that would provide the proper climate for fair bargaining. Excess of power by either party can but lead to disaster for both. I have always kept in mind that the general public had a great interest and that interest should have proper consideration.

There might be some who would infer that any movement to repeal section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act would be an attack on that act itself. This is untrue.

There comes a time when experience brings about a review of some sections of what might be considered a very fair law.

Just a short time ago, I called for a review of the election provisions of the Landrum-Griffin. In two recent national union elections, loopholes in that law was found to exist—loopholes that permitted fraudulent or confusing action. The right of union members to conduct fair elections is paramount.

The Landrum-Griffin Act was drawn so as to give protection to union members that might, on occasion, be beset by autocratic leadership. It is a fine law but improvements, in this one direction, might be made. I would still protect the Landrum-Griffin Act as I still would protect the Taft-Hartley Act.

An organization that is disputing the repeal of section 14(b), falsely charges that this repeal would force every employee to join a union and pay dues. To clear up this misconception, I am detailing the actual effect of the repeal of section 14(b).

As I recently covered this subject in a speech, I do now include excerpts from my remarks pertaining to this subject:

IMPORTANT CONSIDERATIONS IN CONNECTION WITH PROPOSALS TO REPEAL SECTION 14(b)

Section 14(b) of Taft-Hartley authorizes the States to limit or completely prohibit any form of compulsory union membership arrangement. Nineteen of the fifty States

have enacted such statutes, popularly known as right-to-work laws.

There seems to be a widespread misconception that in the 31 States which do not have right-to-work laws union membership is compulsory for employees in organized enterprises. This is utterly erroneous.

Compulsory union membership results exclusively from voluntary contracts entered into between employers and labor unions during the course of free collective bargaining. Nothing in either Federal or State law compels an employee to join a union or an employer to consent to an agreement with a union which would require his employees to join the union as a condition of retaining their jobs.

In other words, compulsory union membership, where it exists, is a result of free and voluntary agreement between employer and union, and is not a requirement imposed by law. If 14(b) were to be repealed, thus nullifying State right-to-work laws, nevertheless, no employee could be compelled to join a union in order to hold his job, unless his employer voluntarily agreed to including such a requirement in his contract with the union.

If section 14(b) were to be repealed, the provision in the Taft-Hartley Act permitting union security arrangements would then apply uniformly in all of the 50 States.

Again there seems to be a widespread misconception that this would have the effect of imposing unrestricted compulsory union membership on all employees in organized enterprises. This, too, is erroneous. The provision in Taft-Hartley permitting employers and unions to agree to union security arrangements is an extremely limited one.

The closed shop, which requires the employer to hire only those job applicants who are already members of the union, would still be unlawful. And employees required to join the union after getting their jobs [this is known as the union shop] could not be deprived of their jobs even if they lose their membership in the union, unless such loss of membership were the result of a refusal to pay their dues or initiation fee. Loss or denial of union membership for any other reason would not be a lawful reason for the employee's loss of his job.

Hence, apart from the requirement to pay union dues and initiation fees, the employee required to join the union would have no other obligations to the union as a condition of holding his job.

Repeal of 14(b) would leave the fundamental scheme of the Taft-Hartley and Landrum-Griffin Acts unchanged.

The Wagner Act which remained on the statute books substantially unchanged from 1935 to 1947, was limited to protecting employees against any attempt by their employers to interfere with their membership in or activities in behalf of their unions. No other safeguards for employees were provided, nor were there any protections provided for employers against any type of union misconduct.

The Taft-Hartley Act, passed in 1947, provided protections for employers against certain types of union conduct such as secondary boycotts, certain types of picketing, jurisdictional dispute strikes, etc. Moreover, the closed shop was completely outlawed, and only the limited type of union shop described above was permitted even in those States without right-to-work laws. None of these new safeguards would be affected in any way by the repeal of 14(b).

In 1959, the Landrum-Griffin Act became law. This strengthened the ban on secondary boycotts, outlawed hot-cargo contracts, and prohibited organizational, recognition, and extortionate picketing. These additional safeguards for employers and employees would not be changed by repeal of 14(b). Moreover, the new provisions establishing a bill of rights for union members, protecting union funds against misuse, erecting certain safeguards for the conduct of union elections, similarly would remain unaffected by repeal of 14(b).

Thus it is plain that repeal of 14(b) would result in no fundamental or significant modification in the structure and safeguards which the Taft-Hartley and Landrum-Griffin Acts have made available to rank-and-file union members, employees, and employers.

Operation Yorkville

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, as the author of H.R. 980, the bill overwhelmingly approved by this distinguished body, to stop the free flow of unsolicited obscenity through the mails, I would like to call attention to an interfaith group in New York City which has done an extraordinary job of fighting smut in that community. I am speaking of Operation Yorkville. The efforts of this outstanding group of interested citizens have alerted others throughout the United States to the dangers of the availability of obscene and pornographic material to our young people.

This interfaith campaign is organized to protect the parental-civil right to stop the traffic in pornography among children by expressing community standards.

I am certain my destinguished colleagues join in commending this very worthwhile organization for their untiring efforts in the war against obscenity.

The following articles taken from the March issue of the Operation Yorkville Newsletter point up the problem which exists and show what can be done and what is being done about this most serious problem:

LETTER POWER (LP) IS PEACEFUL PROTEST—PROTEST AGAINST THE VIOLATION OF YOUR RIGHTS TO EDUCATE AND PROTECT

The problem of the traffic in pornography among children is your problem, and only you can begin the cycle which will result in the protection of your parental-civil right to educate and protect.

Police will not arrest, district attorneys will not prosecute, many judges will continue to rule in favor of pornographers—unless you protest.

Letter writing is protest, peaceful but forceful protest. Letter writing can be the power of the people, which when applied, can tip the scales of justice in favor of innocent children.

The cycle is simple, but effective. Letter protests to the press (to one newspaper, so that the greatest force will be directed to one point) will result in conflict in the press—conflict between parents and pornographers. Conflict will result in news; news will stimulate editorial coverage; editorial coverage will spur law enforcement, prosecution, and judgments, which will reflect regard for your rights and, in so doing, protect the innocent from perversion.

You can help start the wheels of justice turning. You can use the machinery of peaceful protest—use your letter power. Begin writing your newspaper as soon as possible.

MR. JUSTICE BRENNAN AND THE PUZZLING DEFENSE

As the last 1964 issue of the Newsletter was going to press, Justice William J. Brennan, of the U.S. Supreme Court was busily defending his opinion in the June 22 "Lovers" and "Tropic of Cancer" decisions.

Mr. Justice Brennan, in the June 22 opinion, defined community standards (a test since 1957 in obscenity cases) as a national standard, referring to society at large, thus indicating that the test for obscenity should rest on the lowest possible common denominator of morality.

In a November 15 speech at the Louis Marshall Award Dinner of the Jewish Theological Seminary in New York City, Justice Brennan chose to defend his position and succeeded only in compounding the confusion which the Court's June 22 decisions created.

Mr. Justice Brennan quoted from Leclercq: "The jurist is above all interested in social good, in rules to be observed in view of that good; the moralist is preoccupied with the good of the individual." He quickly went on to say, "It is not necessary to accept the proposition as invariably true to recognize its validity in some cases." He hurried on to demonstrate, that he is aware that there is such a thing as a public, social morality, even indicating that it is at a higher level than his June 22 opinion would have us believe: it is a mistaken notion that judges are not as fully conscious as men of religion that our institutions reflect a firm conviction that we are a religious people * * *. Judges in fact daily administer innumerable laws which enact moral standards fashioned by theologians. But there are constitutional limits to the legislative power even in the areas of religion and morality.

Operation Yorkville submits that Justice Brennan's June 22 opinion does not reflect a firm conviction that we are a religious people, and raises a question as to his ideas of the individual good and even the social good. Further, the Court's reading of the Constitution has seemed strained and overdoctrinaire in the area of publications. Why? Mr. Justice Brennan went on in his speech: "The line between protected and unprotected portrayal is dim and uncertain." This, in spite of the fact that we are a religious people. Mr. Brennan's opinion has helped render the line even dimmer and more uncertain. Where to now, Mr. Justice Brennan?

NEW YORK ACADEMY OF MEDICINE RELEASES NEW VD REPORT—CITES SALACIOUS LITERATURE AS CAUSE OF TEENAGE VD RISE

In a report released on February 4, the New York Academy of Medicine outlined steps to aid in the eradication of venereal disease in 7 years. The plan called for public sex education programs.

The Committee on Public Health of the New York Academy of Medicine, noting that the incidence of venereal disease among teenagers has increased more than 200 percent between 1956 and 1963 (on a nationwide basis), said that education on prevention of infection should be directed to teenagers in the form of sex education. "The fact is that teenagers are receiving an enormous amount of sex education—of the wrong kind. A large part of this education is derived from salacious literature.

"This kind of literature, which is motivated by the desire for profit, makes vice attractive. It is intentionally sex-arousing and therefore conduces to illicit intercourse and promiscuity which, in turn, helps to spread venereal disease. Health forces in the campaign against venereal disease should recognize the magnitude of distribution and financial resources of publishers of salacious literature and should recognize this type of material as a powerful competitor, the committee believes. Health forces should oppose salacious literature and counter with oppor-

tunities for sound sex education. Though at the present juncture, it must be stated that the forces for sound sex education and sex hygiene are outmanned and outfinanced by the producers of salarious literature."

OPERATION YORKVILLE RECEIVES $1,000 GIFT FROM CARDINAL SPELLMAN

Francis Cardinal Spellman, Catholic archbishop of New York, donated $1,000 to Operation Yorkville last month to further and continue the work of Operation Yorkville. In a letter to Rev. William T. Wood, S.J., cofounder of Operation Yorkville, Most Rev. John J. Maguire, vicar general of the archdiocese of New York said: "As an evidence of the appreciation of His Eminence for the accomplishments of Operation Yorkville and of his desire that the work continue, I enclose a check for $1,000."

LAWYER SAYS "TROPIC" RULE NOT BINDING

Philadelphia Lawyer John B. Gest, in a letter to a New York paper, said that the opinion of Justices Brennan and Goldberg in the U.S. Supreme Court June 22 decision is not binding because it is not the opinion of the Court. This is the opinion which defined "community standards" as "national standards." Mr. Gest quotes Judge Scilleppi, of the New York Court of Appeals, as saying, "This part of the Roth test, therefore (community standards) has not been finally settled by the highest court."

Mr. Gest declared, "It should be clear, then, that the real meaning of the 'Tropic' case is that the book had not been proven obscene, judged by 'community standards' in Florida, since, as pointed out, the rule of community standards has not been changed.

"I have talked to lawyers and librarians," Mr. Gest said, "who take the view that 'Tropic of Cancer' has received the equivalent of a national clearance by the Supreme Court, making it unassailable as obscene in any court in the Nation. This is wrong. The decision should not be considered binding outside the State of Florida.

"The important conclusion to be reached is that State and Federal courts should continue to make their own findings as to community standards and that existing decisions banning the 'Tropic of Cancer' and other obscene publications should be considered valid and binding unless and until reversed on appeal."

PICKETS PICKET PICKETS PICKETING OPERATION YORKVILLE, ETC.

It was a snowy, sleety, slushy February afternoon in New York when Operation Yorkville had the honor of being picketed by a long-haired group calling themselves "The League for Sexual Freedom."

"Sex, sex, sex," shouted the pickets, marching dauntlessly on with the sleet and the rain in their long hair, when up popped a group of pickets to picket the pickets. "Sick, sick, sick," shouted the pickets picketing the pickets. The picketers' pickets were a short-haired group identifying themselves, with literature, as the "U.S. Nationalist Party."

"Sex, sex, sex," and "Sick, sick, sick," went ringing through the canyons of East 84th Street, while Operation Yorkville members obliviously went about their work, work, work. According to press reports, 10 uniformed policemen and a number of plainclothesmen and detectives separated the two groups with barricades, and waited wetly in the icy rain and slush for pickets and picketers' pickets to go home, home, home.

AND A PAGE 1 EDITORIAL IN NEW HAMPSHIRE

Shortly after the picketing of Operation Yorkville headquarters, an editorial appeared on page 1 of the Manchester (N. H.) Union Leader. Entitled "Sex, Sex, Sex; Sick, Sick, Sick," the editorial said: "Did any of our readers ever think they would see the day when marchers, chanting 'sex, sex, sex' would be allowed to picket a Catholic school, in this case a school in Yorkville, a section of New York City, because it is the headquarters of an antismut campaign called Operation Yorkville? This newspaper can think of no more commendable action than fighting obscene literature. * * * One of the great difficulties in the drive against obscene literature is the apathy of so many good citizens, who prefer to look the other way while a flood of printed filth corrupts the minds and the morals not only of our young people but of adults as well."

The editorial, written by the newspaper's publisher went on to tell the story of the pickets and the pickets of the pickets, and said: "What happened in front of that Catholic school in New York City is simply a symptom of the moral sickness of our day. Material might and prosperity will avail us nothing and will be destroyed unless we root out this moral cancer."

Communist-Oriented Groups Well Financed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES D. MARTIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, while our national leaders, including the President and the Attorney General, keep assuring us that the civil rights movement of Martin Luther King has no Communist connections, there continues to be disturbing evidence that Communist activity is on the rise and many of the leaders of the recent demonstrations and violence are strangely intermingled with Communist groups.

It seems to me the President, the Attorney General, and certainly Members of Congress should be greatly disturbed about the significance of how well financed is a new Marxist direct action group described in the following story by Victor Riesel which appeared recently in the Birmingham News:

LEADER IN NEW LABOR PARTY CALLS FOR SELF-DEFENSE UNITS

(By Victor Riesel)

NEW YORK, April 23.—Money—lots of it—appeared to be the least of the problems of the revolutionary Marxist-Leninist movement launched here Sunday as the Progressive Labor Party (PLP).

From somewhere came ample funds to keep 110 delegates at the founding convention here for a week at the rate of almost $2,000 a day in expenses.

From somewhere came additional thousands of dollars needed to bring in party activists from California, western New York, and Kentucky.

From somewhere came funds for the printing and distributing of tens of thousands of leaflets, booklets, and a 48-page convention discussion document in New York and Washington, D.C., over the April 17 weekend.

And whatever the mysterious sources are, they're also providing thousands of dollars monthly for maintenance of a network of headquarters. The PLP people claim headquarters in Berkeley, San Francisco, Chicago, Buffalo, Louisville, Ky., and Williamsport, Pa. These, in addition to three major offices here in New York.

Apparently there is no doubt of the gold flow. PLP leaders are planning to publish not only a Marxist-Leninist quarterly, a national newspaper, and a series of anti-imperialist booklets, but also a slick magazine fashioned after the pro-Chinese Communist Revolution now issued in Paris for the European Continent.

Thus, there is no reason to doubt that the avowedly Communist Progressive Labor Party—pro-Maoist and pro-Castro—will find the money for its action program.

And those of us seeking clues to this direct action planned by this tough coalition of young people find the specifics in the militant, disdainful program advocated by the PLP's most powerful leader.

He's the 32-year-old William Epton, arrested last August on charges of advocating criminal anarchy. His arrest came after the Harlem riots. His aggressive eight-point action program should be a signal to white and Negro communities alike.

The tenor of his words, the implications of his call to action can be measured by his feeling that the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King is too moderate to be followed by the Negro people.

Epton, a vice president of the new party, calls for the launching of self-defense units to protect the organizations and activities he outlines from "attacks by the ruling class and their representative arm, the police and other paramilitary units."

Epton demands the revival of something not encountered inside labor for decades. He urges the creation of trade union caucuses or organizations within the trade union movement that would represent the interests of the black workers and guarantee them [the interests].

He calls for tenant, house, and block committees to struggle in low-income areas.

In the image of the depression day militancy, he urges organization of unemployment councils to demand jobs and bring the unemployed together.

He wants "political councils" set up to "take effective control of their communities."

He demands immediate establishing of "farmworker organizations of sharecroppers and tenant farmers" so they could "demand agragian reform, and land to the landless."

Then Epton wants all these units to "come together into a nationwide coalition" in "an all-black liberation front led by the black working class."

Wherever Epton spoke of his action program, he was cheered by the PLP people. There can be no doubt of the organization's efforts to concentrate on farm and factory labor.

Two of Epton's fellow vice presidents were not identified but were described as former steelworkers from Buffalo. There are units on the waterfront and on the rails. These are made up of young people. The party is made up of young people.

Hon. James A. Farley Describes President's Voting Rights Speech as "One of the Greatest in Modern Times"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH L. CAREY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, James A. Farley, former Postmaster General and Democratic national chairman, has long been recognized as the country's most astute political thinker. For many years it has been his privilege as a friend of

Presidents to view the changing legislative and political scenes from a vantage point unavailable to others.

Recently while en route home from a Caribbean trip General Farley gave a highly informative interview to the San Juan, P.R., Star in which he discussed the President's message on voting rights and his approach to the other important problems confronting the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I include the full text of this interview with General Farley herein for the benefit of our colleagues and all others who are interested in public affairs:

JIM FARLEY HAILS L.B.J. SPEECH ON RIGHTS AS ONE OF GREATEST

(By Nat Carnes)

James A. Farley, who managed two of Franklin Roosevelt's presidential campaigns, Sunday called President Johnson's civil rights speech last month one of the greatest in modern times.

"I think history will recognize it as such," the 76-year-old politician said during an interview shortly after his arrival at San Juan International Airport.

"He completely summed up the situation as it really is affecting people," Farley said, "and then the President tried to point out to the people of Alabama that the law must be observed."

Farley compared the Johnson speech in its importance to Roosevelt's banking address soon after he took office in 1933 during the depression.

FAMOUS QUOTE

"You'll remember the time when Roosevelt said, 'all we have to fear is fear itself,'" Farley recalled.

Currently chairman of the Coca-Cola Export Corp., the politician-businessman planned to continue a 2-week Caribbean and South American trip to Miami yesterday.

"No, I don't think you can compare Johnson and F.D.R.," he said. "They are two different Presidents serving under different circumstances.

"When Roosevelt came into office people were out of work * * * it was a domestic problem. Johnson is more involved in international difficulties."

"Mr. Roosevelt was extremely fond of Johnson and Mr. Roosevelt played a very important role in Johnson's first bid for Congress."

Farley didn't believe that Johnson would be influenced by the Roosevelt philosophy, and that the President will "let his own experience dictate his moves."

"He (Johnson) fully realizes the importance of his position, and he is highly conscious of how history might deal with him as his own man, and that's all right."

A friend of Presidents for over 30 years, Farley said: "I have a great deal of confidence in Mr. Johnson, and he is particularly fortunate to have a wife like Lady Bird."

NO QUARREL

On politics, Farley said he felt Johnson would win the next election against the Republicans, but then added "I have no quarrel with the GOP and how they feel about their party.

"Sometimes parties remain in power too long.

Farley split with Roosevelt in 1940 when he urged him not to seek a third term, and then assumed his present position with the Coca-Cola Co.

"I'm a rabid Democrat," he said, "and I would like to see a change about every 20 years."

The Importance of Preserving the Small, Nonintegrated Fabricators in the Steel Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, one of the most perceptive and knowledgeable of those economists who have worked with dual distributional problems is Dr. Walter Adams, professor of economics at Michigan State University.

His recent analysis of the importance to our consumers and our economy in preserving the independent steel fabricators is one of the outstanding expositions of the essential role of small business which I have encountered.

I know that it will prove of great interest to many of my colleagues. I, therefore, offer it for inclusion in the RECORD at this point:

THE IMPORTANCE OF PRESERVING THE SMALL, NONINTEGRATED FABRICATORS IN THE STEEL BUSINESS

(By Dr. Walter Adams, professor of economics, Michigan State University)

1. In the steel industry, it is particularly important to preserve the small, nonintegrated fabricators as part of the supply complex. In so doing, there is no implication of subsidizing inefficiency. Rather, these firms are indispensable if the public is to be protected against an arbitrary elevation of costs, prices, and profits by the integrated giants of the industry. After elimination of their maverick competitors these oligopolists will enjoy the opportunity to extract perpetual excess payments from the public at large.

2. It is one of the cornerstones of economic experience and analytical principle that markets with only a few sellers will soon degenerate into oligopolistic or monopolistic pricing practices. These are a direct consequence of the absence of direct, vigorous, dynamic, and, above all, independent competitive effort. Industries characterized by just a few sellers tend to show these features in their pricing. Such markets in many cases also tend to exhibit either stagnation in new product development, or to waste research and development talent in pointless and misleading product differentiation. The big firms, insulated from the truly competitive spur of independent action, devote themselves to product changes that will present little or no threat to existing patterns of production and distribution, and tend to entrench their preferred position in the existing markets.

This behavior is not unethical, or irrational; but it is objectionable from the standpoint of public policy. The presumption of such policy is that the larger the number of competitors, the more likely the goals of competition, in terms of production at minimum cost, and realization of soundly based progress, are to be achieved.

3. In some industries, the requirements of technology in relation to the market make it difficult to preserve a large number of firms without sacrificing the possibility of efficiency gains from bigger plants. If there are too many companies in the market, each may have to operate at less than optimum capacity, with the result that the overhead is spread over an unduly small output, thus raising its cost.

This possibility poses a dilemma for policymakers. In some industries, it would seem that technical requirements so limit the number of sellers that the can insulate themselves from the forces of competition. Yet attempts to increase the number of sellers will fail because the existing firms can drive newcomers out of business by outting prices, and taking advantage of the lower costs that can be realized with larger volume.

4. If competition cannot function as an effective institution, a substitute should be found. Normally, our economy turns to price and investment regulation through some kind of public utility control, or even public ownership. But it is important to determine whether the circumstances in any given industry actually call for abandoning reliance on competition.

Most integrated steel firms are large. Nevertheless, their size can be attributed to many forces other than the drive for greater technological efficiency. Examination of the corporate history of United States Steel, Bethlehem and Republic—to name the big three—shows that merger, rather than internal expansion, has been the major determinant of growth, and hence the prevailing pattern of concentration in the industry.

Steel technology itself, though it necessitates heavy investment in associated blast furnaces, basic steel facilities, and rolling mills—to save transport and heat—by no means dictates the formation of enterprises as large as the biggest 5 or 10 steel firms; indeed, a single unit with total investment of perhaps $250 million would suffice. A scientific inquiry concluded that the steel ingot industry, technologically, could support some 40 firms.

5. The concentration in the steel industry results therefore from market considerations, from the drive to corral raw materials so that they should not be monopolized by another firm in the industry, from the desire to insulate oneself from the thrusts of a competitor by mustering a retaliatory power that will give him pause; and by a response to appropriation of the after-market by other large firms. In short, if basic steel is in the hands of a small number of firms, and some of these push forward to the semifinished and fabricated level, then every basic steel producer has to move forward, in self-defense, becoming larger in the process.

Consequently, the steel industry has become characterized by vertical integration. Just as clearly, this integration has not been a result of the pressure of underlying forces of efficiency; on the contrary, it has been dictated by the strategy of maneuver among large companies intent on attaining goals of stability and security—goals which, in a truly competitive system, can never be realized. Given the drive to forward integration, and assurance of an outlet for the basic and semifinished steel, the big integrated firms of necessity come into conflict with the nonintegrated firms at the higher stages of production.

6. Technological requirements do not handicap the small steel fabricators. Engineering studies and experience alike demonstrate that small firms—with assets less than 1 percent of those of the large companies—can as effectively produce fabricated products. They can make wire, fabricate concrete mesh, woven wire fence, bale ties, chain link fence, automatic baling wire, galvanized fencing, as cheaply as their giant competitors. This has been demonstrated in recent years as, squeezed between falling

domestic prices for the products, and higher prices for the raw material (wire rods), the independent fabricator have survived by purchasing foreign wire rod, and making do with a precarious reliance on both domestic and foreign sources of supply.

There has been proof in the competitive market, therefore, that the independent fabricators of wire products, who are numerous and small, can compete for the very same customers as the big companies—and get the business. They can be more flexible in terms of delivery dates; more personalized in the service they render; and more efficient in their application of managerial personnel to the problems of the mill. These inherent advantages of a well-managed small firm make it possible for these fabricators to overcome whatever disabilities they may suffer because they must depend upon outside sources for their wire rod, and cannot coordinate their fabricating operations directly with the rod rolling mill output.

7. The independent fabricators, then, have sound economic justification for their continued presence in the wire products market. They perform, moreover, a key role in that market because of the vertically integrated nature of their giant competitors. The big steel firms, with their heavy investment in, and commitment to, the semifinished and fabricated materials, must inevitably adopt a statesmanlike and security-conscious attitude toward the competitive process. Decisions about innovations in productive technique, adoption of new machines, pricing response to imports and to domestic competition, must all be made against a background of the articulated, vertically integrated structure of the giant firm. Response must be appraised not merely with the particular product in mind, but more important, in the light of the effect of a price change on the whole vertical structure. While the independent fabricator, dependent, for example, upon the sales of concrete mesh for 30 percent of his revenues, may meet a price challenge immediately and directly, or adopt an innovation on packaging wire as soon as he hears of it—under the dire threat of imminent bankruptcy or cash shortage, the giant firm can delay, and consider the effect of changes in marketing strategy on other units in its system.

The independent fabricator, in short, functions as the competitive institutional system intends that he function: he is forced to greater efficiency, without delay, and without reservations, because he must so react in order to survive. But the giant firms fail to transmit the competitive signals in undistorted fashion, because their larger structure determines their reaction. Moreover, they have the resources, because of their size, to resist for long periods of time the competitive pressures that, on smaller firms, would long since have brought a response.

8. The imperviousness of the giant firms to the requisites of the competitive system was clearly illustrated in the gap that appeared between the price of domestic wire rods and the price of imported wire rods during the period 1958–63. Even though wire rods were being imported in rapidly increasing amounts, the integrated steel firms actually raised the domestic price. Only a greater concern for the possible effect of a cut in wire rod prices on the price of wire and other products can explain this behavior, which cost the vertically integrated firms a large share of the noncaptive domestic market for wire rods.

When the prices of wire products coincidentally dropped, the nonintegrated fabricators were driven to secure a minimum amount of foreign wire rods, or perish. It is incontestable, therefore, that the pricing policies of the integrated firms threw a clinker into the functioning of the competitive machine. Independent fabricators unable to get foreign rod would have been forced out of business, and many of them suffered financial difficulties. Prices of products reflected an artificially high level of wire rod prices, until belated competition reduced them. The integrated firms were enabled to draw from the ultimate consumer an excess profit, or subsidy, of earnings on the obsolete and excessive capacity in wire rods.

9. It is easy to see the consequences if the vertically integrated firms are able to further jeopardize the position of the independent fabricators. The big firms will be left in undisputed possession of the field, and will be in a position to dictate the shape and behavior of the wire-rod wire-products price structure. Considerations of long-run corporate policy, rather than the forces of competition, will determine margins, and timing, and amount of price changes. We will have an oligopolistic managed economy. The persistence of the independents is necessary, in the public interest, as the only means—short of regulation of public ownership—of injecting a suitable measure of fluidity into the steel price structure.

The VISTA Volunteer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, during a recent visit to Baltimore, I had the opportunity to view a permanent training center for VISTA volunteers, or the Domestic Peace Corps workers as they are popularly called.

The Baltimore Training Center, which is operated by the University of Maryland School of Social Work under the direction of Dr. Daniel Thursz, is doing a unique and commendable job in training these dedicated volunteers.

When I visited a field training operation, I had the opportunity to meet a volunteer from Phoenix, Ariz., Mrs. Ann Quinn, who was working with needy individuals in a housing project operated by the Baltimore Urban Renewal and Housing Administration. Mrs. Quinn, despite her busy training, still had the incentive to do some creative writing. For the benefit of my colleagues, I would like to insert three poems composed by Mrs. Quinn which are indicative of both the spirit and sensitivity of our VISTA volunteer:

THE VISTA VOLUNTEER

We will go where we're needed
(When others pass by.)
Where roads have been rough
And hills have been high—

We will go with compassion
To those who are lost
To help them build bridges
So life's streams may be crossed.

We will go without question
and have love to share
With the sick and the lonely
And they'll know that we care.

Then when we get weary
We'll recall with a sigh—
"But for the frace of my God,
There go I—"

—ANN QUINN.

THE SOCIAL WORKER

If you can look beyond an unclean face
And see the lonely heart that cries within;
If you can understand a mind disturbed—
See the sickness of a soul compelled to sin.

If you can feel compassion for the weak
And never mind what color he may be—
Or where he goes to church, or if he does,
Or whether he can walk, or talk, or see.

If you can love a sick and lonely child
Though that child can never love you in return
If you can still be patient and serene
When you try to teach, and find he cannot learn.

If you can smile, and never show despair
And never judge by monetary worth,
You have a unique mission to fulfill
You are God's special Angel here on earth.

—ANN QUINN.

INNER CITY

I know that I shall never see
A slum as lovely as a tree
With trash and litter everywhere
Left by those who just don't care.
Filthy clothing on a line.
Broken bottles, stench of wine—
Children playing in the street
Where prostitute and pickup meet—
Derelict and addict too
Lonely souls whose friends are few
Form a common melting pot
And there they stay, decay and rot.
Their future's past; they have no hope
Their only friends are wine and dope
God sends beauty when He can.
But slums and such, are made by man.

—ANN QUINN.

Mayor Tom Wilmoth, of Longview, Tex.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, one of the most outstanding and public spirited men of Longview, Tex., is its new mayor, Hon. Tom Wilmoth. I have known Mr. Tom many years. He has done much good for his city, his area, and countless individuals. I wish him the very best as the new mayor of Longview, Tex.

SALUTE TO MR. TOM

An announcement of the election of Tom Wilmoth as mayor of Longview, was hailed with enthusiasm throughout the community and received with interest by the area.

Mr. Wilmoth is a man of unusual ability, integrity, honor and honesty. From the standpoint of business and character, he is solid and substantial.

Quiet and unassuming, this fine citizen is a dedicated worker in the vineyard of progress. Calm under pressure, he is highly respected for the thoroughness with which he weighs all problems and invariably comes up with the proper solution. His sound judgment has been an important factor in the tremendous growth Longview has enjoyed during the time he has served on the city commission since 1956.

Mr. Wilmoth has the confidence of his fellow members of the commission and the public. He has earned that confidence by his broad knowledge and forthright dealings and by his ability and performance, both as a municipal official and a citizen.

Father of two sons, Roy and Dan Wilmoth, and a daughter, Mrs. Glen (Bettie Jo) McNeill, the veteran city executive is a member of the First Baptist Church and the Rotary Club and has consistently been identified with Longview's progress, industrially and otherwise.

Mr. Wilmoth was born in Lowell, Ark., on January 31, 1890. When he was a year old his parents moved to Tuskahoma, Okla., capital of the Choctaw Nation. He lived there until 1919, and it was there he married Miss Pearl Overby. The two sons were born in Tuskahoma.

The Wilmoth family moved to Rogers, Ark., and remained in that city 3 years before establishing their residence in Camden in 1921. During the 10 years he was in Camden, Mr. Wilmoth was a member of the city council 4½ years. He came to Longview in 1931 and has been in the construction business since that time. His scope of operations has covered northeast Texas, with some large contracts, mostly commercial buildings, outside the State. Associated with him on some of his big jobs has been one or both of his sons, each of whom decided to follow him in the building business.

Tom Wilmoth is a man of courage and conviction. While delegating responsibility he asks for accountability. He is highly qualified as an executive and administrator, as is demonstrated by the success he has enjoyed in several fields of endeavor.

We are proud to have had Tom Wilmoth as a friend during the last three decades. He ha proved to be a stalwart citizen in contributing in every way possible to the continued growth of his city. Progress has always been foremost in his mind. It is ingrained in him. Both as an individual and a member of the city commission, he has worked tirelessly for the upbuilding of his community. It has been our privilege to have had him as a coworker in numerous industrial campaigns and other programs that have been very beneficial to the city and area.

It is encouraging to see the leadership of our city government pass from the capable hands of E. K. Bennett, who has served us well as mayor, to another able leader, Tom Wilmoth.

It is with great pleasure, "Mr. Tom," that we join with your legion of friends throughout Longview and the Southwest in commending you and congratulating you on being elected to the city's highest and most important office. It is a fine honor, and we are happy and proud it has been bestowed upon you as a reward which you so richly deserve.

We predict that Longview will continue to move forward at a stepped-up pace during your administration. You have the assurance of our fullest cooperation, and in making that promise, we are confident we bespeak the attitude of the majority of the citizenry.

—CARL L. ESTES.

Herbert J. Miller, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, every so often our Government is greatly benefited by the fact that a young man agrees to serve in an appointed capacity and brings with him new ideas, courage, and a will to get the job done. Such a man was Mr. Herbert J. Miller, Jr., better known to his friends as "Jack" Miller who served as Assistant Attorney General and headed the Criminal Division of the Justice Department. But, the sands of time drift on, and these men go with it to greater things.

I do not believe that Jack Miller could receive a nicer tribute to the work he has done than the editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star for April 27. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include this editorial, join with his many friends in wishing him the best of luck in his return to private law practice, and to commend him publicly for a job well done.

WALL OF SILENCE

Much of the strength of organized rackets rests in the assurance that "nobody talks." In the hierarchy or crime, it is seldom the men at the top who fall into the hands of the police. Their underlings, however, frequently do. The testimony of these minor, often less culpable, criminals—if they could be persuaded to give it—offers a primary hope of reaching and prosecuting the bosses.

Means of compelling this type of testimony is a major goal of the commendable new anticrime bill the Justice Department will soon send Congress. In essence, the Department is seeking the right to grant immunity in return for such testimony in certain selective cases. A guarantee of immunity from prosecution, on the one hand, would remove the grounds for a fifth amendment plea against self-incrimination. And beyond that, under the proposal, criminals who refused to testify, or who lied, would be subject to contempt of court or to perjury charges.

Grants of immunity already are authorized in limited areas by existing law. They are too limited, however, to be effective in more than a fraction of the Government's drives against organized crime.

The development of the new immunity bill was a fitting final act by Herbert J. Miller, Jr., who has just returned to private law practice after 4 years of exemplary service as head of the Justice Department's Criminal Division. During the tenure of Mr. Miller, who incidentally was one of the first Republicans tapped by President Kennedy for high office in 1961, the annual number of racketeer convictions by the Federal Government increased by an incredible 1,000 percent. His participation in the continuing Federal anticrime war will be sorely missed.

Tour Booth Jobs Urged for Retired

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. RACE
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. RACE. Mr. Speaker, various committees of Congress have conducted, in the past, extensive studies on problems of our senior citizens. One recurring problem that besets our elderly citizens when they no longer have their jobs to attend to, and families to raise, is one of idleness—a sense of not being needed.

This distress is no stranger to my elderly friends in my hometown of Fond du Lac, Wis. But, Mr. Speaker, a group of these solid senior citizens formed a new community service organization known as the Voyageur Club.

The twofold aim of this club is to put retired people back to work and to promote area tourist attractions by providing information and service tc travelers.

Of side interest to my colleagues will be one of the Voyageur objectives of promoting the Ice Age Scientific Reserve, authorized by the last Congress to be part of the national park system.

In the belief that this group deserves national recognition, and also that my colleagues would find the idea of this organization useful to groups in their own districts, I am pleased to insert in the RECORD a recent report in the Milwaukee Journal on the Voyageur Club:

TOUR BOOTH JOBS URGED FOR RETIRED

FOND DU LAC, WIS.—A new group here would like to put retired people back to work operating tourist information booths. A retired Fond du Lac man said the idea was tested successfully last summer and he thinks persons over 65 are particularly suited to the job. Victor Broome, 67, is secretary of Voyageur, a travel service which is in the process of becoming incorporated.

Members include numerous area business and professional men, Representative RACE, Democrat, of Wisconsin, and a representative of the Fond du Lac County Board.

TO PROMOTE FOREST

The group hopes to promote the Kettle Moraine State Forest and the Lake Winnebago area as tourist attractions. In the process they hope to spawn the tourist information bureaus staffed by retired persons who would like to perform some work.

Broome said that until last year there was no tourist information service for the jam of vacationers who passed through here along Highway 41 bound for the northern woods.

To prove the need and the ability of retired people as person-to-person salesmen, he set up his own experimental booth last August in a drive-in restaurant on Highway 41 here. Edward Patterson, operator of the Dog 'N Suds Restaurant, provided the facilities and enthusiastic support.

INQUIRIES PLENTIFUL

Although Broome tried to plug such nearby attractions as the Kettle Moraine Forest, he helped plan trips as far north as Canada.

Broome said that in the 3 weeks the service was operated "inquiries ran so high there just couldn't be any question the service was needed."

Also convinced were area business and professional people who helped organize the Voyageur group last November.

This year the service will open at the drive-in May 1, staffed by three retired persons who will work in shifts. Broome also hopes to sell souvenirs produced locally by other retired persons.

Broome said a main concern of the Voyageur group was the Kettle Moraine State Forest, destined to become part of a national scientific reserve. It appears, he said, the area will not be able to handle the increasing influx of tourists.

Exploring the problem, Broome recently interviewed officials of the Everglades National Park in Florida about accommodations for visitors.

Broome said he was amazed at the large part private enterprise had played in development of park facilities, notably motels and concessions. The Voyageur group hopes for private investment in campgrounds, motels, and other tourist services in the Kettle Moraine area.

Remove Excise Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES A. BURKE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Harry P. Harwich, the publisher of the Dorchester Argus-Citizen, Hyde Park Tribune, Mattapan Tribune, Jamaica Plain Citizen, New Boston Citizen, and the Milton Record-Transcript is one of the most outstanding citizens of the Hyde Park-Milton area of my district and readers of these newspapers look forward to his own personal comment on various topics which appear weekly. On April 22, 1965, he selected excise tax revision and elimination as his editorial and it appeared in all the above-mentioned newspapers. I believe it is a most informative and well-written article which I include below for my colleagues' review.

The subject of the reduction and eventual elimination of the excise tax on communication services is one I and a great many of my constituents are concerned about. This tax affects 151,637 telephone customers in my congressional district and elimination would mean a direct savings to them of $2,341,733.

Telephone excise tax hits hardest at low-income levels. Bureau of Census figures for 1960 show that of households with telephones, 20 percent—or approximately 7,800,000—had incomes of less than $3,000 per year; 53 perecent—or approximately 21 million—had incomes of less than $6,000 per year. Only 41 percent—or approximately 5,500,000—had incomes of $10,000 and more per year. Statistics reflect that the telephone excise tax takes a higher percentage of any income before taxes than any other excise tax in the families with incomes of less than $4,000.

I have introduced H.R. 6734 to provide for the gradual reduction and eventual elimination of the tax on telephone services. This measure was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means and it is expected that executive sessions should take place sometime during mid-May. Extensive hearings were held during the 2d session of the 88th Congress.

Following is the editorial by Mr. Harwich:

REMOVE EXCISE TAX ON TELEPHONE BILLS
(By Harry P. Harwich)

There isn't a red-blooded person in this great country—from Maine to California or Washington to Florida—who is not thoroughly convinced of the merits of that tongue-in-check adage, "Nothing is more certain than death and taxes." But, as is fitting of a red-blooded American, there isn't a citizen to be found who does not rally to fight unjust taxation as our forefathers once did.

The excise tax which is levied on our telephone bills is one such "unjust tax." Because it is in this category the phone tax is, with each passing year, being subjected to ever-increasing attack by Mr. and Mrs. John Q. Public.

One does not have to search very deeply to discover the prime reason for such severe objection of the added tax burden of the excise tax on telephone service. Basically, it is due to the fact that the telephone is the only household necessity which is so maligned by the Federal tax structure. Electricity, gas, and water—the other three household necessities—are all free from the burden of an excise tax. This, we agree, is as it should be, for such utilities are a most integral part of our American way of life.

Why, then, should the telephone subscriber be crushed with the highly discriminatory excise tax? Why, also, is the inflationary tax of 10 percent of the fixed telephone service charge hanging over the already overtaxed heads of the people?

To answer these questions one must understand the history of the telephone excise tax.

To begin with, the telephone service tax is essentially a wartime tax which was instituted at a crucial time and devised to raise necessary funds as well as to curtail the use of the telephone during such emergency periods.

The first Federal excise tax on telephone service dates back to World War I when an additional charge was levied against long distance calls. This law was repealed in 1924.

In 1932 Congress saw fit to reinstitute the telephone excise tax on long distance calls to help defray the cost of public works and other Government programs during the depression years. From that day to this the excise tax has been with us.

The charge has undergone a face lifting at various times. In 1941 local calls were subject to the additional tax at 15 percent and long distance calls at 25 percent. Fifteen years later, 1954, the tax was altered to 10 percent on all calls and it has remained at this level since.

Congressional records bear out the fact that the telephone excise tax was intended to be a temporary thing. But, like the poor relation, it has overstayed its welcome as far as the public is concerned.

For all intent and purpose, the telephone is grouped in the same category as such nonessential items as furs, jewelry, cosmetics, diamond stickpins, mink stoles, lipsticks, etc. The aforementioned are all wonderful things—but, every one of us can get by without them. Does the same hold true for the telephone?

Imagine the unexplained necessity of a telephone at the time of family illness. Think of the trust you must place in this household essential when a crisis arises within the home. Reflect on the indispensability of this utility in a thousand and one instances. Now, is the telephone as much a necessity as your electricity, gas, and water? Is it a luxury which you and I can well live without?

There is no question as to the unjust and unwarranted, discriminatory, and discouraging aspects of the excise tax which weighs like an albatross on the neck of every subscriber in the United States whether doctor, lawyer, or Indian chief—housewife, cleric, or business tycoon.

The abolition of this tax, which poured some $1 billion into the U.S. Treasury coffers in 1964, would bring a $14 per year saving to the average telephone customer. Each year the people have been balked by the wait-till-next-year pitch—and each year the people become a little more restless than the year before.

The sand has just about run out of the timeglass as far as the telephone excise tax is concerned. Now is the time for you, and you, and you, to stand up and be counted in our ranks as being opposed to this unjust taxation.

What can you do? Join us in writing to your Congressman and Senator, as well as President Johnson, and voice opposition to the telephone excise and support for its revocation. The telephone users have more than carried their share of the load in this levy, which was designed to lift a country in distressing times.

America is in a bounding, bursting, and bountiful era—the Great Society—and the shackles of a wartime tax such as the telephone excise should be removed from Mr. and Mrs. John Q. Public.

A Bill To Aid State and Local Law Enforcement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY H. McVICKER
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, one of our Nation's most important problems is the prodigious increase in its crime rate. The President pointed out in his message on crime to the Congress that since 1940 the crime rate in this country has doubled. Since 1958 it has increased five times as fast as our population.

Measures designed to aid in stemming the increase in crime have recently been passed or proposed in the Congress. Our efforts in combating poverty and in improving education, health, housing, and recreation will contribute greatly to eliminating the causes of criminal activity.

The crime problem will require long-range planning, but it is also a matter of immediate concern. We must act to combat the present threats to the security of our homes and places of business.

Although crime is a matter of grave national concern which deserves the best effort of the Federal Government, the principal enforcement responsibility still rests on State and local governments. That burden is great and becoming heavier. The cost of operating our police departments has risen by 50 percent in the last 5 years alone.

For some years, the Federal Government has been providing valuable assistance to local law-enforcement agencies. The FBI assist them with training activities and the FBI National Academy in Washington gives comprehensive instructions to State and local career law-enforcement officers yearly. The Federal Government also provides support for short-term vocational training for police officers and more extensive training in related fields through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Treasury Department provides instruction for narcotics enforcement personnel through the Bureau of Narcotics Training School.

These have been highly successful programs, but additional efforts are a necessity. We must provide additional assistance in training State and local law enforcement officers, and we must improve capabilities, techniques, and practices in the prevention and control of crime. To this end, I am today introducing for appropriate reference a bill

designed to bolster present training programs.

The need for State and local law-enforcement training programs has long been recognized in my State of Colorado. In 1962, Mr. A. S. (Tony) Reeder, at the request of Gov. Steven McNichols, formed a committee of three chiefs of police, three sheriffs, and the administrative head of the Colorado State Patrol. The committee decided to divide the State into eight areas and to hold open hearings to which local chiefs of police, marshals, sheriffs, city councilmen, county commissioners, city managers, and other interested parties would be invited.

Investigations were conducted concerning which of the following were most urgently needed to upgrade law enforcement in Colorado—the establishment of a State central police records bureau, a State police identification bureau, or a State crime laboratory. As a result of these eight meetings and the correlation of information that had been obtained, it was agreed that the most urgent need of law-enforcement facilities in our State was a law-enforcement training program.

Maj. Gen. Joe Moffett, of the Colorado National Guard, suggested the plan of combining a Colorado law enforcement training academy with the new National Guard complex that was proposed for Camp George West near Golden, Colo. The committee agreed that this was the most feasible plan. They estimated the cost constructing and equipping the law-enforcement academy at $313,000.

The committee proposed that the academy would house the Colorado State Patrol training facility and would afford a basic training, inservice, and administrative and specialized training to all municipal, county, and State law-enforcement officers in the State.

A questionnaire was then sent to all law enforcement administrators in the State. Fifty-three county sheriffs out of sixty-three reported that they would support and use the academy facilities. Of 151 city chiefs of police and marshals, 91 reported that they definitely would use the academy and 28 reported that they would use it when sufficient financial reserve could be obtained, either from local government or from State or Federal Government. These results represent a definite commitment from 2,441 full-time male officers, 130 full-time female personnel, and 1,691 Reserve and auxiliary officers.

There is at present a bill before the Colorado House of Representatives which would provide for the establishment of a training academy along the lines proposed by the committee. This bill has previously been approved by the State senate. There is, however, the problem of how sufficient funds can be secured to implement such a bill.

Recent speeches in the Congress have emphasized how education, health, welfare, and other endeavors have caused State expenditures to rise at a phenomenal rate, causing State finances to be strained enormously. In my own State of Colorado, the property tax, which is the State's primary basis for local and county financing has reached the point of regressiveness and is a major burden to orderly local government and a detriment to economic growth. Yet the need for a training program for our police and sheriffs is an absolute necessity in my State as it is in many States.

The bill I am introducing would provide for the assistance to the States or local agencies to establish programs and facilities giving professional training and education to law enforcement personnel toward the end of increasing the security of persons and property and to promote respect for the law.

I trust that with the assistance given in this bill and the incentive that will be provided by its enactment, for my own State as well as the other States throughout the Union, will provide a training facility for law enforcement personnel that is necessary to increase safety in our streets and security in our homes and places of business.

Governor Shivers Stresses Potential at Marshall Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the RECORD a report of a speech by former Governor Shivers in Marshall, Tex. Governor Shivers emphasizes the great future this area of Texas has. I fully concur with him and commend him on his interest and his efforts to help the great east Texas area.

The article from the Longview, Tex., Daily News, follows:

SHIVERS STRESSES POTENTIAL GROWTH AT MARSHALL DINNER

(By Sam Paris)

MARSHALL.—"This area of the State has the greatest potential for growth of any section of Texas," former Texas Governor Allan Shivers told a capacity crowd at the 1965 Marshall Chamber of Commerce banquet here Tuesday evening, "and all you have to do is continue to distinguish between selflessness and selfishness for the future to be even brighter than most predict."

Shivers, attending the annual chamber banquet in company with his wife, spent the afternoon preceding the dinner in social relationship with numerous local citizens and also played golf. He arrived at the rooftop dining room of Hotel Marshall with a healthy glow imprinted on his forehead by a warm east Texas sun.

"I personally think that the future growth of Texas lies in the eastern part of the State, here where you have the water and natural resources with which to build.

"I want to help this area, including Marshall and Harrison County, not only because I have made investments here but simply to see an area with such abundance prosper and grow," the former Governor continued.

"I believe firmly that this area will grow with the people here tonight—who have accomplished so much during the past year—working for the progress of the city."

Shivers said leaders in his hometown of Woodville have been "trying to do the same thing you have been doing, and towns up and down Texas and Louisiana have been changing the basis of their economies.

"When I was growing up, cattle and cotton were the backbone of our economy in the State, and then we all remember when oil became the prime basis of economy. In the future, with such work as done by men here tonight, I predict that the population of Marshall and Harrison County will double by 1975."

The speaker digressed from his look into the future to state that the freedom of the individual outweighs the rights of property. He said that in actuality property has no rights but "people have many rights, and without those rights there would be no property from which the individual could create wealth." He related an incident in Austin where a purported leader stated that people making "all of the money shouldn't be spending it for cars and cigarettes and other things but should turn it over as taxes to the Government because the Government can spend it best."

"I, for one, like to see people do well," he stated.

Shivers interspersed a personal tribute to Miss Margie E. Neal, of Carthage, former State senator, on her 91st birthday in the near future." And Miss Neal promptly replied that she "would be 90 on my next birthday, not 91." Miss Neal was the first woman to serve in the Texas senate.

Shivers also paid special and warm tribute to District Judge Sam Hall, Sr., and Mrs. Hall, who attended the dinner meeting to see their son Sam Hall, Jr., relinquish the chamber presidency to Max Lale, local resident and staff assistant in plant relations at Thiokol Chemical Corp.

Shivers' comments were augmented by the answers he gave to newsmen during a press conference preceding the dinner.

On school affairs in the State, he stated that he believes that the movement to increase teachers' pay will be successful this year, but that he could not favor either bill now under consideration. Instead, he said, he likes features of both bills. He said the governor's bill and the bill backed by the Texas Teachers Association could be blended to give both an immediate raise across the board and also include a provision which Gov. John Connally has advocated, calling for a gradual scale of salary increases during the next 10 years.

Shivers congratulated area leaders on the development of navigation districts during the past few weeks "because those plans lead to more communication and much more speed is needed in this day and time."

The former Governor also placed his stamp of approval on recent legislation creating oil property pooling under law. He said pooling regulations will benefit small landowners and at the same time give incentive to producers and drillers in their development of new oil fields in what is known as town-lot areas.

On reapportionment, Shivers stated that he hopes the State legislature will solve the problem and not permit congress to enter the troubled field.

Shivers ended the news conference with his opinion surrounding the war in South Vietnam. He insisted that America must choose a course which will not permit a retreat in the face of communism. He said this Nation must continue to confront Red China and the Soviets in any eventuality.

The Research Spectrum

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, pinpointing Pittsburgh research as the key

to tomorrow, I call the attention of the House to another chapter in the story as published by the Regional Industrial Development Corp. of southwestern Pennsylvania.

Today's articles cover the research spectrum and materials.

THE RESEARCH SPECTRUM

A decided advantage to the establishment of new industries is the diversity of the Pittsburgh area's research and development efforts.

Pittsburgh research laboratories are especially strong in the materials, nucleonics, chemicals, electronics, and instruments fields, but they also are engaged in a variety of other R. & D. activities.

Many of the larger companies—such as Westinghouse Electric Corp., United States Steel Corp., and Gulf Research & Development Co.—are active in almost all the principal fields. More often, however, the research and development efforts are more specialized—tailored to a company's product line in a single field or two.

Pittsburgh's three major universities—and Mellon Institute—conduct research in most of the disciplines. Although much of this work is of a basic nature, many of the programs have applications that merit industrial scrutiny.

This section discusses some of the principal R. & D. areas, major laboratories, specialized equipment, interesting projects, and significant results of Pittsburgh's scientific and technical efforts.

The description is far from complete, but serves merely to illustrate the nature, growth, and direction of research and development in the nine-county area. More detailed information about each company's R. & D. activities can be found in the research directory on pages 33 to 47.

MATERIALS

Historically, Pittsburgh has been a materials center. More new materials and processing techniques have been developed in the area than in any other section of the United States.

Although the region's research and development activities have been broadened considerably, new and better materials and processes still command the largest volume of R. & D. efforts.

These activities range from research in such traditional areas as steel, aluminum, coal, refractories, ceramics, and glass, to pioneering work in alloys, nuclear fuels, and exotic materials.

Basic studies into the nature of metals and alloys are conducted at Mellon Institute, Carnegie Institute of Technology, and University of Pittsburgh, as well as industrial laboratories.

On the applied research scene, Allegheny Ludlum Steel Corp. is improving upon its vacuum melting technique breakthrough; MSA Research Corp. is experimenting with new liquid metals; and Universal-Cyclops Steel Corp. is studying ways to fabricate refractory metals in an inert atmosphere.

Semi-Elements, Inc., is developing single crystals of metals; Harbison-Walker Refractories Co. is working on extremely high temperature refractories; Magnetics, Inc., is producing new magnetic materials; Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co. is exploring deep-diving structures made of glass; and Nuclear Materials & Equipment Corp. is perfecting new nuclear fuel materials.

Some of the most diversified materials research is being carried on at companies primarily in other fields, such as Westinghouse Electric Corp., which is involved in semiconductor, nuclear fuel, and other advanced materials research.

The largest and most numerous Pittsburgh materials laboratories are engaged in metals and alloys research. Among the extensive metallurgical facilities in the area are those of United States Steel Corp., Aluminum Co. of America, Allegheny Ludlum Steel Corp., Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., Latrobe Steel Co., Crucible Steel Co. of America, Dravo Corp., Blaw-Knox Co., Vanadium-Alloys Steel Co., Universal-Cyclops Steel Corp., St. Joseph Lead Co., Pittsburgh-Des Moines Steel Co., Firth Sterling, Inc., MSA Research Corp., and Copperweld Steel Co.

The Pittsburgh area also has a heavy R. & D. concentration in refractories, ceramics, and glass. Some of the better known facilities are the Carborundum Co., Harbison-Walker Refractories Co., McDanel Refractory Porcelain Co., Du-Co Ceramics Co., Findlay Refractories Co., Kennametal, Inc., O. Hommel Co., Saxonburg Ceramics, Inc., Nuclear Materials & Equipment Corp., Pittsburgh Corning Corp., Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., American Optical Co., and American Glass Research, Inc.

All aspects of coal technology are explored at the Bureau of Mines, Consolidation Coal Co., Bituminous Coal Research, Inc., Koppers Co., United States Steel Corp., and Pittsburgh Chemical Co.

Improved polymers and coatings are R. & D. objectives at such companies as Pennsylvania Industrial Chemical Corp., H. H. Robertson Co., Koppers Co., Mobil Finishes Co., Mobay Chemical Co., Neville Chemical Co., Thompson & Co., Watson-Standard Co., and Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co.

Victory Memorial Hospital in Brooklyn Continues To Provide Unexcelled Services After 60 years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, for many years the Bay Ridge community in Brooklyn has been considered one of the most underhospitalized areas in the city.

One of the leaders in the struggle against sickness and suffering has been Victory Memorial Hospital, Bay Ridge's only nonprofit, voluntary hospital. This magnificent institution has proven effective and compassionate medical care for the sick and needy, of all races and creeds, for over 60 years. Founded in 1904, Victory Memorial today serves well over 5,000 patients each year, and the quality of medicine and surgery practiced in the hospital is unexcelled anywhere.

Throughout its history, Victory has responded to the call for expanded facilities in the community and its new 62-bed wing which opened in 1962 has been the key factor in enabling the hospital to meet the mounting demands for medical care in Bay Ridge. The importance of this new facility is reflected in the fact that in 1961 Victory Memorial admitted 3,186 patients. By 1964 this figure increased by 70 percent.

Significantly, Victory Memorial also is providing a major medical service for the residents of Staten Island, now that the Verazano Bridge has linked that borough with Brooklyn. Scores of emergency as well as routine cases have been brought to the hospital from Staten Island, and in general, Victory is providing valuable assistance to a neighboring county.

Last month, at the hospital's annual meeting of the board of trustees, George A. Aliano, an attorney and distinguished civic leader, was elected to an unprecedented 16th consecutive 1-year term as president of Victory Memorial. As a result of his dedicated efforts and the close cooperation of the entire board and the professional and nonprofessional staffs, the hospital has witnessed steady and healthy growth over the past several years.

I think it is noteworthy to point out that Victory's west wing was dedicated to the 134 south Brooklyn men killed in action in World War I and that the east wing was dedicated in memory of those servicemen from Bay Ridge who gave their lives during World War II and the Korean conflict.

It is in the name of these heroic men that Victory Memorial carries on its humane and essential programs in the unceasing war against disease and travail.

Harry Truman, Man of Decision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Cleveland Plain Dealer of April 13, 1965, carried an editorial tribute to Harry S. Truman which rates with the best ever written about the great man from Independence, Mo.

The theme of this editorial is that Former President Truman grows in stature with the passage of time because his decisions in the years of world crisis immediately following World War II have taken on added luster under the test of time. Few leaders have been fully appreciated during their lifetime and many have been maligned by the second guessers of history. But the swift passage of events, trying the mettle and courage of free people everywhere in our world, have adequately justified the Truman years in little more than a decade.

Under leave previously granted, I insert in the RECORD, the editorial:

HARRY TRUMAN, MAN OF DECISION

As time passes and as we see the recent past in fuller perspective, former President Harry S. Truman grows in stature.

We realize that Mr. Truman built the very foundations of America's new, powerful foreign policy after World War II, and mobilized all the free world behind it.

Tonight Mr. Truman will go to the Waldorf-Astoria in New York City. There Freedom House will present to him its Freedom Award on the 20th anniversary of his first day in the Presidency.

It will be a reunion for the doughty Missourian. Most of his last Cabinet will be there. So will many men who played important parts in the dramatic and momentous years, 1945 to 1952, when Mr. Truman and they were together winning a war, rebuilding a world and trying to find paths to permanent peace.

No President since Mr. Truman has made more than minor changes in the foreign policy for which he took full responsibility. The Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan, the Berlin airlift, the Korean intervention, the revival of war-stricken nations—these are still the chief girders of America's free world leadership.

On each of these policies Mr. Truman made the final decisions. So he did on dropping the nuclear bomb, too.

He consulted others, but in the end, on the lonely spot of the ultimate decisionmaker, he stuck to his resolute policy: "The buck stops here."

The late Cleveland mayor, Tom L. Johnson, once said with rueful humor: "A good executive is one who can make decisions, and is sometimes right."

Mr. Truman made some of the most crucial decisions any President, and any man in world history, has had to make. And we honor him because he was right so much of the time.

Vietnam Comments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 15, 1965

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the New York Herald Tribune has once again contributed distinguished reporting and thoughtful, sober comment on the Vietnam situation. On April 18, Barnard L. Collier filed a story from Johnson City, Tex., which vividly describes the President's delivery to the press of his Easter message, and the following day the Herald Tribune commented on the situation editorially. Under leave to revise and extend my remarks, I include these two articles:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 19, 1965]

BRICKBATS THROUGH THE WINDOW

The United States, in President Johnson's words, "tried to open a window to peace." But the Communists responded, much as Communist-inspired mobs have responded to American overtures, by heaving brickbats through the window. On the very day that Mr. Johnson was repeating his offer of unconditional negotiations, the Soviet Union announced that Mr. Johnson "does not seek to explore avenues leading to a peaceful solution of the Vietnamese problem."

What are those avenues? The Communists of Red China, North Vietnam and the Soviet Union know only a single avenue: one which leads the United States out of Vietnam. And that avenue, Mr. Johnson has again and again made plain, the United State will not tread—until a peaceful solution is reached.

In other words, the Communists do not want unconditional negotiations but unconditional surrender of the Saigon government. The United States, for its part, cannot sacrifice the people who have been fighting on against the imported revolt that is intended to bring about the end of their independence. Once that independence is assured, the United States is prepared to leave South Vietnam.

The Soviet communique, after the Moscow talks between the Russians and the North Vietnamese, leaves the suspicion that the Soviet Union will take a hand in escalating the war. The reference to Soviet "volunteers," while veiled and "iffy," could imply that Soviet troops will man Soviet antiaircraft missiles in North Vietnam, since sites for such weapons are apparently under preparation. On the other hand, the communique can be interpreted to be a threat, a warning, that may or may not be implemented.

But what the Soviet communique clearly is not is an affirmative answer to President Johnson's offer to negotiate. Until such an answer is forthcoming, the more or less well-intentioned Americans who have been demonstrating against their country's policy in Vietnam as a threat to peace are delivering their message to the wrong address.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Apr. 8, 1965]

JOHNSON RENEWS VIET PLEDGE: ALWAYS READY FOR PEACE TALKS BUT "NO POWER CAN FORCE US OUT"

(By Barnard L. Collier)

JOHNSON CITY, TEX.—In a somber Easter message, President Johnson warned yesterday that "no human power is capable of forcing us from Vietnam." But he still held out the offer of unconditional peace talks with the Communists "next week, tomorrow, or tonight."

After the President spoke, the Soviet Union announced that it will permit Russian "volunteers" to fight in Vietnam if "U.S. aggression against the Democratic Republic of (North) Vietnam is intensified" and if Hanoi requests such aid. The Moscow statement charged that the United States is "extending aggression and does not seek to explore avenues leading to a peaceful solution."

The Soviet announcement in a Soviet-North Vietnamese communique, appeared not to have been in response to the President's statement.

The President spoke from the porch of the LBJ Ranch. He was as serious as reporters have seen him in months.

"If the price of victory in Vietnam is blood and men, we are willing to pay that price," he declared.

"They want no talk with us," he said grimly, summing up Communist reaction so far to his April 7 peace talk proposals. "But our offer stands. The window to peace is still open."

In an implied appeal to America's allies and to neutrals to press for peace talks, he said he hoped that "a mounting crescendo of world opinion, weary of war, opposed to aggression, will finally find a way to reach the ears of those now deaf to calls for peace."

Hours earlier, U.S. planes had lashed highways and a railroad in North Vietnam for the second straight day—and South Vietnamese planes dropped 100,000 leaflets carrying the President's April 7 peace talk proposals and his picture on the North Vietnamese city of Dong Hoi.

The Moscow communique, issued after talks between North Vietnamese Communist party secretary Le Kuan and Soviet officials, said Russia would "continue rendering all necessary assistance" to the North Vietnamese against United States aggression. A Soviet antiaircraft missile site is reported under construction near Hanoi, Russians are in the country and high-altitude surface-to-air (SAM) missiles are believed on the way.

Moscow has spoken previously of "many volunteers"—a Communist euphemism for trained troops—anxious to fight in Vietnam but gave no indication whether they would be permitted to go. The new announcement—with the provisos that the United States intensifies the war and North Vietnam asks for the help—was the furthest the Soviets have gone on the "volunteer" question.

The communique specifically scoffed at the President's April 7 speech as showing that "the United States is still keeping a course for the extension of acts of aggression and does not seek to explore avenues leading to a peaceful solution of the Vietnamese problem."

In Washington, Secretary of State Dean Rusk announced that the United States had "thought long and soberly" about suspending the raids on North Vietnam that began February 7 but had concluded that such action "would only encourage the aggressor and dishearten our friends."

Prime Ministers Lester Pearson of Canada and Lal Bahadur Shastri of India, among others, have suggested that the North Vietnamese might respond by relaxing their guerrilla war if the raids were suspended. But Mr. Rusk, in a statement, said that "we have tried publicly and privately to find out if this would be the result, and there has been no response."

President Johnson in his message expressed regret "that the necessities of war have forced us to bomb North Vietnam." But he emphasized that the raids have been directed at military and strategic targets, "at concrete and steel and not human life."

"I understand the feelings of those who regret that we must undertake air attacks," Mr. Johnson said. "I share those feelings.

"But the compassion of this country, and the world, must go out to the men, women and children who are killed and crippled by the Vietcong every day in South Vietnam. The outrage of this country, and the world, must be visited on those who explode their bombs in cities and villages, ripping the bodies of the helpless."

He added soberly:

"Let us remember that the people of South Vietnam, and the Americans who share their struggle, suffer because they are attacked—not because they are attackers."

The President, who was flanked by Mrs. Johnson and Defense Secretary Robert McNamara, began his message by saying: "This has been a week of tragedy, disappointment and progress."

"On this, of all weekends, we must feel a deep sadness that men must still die and families still be left homeless in the brutality of war," he said. He expressed sorrow for the death of Joseph W. Grainger, the U.S. aid official whose murder by his Vietcong captors was disclosed last week, and for "all the others, on both sides, who found this week to be their last."

A strong theme of the message was the President's expressed disappointment—at the rejection of his April 7 proposal for unconditional peace talks on Vietnam, at the continued loss of American and Vietnamese lives and at the angry censure, in some parts of the world and among some Americans, of his orders to bomb North Vietnam.

The April 7 proposals have been denounced by Hanoi, Peiping and Moscow. Red China and North Vietnam also turned down visits to their capitals by former British Foreign Secretary Patrick Gordon Walker, on a diplomatic sounding mission, and indicated to United Nations Secretary General U Thant that visits by Mr. Thant would serve little purpose.

"We tried to open a window to peace," Mr. Johnson said, "only to be met with tired names and slogans—and a refusal to talk.

"They want no talks with us—no talk with a distinguished Briton—and no talk with the United Nations. They want no talk at all—so far. But our offer stands. We mean every word of it.

"The window to peace is still open. We are still ready for unconditional discussion. We will impose no conditions, of any kind, on any government willing to talk. Nor will we accept any. On this basis we are ready to begin discussion next week, tomorrow or tonight."

Mr. Johnson ended on a dead-serious note. "It is not easy to engage in a struggle whose beginning is obscure and whose end is not

in sight," he said. "Peace, like war, requires patience and the courage to go on despite discouragement.

"Yet we must go on. For there is a world to lose, a world of peace, of order and of expanding promise for all who live therein."

He then murmured "thank you" to the assembled reporters, walked over to put his arm around Mrs. Johnson and kiss her on the forehead and disappeared into the ranchhouse. Reporters could remember no other time when he had not lingered after a formal statement to banter with the press.

Helicopter Service in New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, on January 24 the President's budget message called for an end to Federal subsidies in support of passenger helicopter operations throughout the country. I question whether such immediate withdrawal of support is the wisest move at this point in the development of helicopter service.

To quote a New York Times editorial of February 6:

Any Government subsidy must, of course, be submitted to unremitting review. But it would be most unfortunate and shortsighted to stop the subsidy of helicopter passenger service at this stage. For one thing, the Pan Am heliport itself, because of its great convenience, should encourage an immediate increase in passenger use to make trips to airports in 5 to 10 minutes that might require an hour or more by highway. If, as likely, the proposed new fourth major airport in the area is situated even further away, the helicopter's time advantage will be enhanced.

While the helicopter service would probably be unable to exist this year or next without support, it seems that the great increase in recent years of public support and usage points to a time in the very near future when such service would be able to pay for itself. New York Airways when it started its operations 12 years ago carried approximately 25 passengers daily. Today that figure is up to 1,000 daily. As recently as 1958 subsidies received were 72.9 percent of all revenues received by New York Airways. In 1964 other commercial income had grown so that only 45 percent of all revenues came from Government subsidy. In 1965, this will drop to 34.8 percent and in subsequent years it will fall to 23.6 percent, finally in 1970 to 3.5 percent.

The Civil Aeronautics Board has proposed a plan for ending subsidy which takes account of this attenuating need as well as the requirement of Government economy. This program would gradually phase out aid to the heliports between now and 1970 and offer only the barest subsidy needed to match increasing profits.

I support this plan because I believe it will enable the needed convenience of helicopter service to survive, yet will call for the minimum of Federal funds necessary to do this.

We must remember that we have a large investment in this service. The Federal Government has spent $46.7 million in the past 11 years in fostering the growth of the program. To cut off aid now would be to nip it in the bud and render our previous investment useless. The Civil Aeronautics Board program would call for a small amount of additional funds to complete our investment and would allow that investment to reap the dividend of self-sufficient service that was our original goal and which promises to be an imminent reality.

Partners of Alliance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a recent account of an interesting program undertaken between my own State of Maryland and the State of Rio, Brazil.

Senor Ronald Hees and Senor Durval Goncalves arrived in Maryland on March 20 as representatives of the Partners of Alliance program, jointly sponsored by the State Department and the Agency for International Development. This was a followup to a trip taken to Brazil by three members of the Maryland Partners Committee. These two men from the State of Rio came to assist in the promotion and development of the partners relationship in Maryland and to stimulate interest in the many areas of assistance and exchange in which programs are underway.

Between March 20 and April 3, Senors Hees and Goncalves covered a tremendous amount of territory. They visited various secondary schools, the University of Maryland, several business establishments, and hospitals. They also took a trip to the Eastern Shore and to Westminster, appeared on two Baltimore television programs and attended a dinner given by Gov. J. Millard Tawes.

As a result of their numerous visits, Senor Hees and Senor Goncalves were provided with insights into problems which are acute in Maryland as well as in Rio. The people of Maryland also gained an insight into Rio's problems and responded immediately. For example, after meeting with the two men, students of Canton Junior High School in Baltimore donated a check to the program. The students of the University of Maryland, too, have responded by initiating an exchange under which they are going to attend the University of Rio to undertake a program of improving the level of education and health of slum dwellers. In turn, a school in Rio is being named for Governor Tawes.

These two Brazilian visitors established many valuable contacts so that the Partners of Alliance program will proceed with increased effectiveness. It is evident that an even closer relationship has been cemented between these two great communities.

At this time, I would like to insert into the RECORD two articles from the Baltimore, Md., Sun of March 31, 1965, concrening this program:

RIO PICKS TAWES FOR SCHOOL TITLE

ANNAPOLIS, April 10.—Governor Tawes has been advised that a school is being named for him in the State of Rio de Janeiro.

Rio is a sister State of Maryland in the Partners of Alliance program initiated by the State Department.

Gov. Paulo Torres of the State of Rio advised the Maryland Governor of the honor planned for him. Tawes had given a dinner in Annapolis recently honoring two members of the State of Rio Partners Committee who were visiting Maryland.

Governor Tawes expressed appreciation in a letter to Governor Torres and said he hoped the naming of a Rio school for a Maryland citizen will "help to cement the close relationship" being developed between the two States.

STATE GROUP AIDS BRAZIL—MARYLAND DOLLARS HELP PROVIDE SLUM AREA SCHOOLS

Maryland dollars are helping put slum children in school in the State of Rio in Brazil, a Brazilian visitor said yesterday.

This is one of a number of projects aided by Marylanders in the Partners of Alliance program, sponsored by the Agency for International Development. Maryland is 1 of 20 States which has been linked up with a Latin American counterpart.

At a press conference, Ronald Hees, 33, said the enlargement of one school and the building of another in the slums of Niteroy, the capital of the State of Rio, has enabled many slum children to attend school.

TOTAL OF $1,300 GIVEN

Money to help enlarge the one and help build the other came from the Maryland committee. A total of $1,300 was given.

The chairman of the Maryland committee, appointed by Governor Tawes, is Albert Berney, president of Hamburger's Men Store. Other officers who attended the press conference are Wallace Lanahan, vice chairman, president of Stein Bros. & Boyce, investment bankers; and Julian Stein, secretary, a public relations counsel.

Mr. Stein said that the Maryland help was designed to "help the Brazilians help themselves."

Birthday of Tanzania

SPEECH
OF
HON. BILLIE S. FARNUM
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, exactly 1 year ago today, on April 26, the new African Nations of Tanganyika and Zanzibar embarked upon the enormous task of forging the two countries into a single nation.

To the people of that new nation, Tanzania, and to its President, Mwalimu Julius K. Nyerere, I wish to extend my best wishes for the future, and congratulations for what has been done in 1 year.

All Americans must feel admiration for the daring concepts that were given reality a year ago. Our own history of a

struggle toward a concept which many said could not be attained, makes it obvious to us that this young nation has many trials and tribulations in the days ahead. That it will come through successfully and attain the destiny ordained for a people loving freedom is the hope of all Americans on this day.

Robert Uihlein Receives Milwaukee Press Community Service Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday it was my distinct pleasure to have attended the annual Gridiron Dinner of the Milwaukee Press Club.

On that occasion, the Milwaukee Press Club presented its 1965 award for community service to Mr. Robert A. Uihlein, Jr., president of the Jos. Schlitz Brewing Co.

Mr. Uihlein has richly merited this recognition for his many contributions to the city of Milwaukee and the State of Wisconsin. Among specific civic deeds has been the outstanding support which he, his family, and his firm have given to Milwaukee's proposed Center for the Performing Arts. Further, his sponsorship of the annual Fourth of July parade has made Milwaukee the place to be in the United States on Independence Day.

In addition to the citation presented to Mr. Uihlein, awards were presented to newspaper men and women in the community for outstanding journalistic achievement.

In order to bring the accomplishments of Mr. Uihlein and the members of the Milwaukee press to the attention of my colleagues, I wish to insert in the RECORD at this point excerpts from news stories on the Gridiron dinner which appeared in the Milwaukee Sentinel on Monday, April 26.

UIHLEIN DECLARES "CITY ON THE MOVE"

Milwaukee was described Sunday night as a "community which is really on the move" by Robert A. Uihlein, Jr., president of the Jos. Schlitz Brewing Co. Uihlein made the remarks after receiving the Milwaukee Press Club's 1965 award for community service at the club's ninth annual Gridiron Dinner in the Wisconsin Club.

"I'm very excited about the way Milwaukee is moving these days," Uihlein said. He specifically mentioned the downtown urban renewal underway and new businesses which have started.

"Wisconsin, and more particularly Milwaukee, is on the way to great things. It's fun to be a member of a great community like Milwaukee," he concluded.

Uihlein, 49, was honored for his contributions to sports and cultural activities as well as for his role in the brewing industry. He was cited for his support of the proposed Center for the Performing Arts, to which his firm and family have contributed $1 million; his sponsorship of the city's annual Fourth of July circus parade and fireworks display and numerous other cultural and sporting events.

The dinner, at which events of 1964 were lampooned through song and playlet, was attended by many governmental figures. Included were Governor Knowles, Lieutenant Governor Lucey, Attorney General La Follette, State Treasurer Dena Smith, Representative ZABLOCKI, Democrat, of Milwaukee, Representative DAVIS, Republican, of New Berlin, Mayor Maier, County Executive Doyne; Fred H. Harrington, president of the University of Wisconsin; Associate Justice Thomas Fairchild of the State supreme court and others.

WRITING AWARDS, 10 CATEGORIES

Best newspaper story by a rewrite man, "Wild Bank Robbery," James G. Wieghart, the Sentinel.

Best single news story, reported and written under deadline pressure, "School Boycott," Laurie Van Dyke, the Sentinel.

Best single news story, reported and written without immediate deadline pressure, "Posed as Negro," H. W. Quick, the Sentinel.

Best single story or series on a specialized field of knowledge, including stories on science, business, agriculture, homemaking, art, books, religion, medicine, travel, etc. "The Computer Age," Bob Blackwell, the Sentinel.

Best single feature story, "Expressway Signs," Paul G. Hayes, the Journal.

Best single sports story, "Car Race," Mike Kupper, the Journal.

Best single editorial or editorial cartoon, "Labeling Ludicrousness," Thomas A. Blinkhorn, the Journal.

Best example of continuous reporting on a single subject, in series form or as individual stories, "Public Schools and the Negroes," Ralph Olive, the Journal.

Best single story or series of articles making a contribution to the welfare of the community or State, "Death Rides the Highways," Frank A. Aukofer, the Journal.

Newspaper headline award, based on submission of no more than six headlines with stories attached, Leonard Scheller, the Journal. (The judging took into account how accurately and interestingly the headline summed up the story, plus the writer's versatility.)

PHOTOGRAPHY, FOUR CATEGORIES

Spot news photography, "River Drama," Robert Boyd, the Sentinel.

Documentary photography, "Buck Fever," James Stanfield, the Journal.

Sports photography, "Stock Car Race Crash," Ron Overdahl, West Allis Star.

Feature photography, "Student Requirements," James Stanfield, the Journal.

TV AND RADIO NEWS

Best television spot news, "School Boycott," WITI-TV.

Best television documentary or series, "Our War Babies Go to College," WITI-TV.

Best radio spot news, "Bank Holdup," WOKY radio.

Best radio documentary or series, "Douglas MacArthur Obituary," WTMJ radio.

Best radio-television editorial, "Stand on Police Brutality Charges," WITI-TV.

Brown Bomber Social and Athletic Club of Staten Island, Inc.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. MURPHY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Brown Bomber Social and Athletic Club of Staten Island, New York, N.Y., held their annual dinner on Sunday, April 25, and the proceeds of this dinner will be donated to charitable organizations.

Mr. Christopher Moody was chairman of the dinner and justice of the criminal courts, Alfred J. Cawse, was the recipient of the achievement award given each year to an outstanding citizen for his contributions to the Borough of Richmond. George "Timmy" Allen, senior in McKee High School was the winner of the sports award as Staten Island's outstanding high school basketball player. Councilman Robert G. Lindsay and Justice Frank Paulo, surrogate of Richmond County, were other guests of honor. Borough president, Albert V. Maniscalco, expressed the greetings of the city of New York and introduced me as principal speaker.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my address:

REMARKS OF HON. JOHN M. MURPHY BEFORE THE BROWN BOMBER SOCIAL CLUB, APRIL 25

Ladies and gentlemen, tonight, I want to talk to you briefly about education; but don't get in a panic and start looking for the exits; I'm not here as a professor—a calling, incidentally, that someone once described as getting paid to study the sleeping habits of students—but I do want to leave a few thoughts with you on education as an opportunity and as a challenge.

As you know, only 2 weeks ago President Johnson—once a teacher himself—signed into law the $1.3 billion aid-to-education bill, the greatest single advance in the war on ignorance that this country has ever made. It was an honor and a privilege for me to contribute my vote to the passage of this bill through Congress.

As the President said when he affixed his signature to this historic measure, "It will bring better education to millions of disadvantaged youth who need it most; put the best educational equipment and innovations within reach of all students; advance the technology of teaching and the training of teachers, and provide incentives for those who wish to learn at every stage along the road to learning."

Specifically, the bill is aimed at breaking the cycle of ignorance and poverty by giving special help to children from low-income families. Its main section authorizes the grant of $1.06 billion to the States for the benefit of about 5 million children in families earning under $2,000 a year.

It will provide additional millions to aid school libraries and buy publicly approved textbooks for children in public, private and parochial schools; to start a 5-year program for the establishment of educational and cultural centers such as science laboratories and reading clinics, and to aid educational research and training designed to improve the quality of teaching in grade and high schools.

But let me put it in human terms:

We Americans always pride ourselves on the availability and quality of our public education. For most of us, it is available and it is of good quality. But to hundreds of thousands of families in areas where poverty was and is a bitter reality—and these families and areas know no color line and no State lines—public education often is just barely available and too often of substandard quality.

For instance, recent educational research has shown that alarming numbers of these disadvantaged children are hopelessly behind, scholastically, by the time they struggle into the third or fourth grade. They must have preschool training in order to start on even

terms in the first grade with their more fortunate classmates. But less than half of this country's school districts have kindergartens, and only a hundred or so have public nursery schools.

The aid-to-education bill will fill this urgent need.

Thus, we are on the road to the time when opportunity for education will be a reality for everyone, regardless of color or economic level to the time when no man or woman will be tied to a deadend job, or doomed to a lifetime of idleness and handouts, simply because the door to educational opportunity was locked by circumstances to the time when those in middle life will no longer have to wonder, as millions do now, what they might have accomplished if only they had had a chance.

I think we can now say, with confidence, that the goal of equality of opportunity is in sight. But opportunity alone is not enough to it, we must bring dedication, responsibility and, above all, the surge of challenge.

In fact, I sometimes wonder, in our preoccupation with opportunity, if we have not neglected the qualities that are necessary to take advantage of it.

In the postwar years, hundreds of thousands of veterans, their educational opportunities wiped out by the great economic depression of the nineteen thirties, flocked to college campuses to study under the GI bill of rights. Education was the watchword, the theme of the nineteen forties then, a decade ago, began the industrial revolution brought about by automation, a revolution that is continuing. Again, education was the cry young people were told, and rightly so, that there would be no place for them in the world of the future unless they were trained in the skills demanded by modern technology.

Over these years, the educational picture of this country has undergone a dramatic change. Today, the college graduate is no longer a member of a small and elite minority, as he was for so many years. And the vast majority of our young people complete high school now, even if not all of them go on to college let me give you an example—in just the past ten years, the high school dropout rate has been cut 98 percent, and the curent drive to keep our young people in school is cutting it even more.

It is a heartening picture, certainly but there is a flaw in it. Once, a college degree was virtually a guarantee of a job, if there was a job to be had. To too many young people, a degree became an end in itself, a passport into business or the professions where, by natural progression and with little effort on their part, they would ultimately arrive in the high tax brackets.

Unfortunately, this attitude persists and it persists in the face of a totally changed picture. Today, every applicant for a desirable job has a college diploma; no others need apply. So, the personnel manager is no longer impressed by college credentials; one school is very much like another, and the competition for a given job now narrows down to the individual and his basic attitude.

The door of opportunity has been opened for him, educationally, but has he the qualities that will enable him to walk through that door?

Is he simply looking for a job, a secure corner in which to sit and grow gray while he counts the years to retirement and another secure corner, this one in the sun? Or is he looking for challenge, a chance to put his educational opportunity to work for his firm, his community and himself?

If he is only a job seeker, his chance of exchanging that college degree for a secure corner grows slimmer every day. In today's business world, an employer looks for potential—the potential of growth—not only for his firm but for his community. The day when business took no active part in the community around it is long since gone; today, a business leader is also a community leader, and the qualities demanded in one are demanded in the other.

These qualities, in my view, are first, enthusiasm—the drive to do a job well regardless of its relative unimportance; initiative—the spirit needed to originate action on your own; responsibility—the ability to meet obligations or to act without superior authority or guidance; and service—the willingness to devote time and effort to build and improve your community.

Without these qualities, the door of educational opportunity is a revolving one that will bring you right back around to where you went in. Now, through the administration's aid-to-education bill, opportunity soon will be within the reach of everyone. But Government can do no more than open the door; you must make your own way along the path to the rewards of accomplishment and service that lie beyond it. Thank you.

Address by Bruce Catton at Appomattox Courthouse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, on April 9, 1965, we observed at Appomattox, Va., the 100th anniversary of the end of the War Between the States. This centennial observance was marked by very simple yet impressive ceremonies, coupled with the dedication of the restored Old Appomattox Courthouse. This fine building has just been completed by the National Park Service and is part of the Mission 66 program for restoring the Appomattox setting where the war was brought to a close.

Thousands of people from all over the country came to Appomattox on this occasion and the address of the day was delivered by Mr. Bruce Catton, author of "A Stillness at Appamattox" and one of the outstanding authorities on the war.

The occasion called for a reverent, sober reminder of the climactic moment 100 years ago and Mr. Catton delivered a most appropriate address. He set the scene in a most dramatic manner and called his listeners to a renewed dedication of the fundamental principles on which our Nation was founded. His remarks on that occasion are worthy of the attention of all Americans and it is my privilege to include his address herein with the hope that it will be studied with interest and care.

The address follows:

ADDRESS BY BRUCE CATTON AT APPOMATTOX COURTHOUSE, APRIL 9, 1865, THE CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY OF THE SURRENDER BY GEN. ROBERT E. LEE OF THE ARMY OF NORTHERN VIRGINIA

We are met here today to commemorate the centennial of a great moment in American history—the moment when Gen. Robert E. Lee in this place surrendered the Army of Northern Virginia to Gen. U. S. Grant.

That was the final act in an unforgettable story—the story of the American Civil War, in which the people of our country struggled for 4 years, at immeasurable cost, to work out the basis on which they would go forward to greatness.

The cost of that war has been paid in full. As we look back to the dramatic scene in the McLean house 100 years ago, we are no longer torn by the fierce emotion that possessed the men and women of that generation. At the same time, we are compelled to realize that we are studying something profoundly tragic. What happened here was the closing scene in an enormous drama wherein men were compelled to contend with a force greater than themselves. As Abraham Lincoln said, neither party in that war had looked for a struggle so long and so costly or for a result "so fundamental and astounding." During those war years the American people had been at grips with fate itself, serving an end larger than they could understand.

Such a struggle is the essence of tragedy. Yet we need to remember one saving fact: the final note of a great tragedy is not a note of denial or despair. No man arises from Hamlet feeling that the answer to the drama he has seen is frustration or futility. On the contrary, it is precisely from the greatest tragedies that we get our most significant and uplifting experiences. For although tragedy does show man contending against fate, fighting a battle which perhaps he must lose, it also shows us that he has something unconquerable and magnificent within himself; and it is that magnificence of the human spirit—the conviction that it is the unconquerable something in man that finally matters—which at last stays with us.

There is a spirit in man that triumphs even in the hour of despair. Grim and terrible as the story of our Civil War is we at least know that great men were involved in it—great men whose living example is part of our heritage today.

Two of the greatest of these, of course, were Robert E. Lee and U. S. Grant, and on this centennial anniversary it is worth our while to recall what happened here when they met.

The scene at Appamattox Courthouse is one of the great dramatic moments in the American story. Quite properly, it was underplayed; nobody tried to strike an attitude or intone notable words for the record, and the two principals, Grant and Lee, behaved with quiet dignity and a deep sense of responsibility. Their meeting was proof that these leaders of rival armies would thereafter have one common country, and on April 9 they served that country well.

Their armies had their final confrontation that morning. Lee was fleeing from the broken siege lines at Petersburg, trying desperately to reach some safe spot where his army could get supplies, regroup, and prepare for fresh battles. Grant's army had overtaken it and had put troops in front of it, and on the morning of April 9 the Army of Northern Virginia was at bay, drawn up on open fields near Appomattox Station. It was surrounded, it was exhausted and it was badly outnumbered; and now the Federal Army was ready to drive home a shattering charge that could end only one way. The blue troops were in line, ready, just beginning to move—when suddenly, out of the Confederate lines, came a young officer on horseback, bearing a staff with a white flag, galloping toward the Yankee line. The movement was frozen, the guns stopped firing, the officer was taken off to headquarters; and then the war was over, there was no charge and no killing, there was a truce, and all that remained was a meeting between Grant and Lee.

So Grant and Lee met in the parlor of Wilmer McLean's house at Appomattox Courthouse: the courtly southerner of aristocratic lineage, gray and knightly in his best uniform, presentation sword belted at his waist, and the middle-westerner whose father was a tanner and who never managed

to look like anything but a run-of-the-mill soldier, wearing a mudsplashed uniform and no sword at all. Lee was accompanied by a military aide, and Grant admitted several of his generals to the room, but all of these people were here chiefly as spectators, essentially, the only actors present were Grant and Lee.

This was undoubtedly the hardest monent of Lee's life, and Grant tried to smooth the way, making smalltalk; Lee himself had to call the meeting to order, so to speak, by remarking that they knew what they were there for and had better get down to it. So Grant scribbled out the terms in pencil, while Lee waited. Finishing the job, Grant passed his orderly book over for Lee to read.

As Lee read, he discovered that this was not grim old "Unconditional-Surrender" Grant who had been writing. Lee's army must be surrendered, but it was not to be paraded off to a northern prison camp; the men would lay down their arms, turning over flags and guns and all military property, and then they would be free to go to their homes, with a saving clause that protected them against any end-of-the-war reprisals. Once these soldiers got home, said Grant's document, they were "not to be disturbed by the U.S. authorities so long as they observe their paroles and the laws in force where they may reside." With Grant's weighty signature under this sentence, Confederate soldiers who had fought so hard against the U.S. Government could not be hanged, imprisoned, or otherwise prosecuted as traitors. The vengeance a victorious government might want to inflict after 4 years of civil strife was ruled out, once and for all.

Lee raised one point. In the Confederate service, cavalry horses (and some artillery horses as well) were not government issue: they were owned by the men who rode them. The written terms said that these horses must be given up. Could not the terms be softened?

Grant remarked that he had not known the soldiers owned these horses, and he did not think he could change the written terms. However, most of the soldiers who were being surrendered were small farmers, they would need horses if they were going to go home and make a living, so he said he would instruct the officers in charge of receiving captured property to give a horse or a mule to any Confederate soldier who claimed to own one. In that way, he said, the men could "work their little farms" once they got back to them. Lee said this would have a very good effect, it was agreed on, and on this homely note the ceremony ended. Lee left the room, mounted his horse, received a salute from the Federal officers who stood by, waiting, and rode off into legend; and Grant went off to his own lines, angrily stopped the firing of jubilant salutes that had just begun (reminding his soldiers that the "Rebels" were now their fellow countrymen once more) and saw to it that wagonloads of bacon and hardtack were sent into the Confederate camp so that Lee's half-starved soldiers might have something to eat. The big surrender scene was over. As far as Grant and Lee could determine it, the Nation could begin healing the dreadful wound the war had left.

That is the note this scene at Appomattox leaves with us—the attempt to heal the wounds. I would like to remind you that one essential part of it is something General Lee did before this meeting took place.

After he had made up his mind to meet General Grant, but before the final arrangements had been made, General Lee quietly spoke a few words that were fully as important for the future of the country as the surrender ceremony itself. To him, as he prepared to meet Grant, came a trusted lieutenant who urged him not to surrender but simply to tell his army to disperse, each man taking to the hills with his rifle in his hand: Let the Yankee handle guerrilla warfare for a while and see what they can make of that.

Lee replied that he would have none of it. It would create a state of things in the South from which it would take years to recover. Federal cavalry would harry the length and breadth of the land for no one knew how long. He himself was "too old to go bushwhacking"; even if the Army did break up into die-hard bands of irreconcilables, he said "the only course for me to pursue would be for me to surrender myself to General Grant." This was the last anybody heard about taking to the hills. The officer who suggested this course wrote that Lee "showed me the situation from a plane to which I had not risen, and when he finished speaking I had not a word to say."

The unquenchable guerrilla warfare this officer had been hinting at was perhaps the one thing that would have ruined America forever. It was precisely what Federal soldiers like Grant and Sherman dreaded most—the long, slow-burning, formless uprising that goes on and on after the field armies have been broken up, with desperate men using violence to provoke more violence, harassing the victor and their own people with a sullen fury no dragoons can quite put down.

On November 7, 1864, President Jefferson Davis strongly hinted at this kind of warfare when he told the Confederate Congress that "there are no vital points on the preservation of which the Confederacy depends. There is no military success of the enemy which can accomplish its destruction. Not the fall of Richmond, nor Wilmington, nor Savannah, nor Mobile, nor of all combined can save the enemy from the constant and exhaustive drain of blood and treasure which must continue until he shall discover that no peace is attainable unless based on recognition of our indefeasible rights."

What Mr. Davis was talking about obviously was an evocation of the revolution which the Confederacy had long denied. A Confederacy that abandoned its cities and no longer relied on any fixed bases would survive—if it survived at all—by guerrilla warfare, counting military coup in terms of crossroads ambushes and the shooting of traitors, living in the desperate hope that the victors would eventually be poisoned by hatred and terror.

The Civil War might very well have ended that way, because civil wars often do end in such a manner; but because of Lee's decision on the last stage of the road to Appomattox, this war was not going to have that kind of ending. The conquered South was not going to become another Ireland or Poland, with generation after generation learning hatred and the arts of back alley fighting.

General Lee ruled it out, not only because he was General Lee but also because he had never seen this war as the kind of struggle that could go on that way. He understood the cause he served with complete clarity. The South had meant neither revolution nor rebellion; it simply desired to detach itself and live in its own chosen part of an unchanging past, and Mr. Davis had defined it perfectly when he said that all his people wanted was to be left alone. Borne up by that desire, the Confederacy had endured 4 years of war, and it was breaking up now because this potential for inspiring the human spirit had been exhausted. With unlimited confidence the Confederacy had fought an unlimited war for a strictly limited end. To go on fighting from the woods and the lanes and the swamps might indeed plague the Yankees and infect a deep wound beyond healing, but the one thing on earth it could not do was give the South a chance to be left alone with what it used to be.

So Lee met with Grant and agreed to surrender the men who had followed him so long and so valiantly, and then he returned to his camp, making his way through the broken ranks of men who were trying numbly to adjust themselves to the blow that had fallen. After a quiet conversation with some of his officers around the campfire he told an aide to draft a farewell order to his army. The first version did not quite suit him, and he struck out a few lines that seemed likely to keep hard feelings alive. At last he had what he wanted and next day it was published to the troops:

"After 4 years of arduous service, marked by unsurpassed courage and fortitude, the Army of Northern Virginia has been compelled to yield to overwhelming numbers and resources. I need not tell you brave survivors of so many hard-fought battles, who have remained steadfast to the last, that I have consented to the result from no distrust of them. But feeling that valor and devotion could accomplish nothing that could compensate for the loss that must have attended the continuance of the contest, I determined to avoid the useless sacrifice of those whose past services have endeared them to their countrymen.

"By the terms of the agreement officers and men can return to their homes and remain until exchanged. You will take with you the satisfaction that proceeds from the consciousness of duty faithfully performed; and I earnestly pray that a merciful God will extend to you His blessing and protection.

"With an increasing admiration of your constancy and devotion to your country, and a grateful remembrance of your kind and generous consideration for myself, I bid you all an affectionate farewell."

That was the end of it. Lee himself returned to Richmond, Grant started back for Washington, and a day or so later the Confederates formally paraded and gave up their arms and their flags, receiving a salute from the waiting Federals, giving a salute in return. Then the men who had been paroled broke ranks, and the Army of Northern Virginia went away from its last parade ground.

It would, of course, be easy to make too much of the general air of reconciliation. Lee's soldiers were hard passionate fighters, they did not enjoy defeat, they were not ready to start loving their enemies with sentimental fondness, and there were wounds that would be a long time healing. And yet by any standard this was an almost unbelievable way to end a civil war, which by all tradition is the worst kind of war there is. Living for the rest of their lives in the long gray shadow of the lost cause, they were nevertheless going on toward the future. General Lee, who had set the pattern, had given them just the right words: "unsurpassed courage and fortitude * * * steadfast to the last * * * the consciousness of duty faithfully performed." Pride in what they had done would grow with the years, but it would turn them into a romantic army of legend and not into a sullen battalion of death.

Here is how the legend worked. Fifteen years after the surrender, one of Lee's veterans—a soldier from South Carolina, who had been in the worst of it from beginning to end—sat down to write his memoirs, a little job of writing that did not get published until many years after its writer was dead. Looking back, he seemed to see something that was worth everything it had cost him, something indeed that a man would almost like to get back to if he only could. He wrote, remember, as one who had been through the mill and not as a starry-eyed recruit, and this is how he put it:

"Who knows but it may be given to us, after this life, to meet again in the old quarters, to play chess and draughts, to get up soon to answer the morning rollcall, to fall in at the tap of the drum for drill and dress parade, and again to hastily don our war gear while the monotonous patter of the long roll summons to battle? Who knows but

again the old flags, ragged and torn, snapping in the wind, may face each other and flutter, pursuing and pursued, while the cries of victory fill a summer day? And after the battle, then the slain and wounded will arise, and all will meet together under the two flags, all sound and well, and there will be talking and laughter and cheers, and all will say: 'Did it not seem real? Was it not as in the old days?'"

The worst experience on earth could be remembered that way, with a still youthful veteran dreaming about foes meeting under two flags and one all-embracing destiny. No civil war in history ever ended quite like this. Instead of leaving an indigestible legacy of hatred and bitterness, this one left a great legend and a long remembering. The story of the lost cause became a positive asset to the united country. What was left of the passionate desire to create an independent southern nation spiralled off into a myth that contained, and still contains, a beautiful residuum of truth. In place of unending rancor and continued backwoods warfare that would have destroyed forever the central force of the American dream, we got this legend that has helped us: the legend of a great leader and great followers who did their utmost for something they believed in, accepted defeat when it came, and enshrined their broken hopes in a romantic story which helped the country to put itself together again.

That is our abiding legacy from Appomattox. We have a memory that unites us; the memory of brave men who fought each other to the limit of endurance and then struck hands across a silent battlefield and asked—is not this as it was in the old days? We have one country now, bought at a terrible price, cemented everlastingly together because at the end of our most terrible war the men who had fought so hard decided that they had had enough of hatred.

National Gallery of Art Calendar of Events May 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES G. FULTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Calendar of Events for the National Gallery of Art for the month of May 1965. We Members of the U.S. Congress and the residents of our Nation's Capital, as well as the many people from our country and visitors from abroad are very fortunate to have such an outstanding gallery of art.

The National Gallery of Art has an excellent permanent collection, and the many fine works of art that are lent to the Gallery from time to time make our visits there very worth while.

If you have not visited the Gallery or seen the exhibit lately, the Gallery tour is well worth while.

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART, MAY 1965

Gallery hours: Weekdays 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. Sundays 2 p.m. to 10 p.m. Admission is free to the Gallery and to all programs scheduled.

Collections: Paintings and sculpture from the Andrew Mellon, Samuel H. Kress, Widener, and Chester Dale collections, with gifts from other donors, are on the main floor. The Garbisch American primitive paintings, Kress Renaissance bronzes, and Widener decorative arts are on the ground floor.

New exhibition: The Chester Dale bequest. An exhibition of the complete collection, including 80 paintings not previously shown in Washington. Opening May 6.

New publications: Catalog, 18th and 19th century paintings and sculpture of the French school in the Chester Dale collection. Composed of 152 pages, 9 inches by 6 inches; with introduction by John Walker; 4 color plates, 126 black and white illustrations; $3.50 postpaid.

Catalog, 20th century paintings and sculpture of the French school in the Chester Dale collection. There are 104 pages, 9 inches by 6 inches; with introduction by Maud Dale; 4 color plates, 86 black and white illustrations; $3 postpaid.

Catalog, paintings other than French in the Chester Dale collection. 64 pages, 9 inches by 6 inches; 2 color plates, 51 black and white illustrations; $3 postpaid.

Lectures: A series of three Sunday lectures on the Chester Dale collection will begin on May 9 and continue through May 23.

Lectour: A radio lecture device is installed in 30 exhibition galleries. Talks, running continuously, cover most of the periods of art represented by the collections. A visitor may rent a small receiving set for 25 cents to use in hearing these lectour broadcasts.

Cafeteria: Open to the public Monday through Saturday 11 a.m. to 4 p.m. Sunday 4 p.m. to 7 p.m.

MONDAY, APRIL 26, THROUGH SUNDAY, MAY 2

Sculpture of the Week: Jacopo Sansovino; "Bacchus and a Young Faun," (Andrew Mellon Collection) West Hall Tuesday through Saturday 12:00 and 2:00; Sunday 3:30 and 6:00.

Tour of the Week: Precursors of Modern French painting in France, Rotunda; Tuesday through Saturday 1; Sunday 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection, Rotunda; Monday through Saturday 11 and 3; Sunday 5.

Sunday lecture: "Holbein and Henry VIII"; Guest speaker: Roy Strong, assistant keeper, National Portrait Gallery, London; Lecture hall 4.

Sunday concert: Twenty-second American Music Festival; Howard Lebow, pianist; East Garden Court 8.

MONDAY, MAY 3, THROUGH SUNDAY, MAY 9

Painting of the week: Ralph Earl, "Daniel Boardman;" (gift of Mrs. W. Murray Crane) Gallery 67; Tuesday through Saturday 12 and 2; Sunday 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: Precursors of Modern French Painting Outside France. Rotunda; Tuesday through Saturday 1; Sunday 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda; Monday through Saturday 11 and 3; Sunday 5.

Sunday lecture: "Naturalism in Barbizon Painting"; guest speaker, Robert L. Herbert, professor of art history, Yale University, New Haven, Lecture Hall 4.

Sunday concert: 22d American Music Festival: Carolyn Reyer, mezzo-soprano, Ralph Zitterbart, pianist, East Garden Court 8.

All concerts, with intermission talks by members of the National Gallery staff, are broadcast by Station WGMS–AM (570) and FM (103.5).

MONDAY, MAY 10, THROUGH SUNDAY, MAY 16

Work of art of the week: "Medici Ware, XVI Century." Ewer (Widener collection) Gallery G–3, Tuesday through Saturday 12 and 2; Sunday 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: The Chester Dale collection up to 1860, Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday 1; Sunday 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday 11 and 3; Sunday 5.

Sunday lecture: "Classical and Modern Art," guest speaker: Otto J. Brendel, professor of art history, Columbia University, New York, Lecture Hall 4.

Sunday concert: Twenty-second American Music Festival: Aeolian Trio, East Garden Court 8.

MONDAY, MAY 17, THROUGH SUNDAY, MAY 23

Painting of the week: French School, 1572, "Prince Hercule-Francois, Duc d'Alençon," (Samuel H. Kress Collection) Gallery 41, Tuesday through Saturday 12 and 2; Sunday 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: The Chester Dale collection 1860 to 1890, Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday 1; Sunday 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday 11 and 3; Sunday 5.

Sunday lecture: "Postimpressionism in the Chester Dale Collection"; guest speaker, Leslie Judd Ahlander, author and critic, Lecture Hall 4.

Sunday concert: Twenty-second American Music Festival: National Gallery Orchestra, Richard Bales, conductor, Church of the Reformation Cantata Choir and Soloists, East Garden Court 8.

Inquiries concerning the Gallery's educational services should be addressed to the Educational Office, 737–4215, extension 272.

MONDAY, MAY 24, THROUGH SUNDAY, MAY 30

Sculpture of the week: Verrocchio. "Giuliano de'Medici" (Andrew Mellon Collection) gallery 2, Tuesday through Saturday, 12 and 2; Sunday, 3:30 and 6.

Tour of the week: The Chester Dale Collection 1890 to the present; Rotunda, Tuesday through Saturday 1; Sunday 2:30.

Tour: Introduction to the collection. Rotunda, Monday through Saturday, 11 and 3; Sunday, 5.

Sunday film: "Michelangelo," (produced by Prof. Carlo L. Ragghianti), courtesy of the Italian Government, (Commentary in English), Lecture Hall, 4.

Sunday concert: 22d American Musical Festival; John Celentano, violinist, David Renner, pianist; East Garden Court, 8.

U.N. Charter 20 Years Later

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILLIP BURTON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the San Francisco Chronicle for its thoughtful editorial entitled "U.N. Charter 20 Years Later."

In it, they recall the confident anticipation which gripped San Francisco and the world 20 years ago as nations met in the San Francisco Opera House to create a "perpetual world alliance for the preservation of peace."

In it, they also remind us of the task which yet remains ahead and of the difficulties with which the United Nations must daily cope.

I join with the San Francisco Chronicle in urging that invitations to the 20th anniversary ceremonies commemorating the founding of the United Nations be extended to the surviving delegates to that historic Conference.

It is my pleasure to insert in the RECORD at this time the full text of the San Francisco Chronicle editorial:

U.N. CHARTER 20 YEARS LATER

Twenty years ago today, President Harry S. Truman, less than two weeks in office, took the stage of San Francisco's War Memorial Opera House for a role in history which, he duly noted, belonged to Franklin Delano Roosevelt. He opened the United Nations Conference on International Organization.

In the stead of his profoundly mourned predecessor, President Truman bespoke the shining hopes of a war-weary world as he bade the delegates of 50 nations to bring forth a durable successor to the League of Nations, a perpetual world alliance for the preservation of peace, security and international cooperation.

With the European war rushing to its end and with victory over Japan clearly visible, the participating nations assumed the task with confidence that was almost lighthearted. San Francisco surrounded them with an air of festivity. No one doubted that the great statesmen here assembled would devise a millennium, a system to satisfy mankind's highest desires and guarantee a world of universal good will and harmony, of international law, where strong nations would defend rather than prey on the weak and the rich would assist, not exploit, the poor.

The charter that emerged has proved its ability to fend off wars, establish a code of international law, relieve famine and carry economic aid and technical assistance where needed. It has safeguarded human rights. It has also had its failings. On the eve of its 20th anniversary, the United Nations is sorely in trouble. One member has withdrawn and others openly despise it. Several deny their financial obligations. Its doubled membership has brought embarrassments. Its machinery creaks and frequently stultifies it. Its peacekeeping operations are poverty stricken and it is haunted by the specter of bankruptcy.

Thus the 20th anniversary of the signing of the charter, to be held in San Francisco this June, demands an outpouring of public enthusiasm and support, a demonstration of faith in the U.N. ideals and competence. The charter was forged by the long and tireless efforts of the world's greatest statesmen. Many of those who contributed to its ideas and its language are still among the living, though some are retired or no longer prominent in government. Their presence at the upcoming observance would be both fitting and useful.

We urge that invitations be extended to surviving delegates—to Anthony Eden, Lester Pearson, Mme. Pandit and others, not excepting Vyacheslav Molotov—to the end that at least one member of each original delegation be on hand. Thus might the high hopes and bold intent of the charter framers be honored, and the aspirations of the Atlantic Charter and of Dumbarton Oaks be made to run anew through proceedings of the United Nations, which remains man's best hope for peace and strongest bulwark against tyranny, poverty and disease.

Anniversary of Katyn Massacre and the Yalta Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from the Polish American Congress calling attention to the fact that today is the anniversary of Poland's May 3 Constitution of 1791.

I am pleased to participate again in these proceedings and express my admiration for the Polish people and my sincere hope that they will soon be free from the yoke of Communist slavery.

The Polish American Congress has further called to the attention of the Members of Congress and people of the Nation the fact that this year marks the 25th anniversary of the discovery of the Katyn massacre perpetrated by the Soviet Union and the 20th anniversary of the Yalta agreement.

I wish to place in the RECORD the statements of the congress on these two events as a reminder of Communist treachery.

The statements follow:

TWENTY-FIFTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE KATYN MASSACRE

The Katyn massacre which shocked the world as one of the most brutal acts of genocide in World War II took place 25 years ago in a forest near Smolensk in the Soviet Union.

Mr. Charles Rozmarek, president of the Polish American Congress and the Polish National Alliance, recently presented a study of this international crime. Mr. Rozmarek stated in an address delivered in New York City:

"The basic facts of the Katyn massacre are well known to world public opinion.

"The first news of the mass graves at Katyn was announced by the German radio on April 13, 1943. In the next few days, citing personal documents, identification cards, letters, and newspapers found in the graves as well as quoting expert opinion of the pathologists, the Germans accused the Russians of mass murdering Polish officers and intellectuals in the month of March of 1940.

"On April 15, 1943, Radio Moscow not only denied the accusations made, but, in turn, charged the Germans with this hideous crime of genocide.

"On April 17, 1943, the Polish Government-in-Exile in London appealed to the International Red Cross at Geneva to conduct an impartial investigation and determine the actual facts of the Katyn crime.

"Nine days later, on April 26, 1943, the Soviet Union severed diplomatic relations with the Polish Government in London, denouncing it falsely as acting in collaboration with Nazi Germany."

With the quoted dates as the background, the following facts were ascertained and established:

The bodies of 4,423 Polish officers, scientists, professors, chaplains, lawyers, and students were found in three mass graves in the Katyn forest. Their last place of imprisonment had been the military prisoners camp at Kozielsk.

Held in another camp at Starobielsk were an additional 2,290 Polish officers, while 6,570 officers were interned in the third camp near Ostashkov. These prisoners of war from the Starobielsk and Ostashkov camps disappeared without a single clue or trace as to their whereabouts. The conclusion is thus inescapable that they met with the same fate as that which befell their fellow officers of the Kozielsk camp. It has not been established as yet whether they rest in some unidentified up to the present time mass graves, or were simply heretofore drowned at sea.

Thus, 14,283 Polish officers and intellectuals, taken as prisoners of war by the Soviets in September of 1939, were brutally and inhumanly murdered in one of the most shocking crimes of genocide in the history of mankind.

The second in the series of dates and facts relating to the crime of Katyn forest is to be found in the United States, due largely to the efforts of the Polish American Congress.

On September 18, 1951, the House of Representatives appointed a Select Committee To Investigate the Katyn Massacre. Headed by Representative RAY J. MADDEN, of Indiana, the committee was composed of Representatives DANIEL L. FLOOD, of Pennsylvania; Foster Furcolo, of Massachusetts; Thaddeus Machrowicz, of Michigan; ALVIN O'KONSKI, of Wisconsin, and Timothy P. Sheehan, of Illinois.

After a scrupulous and detailed investigation of the pertinent documents and the hearing of testimony of hundreds of duly identified witnesses, the committee stated in its two reports, one of July 1, 1952, and the second of December 22, 1952, that beyond the slightest shadow of doubt, Russia stands accused of the Katyn massacre, and likewise that Russia planned other crimes of genocide against Poland as early as the year of 1939.

The committee asked the President and the State Department that this indictment with all of the documentary evidence be filed with the United Nations General Assembly, and that, eventually the case be brought before the International Tribunal in The Hague.

These facts should have shocked the conscience of the entire world, and brought about an awareness to the western nations of the true face of communism.

It is a fact of crime, of deceit, of falsehood, and of treachery, which cannot be hidden behind the facade of scientific and technological progress of Russia. Science in itself is not wisdom. Wisdom is based upon moral and spiritual values, not upon a calculated and conquest motivated progress of essentially neutral sciences.

At the time of the discovery of the Katyn massacre, the West seemed to have been hypnotized by Russia and her wartime so termed "cooperation."

Indeed it is truly a sad commentary upon our times, that to this day, the West in its dealings with the Soviet Union, seems to be suffering as yet from strange post-hypnotic misconceptions and illusions. They weaved around as yet under an illusory doctrine of so-called coexistence.

Stalin's Russia was deceiving the West with its promises of cooperation.

Present day rulers of Russia are deceiving us now with a false promise of peaceful coexistence.

The peaceful coexistence of the free nations of the world with whom?

Is it to be a coexistence with evil, mass murders and treachery?

YALTA—THE PLACE AND DATE OF A TRAGEDY

On February 11, 1945, President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Prime Minister Winston Churchill of Britain and Premier Joseph Stalin of the Soviet Union concluded their conference in the Crimean resort of Yalta, signing a joint communique which has become known to the world as the "Yalta Declaration."

The communique summed up fateful East European decisions that were made at Yalta without the participation or consent of the nations concerned—especially Poland, as the historic key to East European peace and stability.

Beneath the high sounding words of the Yalta Declaration, a foreboding pattern soon became evident. It was a pattern of Western concessions to the Soviets on specific geographical and political issues while still proclaiming lofty principles of freedom and democracy. The basic blunder of Yalta was the confirmation of the Teheran (1943) decision to divide Europe into military zones. Actually, the wording supposedly dictated by war exigencies, was a coverup for a secret agreement on the "spheres of influence" as-

signed to the Western Powers and to the Soviet Union. This is the immoral act, for which the free world is still paying and will pay for years to come in the expenditures and frustrations of the cold war.

The fate of east-central Europe, and thus the fate of more than 100 million peoples was sealed. When Roosevelt and Churchill agreed at Yalta that the Soviet military zone of occupation should extend to the Elbe River. In accepting Stalin's notion that the countries of east-central Europe should have a government "friendly disposed" toward Russia, the Western Powers showed complete lack of awareness of the fundamental conflict between real freedom and the Soviet concept of a government by Communist tyranny. Thus, by accepting this notion, Roosevelt and Churchill automatically, though, perhaps, unknowingly, annulled the high principles of democracy and national independence proclaimed in the Yalta Declaration.

The abandonment of Poland to the control of the Polish Communist Party, which was tantamount to a Russian takeover of Poland, foreshadowed the way in which the principles of Yalta would be distorted in the rest of east central Europe. The Yalta declaration promised "to assist the people in any European liberated (from the Nazis) state to form interim governmental authorities broadly representative of all democratic elements in the population and pledged to the earliest possible establishment, through free elections, of a government responsible to the will of the people". The actual result, through Russian cunning, was to foist Communist minority groups on unwilling majorities in Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Rumania. Instead of peace and stability in Europe, which is a prerequisite for world peace and order, we have the Iron Curtain extending from the Baltic to the Alps.

Europe, a cultural and historical entity, was split in half. It was made half free and half enslaved by the shortsighted Yalta decision, on the part of Roosevelt and Churchill.

It is the fault of the Yalta decision that today, the barbarian forces of the East are threatening the heart of Europe from the banks of the Elbe.

Multiple Listing Service of the Brooklyn Real Estate Board Renders Outstanding Service to Buyer and Broker

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH L. CAREY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, the Brooklyn Real Estate Board's multiple listing service from the Bay Ridge area, which pioneered multiple listing service in New York City 8 years ago, performs a commendable service for the prospective homebuyer, as well as for real estate brokers who are participants in this organization.

Through the use of this service the persons seeking to purchase a home can save considerable time, effort, and expense, and also, from the standpoint of the broker-participant, sales action is accelerated. This is how the multiple listing service assists the prospective homebuyer.

While there may be many houses on the market which meet all the buyer's specifications, the individual realtor cannot be thoroughly familiar with all of them.

However, each of the 50 members and more than 200 of their salesmen are able to offer the customer a choice of every house available on any given day.

The shopper can narrow his choice down to a few dwellings by looking at the listing sheets and photographs in the broker's office. He is then shown just the few dwellings which will fill his specific needs.

Although the listing sheets and pictures do not get into the hands of all members for approximately 5 days from the time it was listed, the average time expired from listing to sale in Bay Ridge is 32 days. This is the direct result of the realtor listing the property at a realistic selling price.

Persons who wish to sell their homes also enjoy the benefits, by obtaining an estimate of a fair market value. A photograph of his home is taken and distributed with his listing. This generates widespread interest and attracts many prospective buyers. Appointments to show the house are made at the seller's convenience.

These extra services provided by the multiple listing service costs the homeowner nothing more than the regular brokerage he would pay to the realtor who sells his house.

There is a growing awareness of the advantages such listing services offer brokers in today's varied real estate market.

During the past year, members of the Bay Bridge service have been invited to address various real estate boards throughout Brooklyn and Long Island, to help them organize their own listing service and exchange views.

Helping to guide the programs of multiple listing service are its capable committeemen, who include:

John A. Salvatore, chairman; Vincent F. Lucadana, cochairman; Robert J. Stapleton, legal consultant; Zenon L. Post, education; Joseph P. Alessio, budget director; Thomas A. Meagher, education; A. A. Bongiorno, program chairman and James B. Manzi, and John B. Swift, past presidents of the Brooklyn Real Estate Board.

The Historical Background of the Transylvanian Question

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished colleagues illumniated the present plight of the Hungarian minority in Transylvania and suggested some specific steps the administration could take to ameliorate its position in the course of American-Rumanian economic and cultural negotiations.

To understand the problem fully, we have to ask the question, however, how did the question arise, what are the historical-political facts that had led to the emergence of the present tragic situation?

Transylvania forms the eastern part of the Danubian Basin, a land surrounded everywhere except in the northwest by the Carpathian Mountains in the east and south and the Bhari—Bihor—Mountains in the west. Transylvania, a country of scenic beauty resembling Switzerland, is rich in mineral resources, including coal, iron, alloy metals, natural gas, and hydroelectric power, and its economy is well suited to the development of chemical and steel industries. As a matter of fact, the Communist Rumanian government built its industrialization plan around the Transylvanian resources as the pivot.

Magyars—Hungarians—live in Transylvania at least since the end of the ninth century. Historical research showed about 70 percent of the river and place names to be of Hungarian etymological origin, and only about 5 percent of the same names have Rumanian origin. In the 13th century, as Transylvania remained an exposed outpost of the kingdom, the Hungarian kings settled German Saxons and accepted the first Rumanian immigrants from the south into Transylvania. However, except in two counties, Rumanian mass immigration began only in the 16th and 17th centuries when Rumanians fled from the Danubian principalities of Moldavia and Valachia into Transylvania in the wake of Turkish raids, incessant civil wars, and cruel taxation by their Fanariot princes. The high altitudes and dense forests of the Carpathians provided a secure refuge for them, and the Westernized state system offered a more humane and civilized life.

Transylvania, however, failed to escape the Turkish wars either. Though never a Turkish province like the Danubian principalities and Central Hungary, Turkish raids in the 17th century and wars with the Habsburgs decimated its Hungarian population living in the valleys and on the central plateau. The mountaineer Rumanians herding their sheep suffered considerably less from marauding soldateska.

Despite the heavy blood losses, the 16th and 17th centuries were the golden age of Transylvanian culture and political power. An independent principality only loosely connected with the Hungarian Kingdom ruled by the Habsburgs, Transylvania was ruled by the three political nations, Hungarians, Szekler—old Hungarian frontiersmen—and the German Saxons. Rumanians were in the 15th and 16th centuries still in such a minority that when the nobility made the pact in 1437 they were not recognized as a nation.

One of the first princes of Transylvania, Stephen Bathori, became also King of Poland for more than a decade and under Gabriel Bethlen and George Rakoczi I, Transylvania was internation-

ally recognized as a belligerent on the French side in the Thirty Year's War. Several hundred Transylvanian students were also studying at Western universities, and German, Italian, and even French teachers were teaching at Transylvanian colleges.

With the reconquest of central Hungary by the Habsburgs, helped by Hungarians and soldiers from many Western nations in a last crusade, Transylvania could no longer continue as an independent principality as it had always been regarded at home and abroad as a part of the Hungarian Kingdom.

Between 1091 and 1867, except for 1848–49, Transylvania was administered by the Habsburgs as a grand duchy belonging to the Hungarian Crown. The governor was usually a Hungarian nobelman from Transylvania, but there existed a separate Transylvanian chancery in Vienna, usually stuffed by Austrians and Saxons. The Habsburg rule promoted the Saxons and even the Rumanians, but not the Hungarian majority which had to fight in order to continue its role in the Diet and the local administration.

The major accomplishment of the period was the education of the Rumanians and the subsequent awakening of national consciousness among them and among the Hungarians and Saxons as well.

The Hungarian princes of the Reformation period already translated the Bible into Rumanian and tried to convert the Greek orthodox Rumanians to protestantism. They failed to achieve much success. The Roman Catholic Church was temporarily more successful after 1701 when the orthodox clergy accepted the supremacy of the Pope in exchange for keeping their own Greek-Rumanian rites. In the Union of Gyulafehervar (Alba Julia) the Rumanian clergy became Uniate and soon its seminaries, especially the one at Balazsfalva (Blaj) were to become the cradles of Rumanian national consciousness. It was there that the idea of Daco-Roman origins of the Transylvanian Rumanians was conceived on the basis of Hungarian Renaissance Hungarian historians who tried to show as many ties between the Latins and the Hungarian King, Mathias Hunyadi (Corvinus). By 1848 national consciousness was well developed among all nationalities in Transylvania. The Magyars (Hungarians) wanted the abolition of the separate Habsburg administration of Transylvania and favored a political union with Hungary proper that would have its liberal constitution and freely elected, responsible government. They also wanted to abolish serfdom for all nationalities alike. The German Saxons favored the continuance of the status quo that enabled them to influence Transylvanian affairs to an extent incommensurate with their number that hardly exceeded 10 percent at that time.

The Rumanians were by now well provided with nationalistic leaders, including the Greek Orthodox Archbishop Andreas Saguna and the half insane, cruel guerrilla leaders around Avram Lancu. When in September 1848, the Vienna court decided to revoke the laws of April 1848, resulting in the political union with Transylvania and the liberal political reforms, it promised autonomy to the Transylvanian Rumanians in order to gain their military alliance against Louis Kossuth's Hungarians. Subsequently, some of the southern Transylvanian Rumanians rose under Iancu against the Hungarians, committing grave atrocities and massacres among the Hungarian population, only to be chased by Kossuth's armies into the mountains a few months later.

In 1849, just before the combined Austrian-Russian invasion ended the Kossuth regime, Rumanians, and Hungarians seemed to have come to an agreement on the nationality question but, of course, this remained dead paper because of the collapse of Kossuth's Hungary.

During the coming 17 years Hungarians and Rumanians alike were suppressed by the absolutist Habsburg regime. Thus by 1867 despite the realization of the political union between Transylvania and Hungary proper, the Rumanians were willing to accept the situation especially after the passing of the very liberal nationality law of the Hungarian Government in 1868.

Much has been written about the post-compromise period of Transylvania both by Hungarians and Rumanians. Eliminating the obvious propaganda on both sides, it must be said with J. Cabot Moore "The Racial Conflict in Transylvania" that the 50 years were years of development, culture, and progress. Even industrialization was begun and the cultural accomplishments in literature, architecture, sculpture, and theater were impressive. Politically, however, especially the last 15 years before the First World War were years of increasingly acute nationality conflict. Rumanian deputies in the Hungarian Parliament fought almost all the administrative and educational measures of the Government as Magyerizing and anti-Rumanian and the Liga Culturalea of Rumania sent money and agitators into Transylvania where the new Rumanian savings banks succeeded in buying up more and more land. At the same time, there were administrative abuses against the Rumanians on the Hungarian side, and both sides became bitter toward each other. Yet, it must be said that the expansion of public and parochial schools enabled Rumanians to educate their children in their mother tongue—there were 13 colleges, several hundred high schools, and 2,800 grade schools where Rumanian was the language of instruction in 1914 in Transylvania.

The number of Rumanian deputies in the Budapest Parliament, though lower than proportional representation would have accorded it, was considerably higher than later on the number of Hungarian deputies in the Rumanian Parliament after 1920. The Hungarians scolded the Rumanian politicians both for their preference to Vienna—A. Popovici in 1912 was the author of the most detailed book on how to reorganize the monarchy on ethnic basis—and for their suspected irredentist motivation and connections with the Rumanian kingdom. The Rumanians, in turn, complained about highhanded Hungarian administration, and the failure to receive autonomy in the Rumanian areas.

The outcome of the First World War drastically changed the fate of Transylvania. First, Rumania, a German ally, changed sides in 1916 and attacked Austria-Hungary. In return for such a switch, the Allied Powers promised Transylvania and other parts of the Hungarian kingdom to Rumania. Yet, Rumania was defeated by the German and Austro-Hungarian armies and had to sign a peace treaty in May 1918, at Bucharest which restored the prevailing frontiers. On November 7, 1918, several days after the armistice of Austria-Hungary with the Allies, Rumania again declared war on the nonexisting state, and proceeded to occupy Transylvania. Resisted only by one volunteer division of Szeklers and Hungarians, Rumanian advance remained still very slow, and only in March 1919, could they occupy Transylvania after the Allied High Command forced the Hungarians to withdraw.

On December 1, 1918, the Rumanians of Transylvania, after some bitter debate, voted for the incorporation of Transylvania into the Rumanian kingdom, a step which was not followed by the Hungarians and accepted by the Saxons only after personal guarantees of the Rumanian leaders that the peace conference already assigned Transylvania to Rumania.

In the peace treaty of 1920, Rumania was given substantially the same area as promised to her in 1916. Minority protection clauses were included into the treaty. They were never kept fully but at least prevented an even more intense persecution of the Hungarians. About 150,000 Hungarians were forced to leave and the rest became second-class citizens.

Yet the Transylvanian Rumanians also had a sorry lot as their brethren from the Rumanian Kingdom took over. Some of the leaders, Vajda-Voevod, Maniu, Goga were the bitterest critics of the new regime, though certainly they were not friendly toward the Hungarians. Corruption, political and financial, flourished encouraging extremist movements on the right—Iron Guard—and aggravating the situation of the Hungarian minority, still numbering 1.6 million. The land reform hit the Hungarians as Rumanian estates were usually excluded under false pretexts, the language requirements were made too severe so that civil servants of Hungarian descent, even in the railroad and post offices were always in the danger of being fired, as they often were, Hungarian students were seldom allowed to pass the Rumanian university and high school exams, administrative abuses were numerous and schools were closed right and left.

By 1936 many a volume of the League of Nations was full with the complaints and proceedings of the Hungarian minority in Transylvania. It is interesting to note that though Rumania was a French ally, the League of Nations ordered at least partial relief in 40 percent of the cases of complaints.

By 1940 the situation changed internationally. Rumania abandoned the Anglo-French guarantee in the wake of France's surrender to Hitler's armies and Hungary pressed for a revision of the frontiers. The Soviet Union, under the secret protocol of the German-Russian Treaty of August 23, 1929, that led to the partition of Poland as well, demanded Bessarabia back from Rumania in June 1940. Rumania had no choice but to yield to the Soviet demand. Hungary's turn was next, but the subsequent negotiations led into a deadend street. War seemed to be imminent between the two countries, and Germany and Italy did not want any war while they were concentrating their activities against England and stepped in at Rumanian request. The result was the second Vienna award of August 30, 1940.

The decision restored about 40 percent of Transylvania to Hungary, including most of the Hungarian-inhabited areas and some Rumanian areas as well, as there could not be a clear-cut ethnic division of the province. Yet the solution was not regarded by anyone as final. The Germans used it as a bait both to the Rumanians whom they promised restoration of northern Transylvania if they act as loyal allies, and to the Hungarians whom they promised Southern Transylvania as well if they follow the Fuehrer to "final victory." The British and Soviet Governments, in turn, promised the northern part of the province to that state which leaves the Axis Powers first.

As Rumania was the more easternmost German ally, she changed sides first on August 23, 1945, and the armistice provided for Rumanian administration of northern Transylvania. Yet, the atrocities of the returning Rumanian Armies and guerilla bands were such, that the Red Army itself expelled the Rumanian administration from the region and established a Russian military government. Only after the Yalta Conference, when upon Molotov's pressure the Rumanian king appointed a pro-Communist government, was the region returned to Rumanian administration, a decision confirmed by the Paris Peace Conference of 1947. It is interesting to note that the State Department was in favor of returning some of northern Transylvania to Hungary in 1946 and it was only the Soviet veto at Paris which prevented the United States to provide for such a frontier revision. The reason for the Soviet veto was that Rumania was already in the Soviet orbit, while Hungary was still holding out, to be absorbed later.

My colleague from New York gave us an insight into the persecution of the Hungarian minority since 1956. While it is true that during the days of the Stalin rule in Russia, the Rumanian Communists equally persecuted Rumanians and Hungarians if they were anti-Communists, one should not forget to mention this persecution of anti-Communist Hungarians either. According to Hungarian sources, documented in every individual case, between 1945 and 1964 there were not less than 278,000 Hungarians killed or deported to Dobrudja in Rumania. Most of the cases occurred in the late forties and early fifties, in order to break the Hungarian middle class and smallholders, the two mainstays of the Hungarian minority which were declared "class alien." The churches were also severely attacked, the orders dissolved, and the Roman Catholic Bishop of Gyulafehervar (Alba Julia), Aron Marton, and hundreds of priests jailed. The Greek Uniate Church suffered an even more grievous fate. It was by decree united with the Orthodox Church, though it had about 1 million adherents in Transylvania and several bishoprics and large clergy. Today, they are separated from Rome and also curtailed in their jurisdiction by the Communist government.

This is the background to the "Transylvanian Question," which was known to us already since the end of the First World War. Until Communist rule perishes in Rumania and until Rumanians and Hungarians find the secure basis for coexistence, there will be no peace in this long-suffering area of Europe. A solution of the problem is even more urgent as the colored world has now received its independence and the map of the world is changing in accordance with the wishes of its populations. Only in the Soviet orbit everything remains politically the same. Minority protection and perhaps also a friontier revision—there are 1.65 million Hungarians in Rumania, and about 60,000 Rumanians in Hungary only—are demands of the hour if a reorganization of the region after the end of Communist rule is ever to take place.

Resolution of Central High School, Newark, N.J.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of our colleagues a very fine resolution on H.R. 6400 adopted by the student body and faculty of Central High School, Newark.

It is most heartening that our young people today possess so keen an interest in public affairs and so strong a sense of justice and humanity. Their commitment to the democratic principles upon which our Nation was founded presages a new and greater concept of American freedom and equality under law.

The resolution follows in full:

Re H.R. 6400.

To: The Honorable JOSEPH G. MINISH.

Whereas a major part of the task of government under the Constitution and laws of this Nation, which most directly and intimately affects the lives and people of our Nation, is performed by or with the cooperation of its several and varied constituencies; and

Whereas it is generally recognized that responsive and effective government is vital to the strength of our whole system of self-government in the State and Nation; and

Whereas full involvement of all Americans in our processes of government is recognized as a necessary ingredient of the Democratic way of life, which we display to our allies and the world; and

Whereas at long last, the conscience of America has focused upon the need to remove the stigma of less than full citizenship imposed upon millions of Americans: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the student body and faculty of Central High School, Newark, N.J., urge and implore that you vote for bill H.R. 6400.

You persuade to your point of view those among you who hide behind archaic and outworn methods of delay which will thwart the ends which you desire and humanity demands.

This resolution should take precedence over all other businesses of government.

Respectfully yours,

CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL STUDENT COUNCIL.

ANGEE MORSE, *President.*

LOUIS MOLINA, *Vice President.*

HAROLD W. TAYLOR, Jr., *Adviser.*

When Is a World Trade Not a Trade Center?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, for some time now the New York Port Authority has been making plans to build a huge complex in Lower Manhattan which it calls a world trade center. But no one seems able to justify this project.

I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial broadcast by WCBS in New York on April 20 and April 21, 1965, concerning this proposal:

WHEN IS A WORLD TRADE CENTER NOT A TRADE CENTER?

So much of what is wrong with New York City is underscored by official reaction, or lack of it, to the port authority's plan for a giant trade center on Lower Manhattan.

Here we have a project that would dislocate or wipe out hundreds of small businesses, deprive thousands of their jobs. Yet on the central question of need the city administration remains silent.

Why?

The question is a simple one. Does New York City need a world trade center? Is it a feasible undertaking?

Why can't we get straight answers to absolutely basic questions of the project's function and practicability?

For example—the port authority insists it will centralize in the trade center's twin towers firms engaged in oversea commerce. Yet after a year of beating the drum for tenants, the authority has managed to come up with nonbinding commitments for only a third of its proposed commercial office space. And it's having no better luck with the most important of the Government agencies it hopes to attract—the U.S. Bureau of Customs. With justice, the port authority has called Customs' tenancy the "cornerstone" of the project, and has said repeatedly the Bureau will be an occupant. Yet to this date there is no hard evidence that Customs desires, or would be allowed by Congress, to participate. Even on the

matter of tax payments to the city, there's confusion. The port authority claims it's worked out a deal giving the city more in the way of tax revenue than the site now accounts for. A highly placed spokesman for the city denies any agreement exists.

The trade center concept has been described as the key to a revitalized port. And because reversing the port's declining fortunes would yield wide public benefits, the port authority was empowered to condemn the land it needs for the scheme. But if the port authority fails to centralize firms and Government agencies engaged in oversea trade, then it will also have failed to create a trade center. That much is obvious. What then of the small businessman forced to make way for a so-called public project? How would his eviction have served the larger public good? What would be the effect of millions of square feet of new office space thrown onto an already-glutted open rental market?

Before 13 blocks of New York City real estate are bulldozed under by the port authority, Mayor Wagner owes it to business, big and small, to provide some answers.

Steel Imports and Dual Distribution: The Plight of the Independent Wire Drawer and Fabricator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, dual distribution is rapidly becoming one of the chief factors threatening the existence of many small businesses in a growing number of industries. As a result, it is increasingly imperative that each of us understand the forces at work here.

One of the most clear cut and painfully instructive examples of the plight of small businessmen confronted with dual distribution is that of the independent wiredrawers.

Recently, I have received a position paper describing the situation in the wiredrawing industry from Mr. F. C. Muntwyler, president of the Independent Wire Drawers Association. It contains a most incisive analysis of the results of dual distribution upon small independent businesses. Under unanimous consent, I include it in the RECORD at this point:

INDEPENDENT WIRE
DRAWERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN ROOSEVELT: A prime example of the inequities of dual distribution is fully described in the position paper of the Independent Wire Drawers Association entitled: "Steel Imports and Dual Distribution: The Plight of the Independent Wire Drawer and Fabricator." The present situation in the steel wire and wire products industry aptly illustrates the need for remedial legislation, such as you have sponsored, to assure that the market power of integrated producers in dual distribution industries is exercised in the public interest.

Very sincerely yours,

F. C. MUNTWYLER,
President.

STEEL IMPORTS AND DUAL DISTRIBUTION: THE PLIGHT OF THE INDEPENDENT WIRE DRAWER AND FABRICATOR

The plight of the independent, nonintegrated steel wire drawing and fabricating industry is a prime example of the anticompetitive market power which can be exercised by integrated producers in a dual distribution industry, and aptly illustrates the need for remedial legislation to assure that this market power is exercised in the public interest.

The basic raw material for the steel wire and wire products industry is hot-rolled carbon steel wire rod. In the United States wire rod is produced by 15 vertically integrated steel mills; and 93 percent of U.S. wire rod capacity is controlled by 12 of these producers, including such industry giants as United States Steel, Republic, and Bethlehem. Steel wire and wire products, however, are produced by both the major integrated producers of wire rod and by many small, independent, nonintegrated wire drawers and fabricators, who are dependent upon the integrated producers for their wire rod—the classical dual distribution situation.

There is nothing inherently evil about this situation so long as a normal relationship exists between wire rod, wire and wire product prices which permit an adequate margin for converting wire rod into wire, and wire into products. Beginning in 1955, however, the behavior of these prices has not been normal, instead these prices illustrate how the integrated producers in a dual distribution industry can apply anticompetitive price squeezes to their nonintegrated competitors.

The case of a typical fabricated wire product, welded wire concrete reinforcing mesh, graphically illustrates the double price squeeze experienced by the independent wire drawer fabricators. Prior to 1955 most nonintegrated producers purchased their wire rods from domestic integrated steel mills at an average price of approximately $144 per ton. At that time welded wire mesh sold for around $202 per ton which permitted the fabricators a small markup on the wire drawing and fabricating process. But the major steel producers raised wire rod prices in 1955, 1956, 1957 and again in 1958. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, wire rod prices rose more than any other steel product during the postwar period. The price of the finished product did not increase proportionately, instead it actually decreased. A point was reached, in many areas, where the raw material was selling at a higher price than the fabricated wire product. For example, during 1963 hot-rolled carbon steel wire rod (seven thirty-seconds inch to twenty-one sixty-fourths inch) was sold, f.o.b. Sparrows Point, Md., for $144.50 per net ton. Yet, the same integrated steel mill was selling welded wire mesh for $141.50 per net ton, f.o.b. Sparrows Point.

Obviously, the independent producer could not purchase wire rod from the integrated producers at $144.50, clean and draw the rod into wire, fabricate the wire into welded wire mesh and then compete against a price of $141.50. As a matter of survival the independent producer had to turn to imported wire rod.

As a result of the double price squeeze applied by the integrated mills, wire rod imports increased from 47,800 tons in 1955 to 910,000 tons in 1963. These imports are consumed almost entirely by the independent wire drawers, and it is estimated that imports account for about 50 percent of the noncaptive wire rod market. The integrated mills did not even attempt to meet this import competition in the marketplace, rather they sought the protection of the U.S. Antidumping Act. Fortunately for the independent producers, the Treasury Department found Japanese wire rod prices were "not less than fair value," and the Tariff Commission dismissed the complaints against wire rods from West Germany, Belgium, France, and Luxembourg on the grounds of "no injury to a domestic industry." Now the intergated producers are seeking to drastically amend the Antidumping Act to insure success in any future complaint against imported steel.

The cold statistics for this period elegantly portray the plight of the independent wire drawer and fabricator:

[Price per short ton]

	Imported wire rod [1]	Domestic wire rod [2]	Welded wire mesh
1959	$122.60	$148.17	$199.54
1960	127.60	148.17	180.93
1961	115.40	148.17	173.71
1962	104.40	148.17	168.13
1963	97.20	148.17	155.62

[1] Open-hearth quality. Imported Thomas quality usually quoted $4 to $10 less than open-hearth quality.
[2] Open-hearth quality.

Source: Average import wire rod and welded wire mesh prices based on reports from independent wire drawers. Average domestic wire rod prices from Steel magazine, and from reports by independent wire drawers.

Early in 1964 the major integrated producers, with much publicity, announced a price decrease on common quality wire rod to $122.50 per short ton. This was an empty gesture as far as the independent wire drawers were concerned—the price of domestic rod gives them a margin of less than $20 to clean the wire rod, draw the wire and fabricate the mesh, plus carry overhead and profit. Fabricating costs on welded wire mesh average about $40 to $50 per ton.

Here are some further current examples of abnormal pricing in the dual distribution steel wire and wire products industry which illustrate the anticompetitive market power exercised by the vertically integrated steel producers:

1. The vertically integrated steel producers did not decrease the price on the heavier sizes of wire rod (nine thirty-seconds inch, eleven thirty-seconds inch and thirteen thirty-seconds inch) which sells for $143.50 per short ton, f.o.b. mill (Midwest). The vertically integrated steel producers did, however, decrease the price $20 per short ton on the wire drawn from this heavier wire rod. In the Midwest the following price decreases were made:

Steel wire, ¼" to ⅜", reduced from $175.80 to $155.80 per short ton f.o.b. mill.

Steel wire, .192" to ¼", reduced from $173.80 to $153.80 per short ton f.o.b. mill.

Steel wire, .177" to .192", reduced from $169.80 to $149.80 per short ton f.o.b. mill.

2. The same situation exists with wire products fabricated from the heavier wire rod. In Florida, the vertically integrated steel producers sell nine thirty-seconds inch wire rod for $150.20 per short ton, delivered; yet 6-by-6 4/4 welded wire mesh (a product fabricated from 4-gage wire, which is drawn from nine thirty-seconds inch wire rod) is sold by the vertically integrated steel producers for $150 per short ton delivered.

3. The vertically integrated steel producers sell common quality carbon steel wire for a higher price than some wire products fabricated from common quality carbon steel wire. For example:

A. WEST COAST

Welded wire mesh 6-by-6 10/10, $139.83 per short ton, f.o.b. mill.

Common quality 10-gage steel wire, $149 per short ton, f.o.b. mill.

(B) MIDWEST

Welded wire mesh, 6 by 6-6/6, $137.98 per short ton, f.o.b. mill.

Common quality 6 gage steel wire, $146 per short ton, f.o.b. mill.

(C) FLORIDA

Welded wire mesh, 6 by 6–10/10, $135 per short ton, f.o.b. mill.

Common quality 10-gage steel wire, $160 per short ton, f.o.b. mill.

The eminent steel economist, Prof. Walter Adams, of Michigan State University, recently said that without the independent wire drawer "We would have an oligopolistic managed economy (in the steel wire industry). The persistence of the independents is necessary, in the public interest, as the only means—short of regulation or public ownership—of injecting a suitable measure of fluidity into the steel price structure."

It is apparent from this brief analysis of the steel wire and wire products industry that the vertical oligopoly power of the integrated steel producers has tended to keep prices artificially high, which, in turn, has contributed to this Nation's adverse balance-of-payments position by forcing independents to buy imported steel.

The independent wire drawers have displayed direct, vigorous, and dynamic competitive effort—this competitive effort is in the public interest of maintaining a free competitive marketplace. If the integrated steel producers had followed the example of the major auto producers by meeting import competition directly in the marketplace rather than running to Washington, there would have been no need for the independents to use imported steel, and the industry, the public, and the Nation would have benefited.

The Roosevelt bill would require fair pricing behavior in dual distribution industries. The Roosevelt bill is not an indirect subsidy for inefficient independent producers; in the fabricating segment of the steel industry scientific evidence proves that independent fabricators one one-hundredth the size of their integrated rivals have been capable of competing effectively with the giants—whenever allowed to do so in free and open competition.

The independent wire drawers and fabricators do not want special favors or subsidies from the Federal Government—all we ask is preservation of the marketplace—free from squeeze tactics and monopolistic sharpshooting.

Young Americans for Freedom—Vietnam Policy Statement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the John R. Pillion chapter of Young Americans for Freedom, in Buffalo, N.Y., endorses the strong position taken by President Johnson in dealing with the Vietcong Communists.

In support of the President's action, the members of this chapter have circulated petitions in Buffalo which already include more than 1,000 signatures. These petitions, together with the Vietnam policy statement of the Young Americans for Freedom, are being forwarded to the President so that he can be apprised of this group's efforts in support of the course he is pursuing in this troubled area.

Under leave to extend my remarks, their Vietnam policy statement follows:

VIETNAM POLICY STATEMENT

Young Americans for Freedom is proud of President Johnson's strong and effective actions against the Communists in Vietnam.

There are many influential parties exerting maximum pressures on the President to retreat and negotiate in Vietnam. In this morning's newspaper, we read of Democratic Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, chairman of the powerful Senate Foreign Relations Committee, urging the President to temporarily halt air strikes against North Vietnam because he is "pessimistic about the outcome of the situation in Vietnam if there is no attempt at negotiations." This is not an isolated case. Students and Communists have marched on Washington to picket the White House; college professors and university senates have sponsored rallies and marathon teach-ins urging withdrawal; Senators WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, and ERNEST GRUENING, of Alaska, have delivered vehement tirades against the President's southeast Asian policy of containment; Senators FRANK CHURCH, of Idaho, and GEORGE MCGOVERN, of South Dakota, have made severe attacks on Mr. Johnson; and other powerful agitators continue a furious onslaught of peace-at-any-price propaganda. Moreover, such irresponsible conduct is increasing at a shocking pace.

Americans must assure Mr. Johnson that he is not alone in the cause of freedom. It is our patriotic and moral duty to stand by our President in this hour of great crisis.

We must not relent our traditional duty to defend liberty. We must not capitulate even in the face of defeat. We must not succumb to threats of a full-scale war. We must not forsake the people of southeast Asia to the barbarous invasions of the Attilic Red Chinese. We must not abandon the South Vietnamese to the inhumane atrocities of communism.

The American people's will to fight for freedom—not only for ourselves, but for all the people of the world—has been demonstrated in the past and must be reasserted now.

Outstanding anti-Communists such as Senator THOMAS DODD, of Connecticut, and our own Congressman THADDEUS J. DULSKI are to be congratulated for their stanch and resolute positions in this crucial situation. As they know and have repeatedly said, we must win—we can win—and we will win.

KENNETH K. MAHER, Jr.
Chairman.

LOUIS MARANO,
Director of Young Americans for Freedom.

California State Senator Introduces Resolutions for Study of Nature's Destructive Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, recently, Gov. Edmund G. Brown, of California, gave a speech in which he suggested that the great ingenuity and resources of the aerospace team in California should be channeled to provide some sources or at least unravel some of the unknowns concerning the destructive forces of nature such as storms, earthquakes, fires, and floods.

State Senator Alvin C. Weingand recently announced that he plans to introduce resolutions in the State legislature to accomplish this purpose.

I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Senator Weingand's press release which indicates the great promise of this approach to some of the problems which have plagued mankind for many years.

The press release follows:

CALIFORNIA STATE SENATOR INTRODUCES RESOLUTIONS FOR STUDY OF NATURES DESTRUCTIVE FORCES

Senator Alvin C. Weingand announced today he will introduce resolutions calling for studies by California aerospace firms into the mysteries of the destructive forces of nature—storm, earthquake, fire, and flood.

Senator Weingand, Democrat, of Santa Barbara, said the legislation represents an expansion of the State's pioneering efforts to direct California aerospace industry talent to pressing State problems.

It would authorize preliminary feasibility studies into the causes, control, and prevention of natural phenomena as well as into the long-range forecasting of State recreational needs.

'I believe that if the genius of California's space age talent can find ways to rocket a man to the moon, it can also begin to give us some answers to help us control the destructive forces of nature," Senator Weingand said.

"Despite the marvelous accomplishments of modern science, we are still all but helpless before these natural phenomena.

"The toll in California alone in lives and property from forest fires, floods, and earthquakes is appallingly high year after year.

"I am hopeful that the preliminary investigations my resolutions would authorize will suggest some answers. I am hopeful they will help us move toward realizing man's ancient dream of truly mastering the elements and controlling them for his own benefit."

Governor Brown commended the senator "for his interest in this highly important undertaking."

The Governor said studies under contracts already let into four other problem areas—transportation, information collection and control, waste management, and criminal control—"are proceeding extremely well."

"They are proving that the systems analysis approach can be applied to unsolved and expensive problems here at home, and they are justifying my original hope in proposing them," the Governor said.

"Our aim in these undertakings is twofold. We want to mount a more effective attack on some of the problems we face in California and the Nation that have too long defied the necessary scientific or engineering solutions. At the same time, we can assist the State's aerospace industry to convert part of its activities to nondefense pursuits.

"Our hope ultimately is that California, which now dominates the aerospace scene nationally, will become the research and development center of the Nation in an economy turning increasingly to peaceful pursuits."

The five resolutions authorize the administrator of the resources agency to coordinate the efforts of agency departments in cooperation with the aerospace industry to investigate and seek solutions to the various problems.

Excerpts from the resolutions:

On earthquake cause and prediction: "California has experienced a large number of earthquakes, three of which were of a general magnitude similar to the 1964 Good Friday earthquake in Alaska.

"The occurrence of an earthquake of this general magnitude in a densely populated

area of California would be catastrophic not only to man's works, but to man himself, physically and psychologically.

"Many disciplines of knowledge should be directed to the study of earthquake cause and prediction and on man's proper response to the knowledge so developed."

On forest fire control and prevention "The problems of wild land fire prevention and control have been greatly intensified during the past 20 years by California's population growth and economic expansion resulting in human use of the 37 million acres of wild land and timber.

"Completed research projects lead to the conclusion that direct study of production relationships appear to be an essential prerequisite for further progress toward determining proper economic production goals for fire prevention and fire control programs, operations, and organization."

On flood control planning: "The great floods of December 1964, caused economic and personal damage to vast areas of the State, which demonstrate the need for improved methods of forecasting and controlling floods.

"Present criteria and procedures utilized in evaluating the justification of expenditures for flood control works may not properly account for the long-range impact of a major flood on the economy of an area."

Edward R. Murrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of my colleagues to the following article in today's New York Times, a fitting tribute to an unusual man, Edward R. Murrow.

The article follows:

EDWARD R. MURROW, BROADCASTER AND FORMER USIA HEAD, DIES

Edward R. Murrow, whose independence and incisive reporting brought heightened journalistic stature to radio and television, died yesterday at his home in Pawling, N.Y., at the age of 57.

The former head of the U.S. Information Agency had been battling cancer since October 1963. He had been in and out of the hospital ever since, and death came 3 weeks after he was discharged from New York Hospital for the last time.

The ever-present cigarette (he smoked 60 to 70 a day), the matter-of-fact baritone voice and the high-domed, worried, lopsided face were the trademarks of the radio reporter who became internationally famous during World War II with broadcasts that started, "This [pause] is London."

Later, on television, his series of news documentaries, "See It Now," on the Columbia Broadcasting System from 1951 to 1958, set the standard for all television documentaries on all networks.

President Johnson, on learning of Mr. Murrow's death, said that all Americans "feel a sense of loss in the death of Edward R. Murrow."

He was, the President said, a "gallant fighter" who had "dedicated his life as a newsman and as a public official to the unrelenting search for truth."

Mr. Murrow died at his home on the rolling hills of his 280-acre Pawling farm shortly before noon.

He is survived by his widow, the former Janet Huntington Brewster; a son, Charles Casey Murrow, a freshman at Yale University; and two brothers, L. V. Murrow, of Washington, and Dewey Murrow, of Spokane, Wash.

A funeral service will be held on Friday at 2 p.m. at St. James Episcopal Church, 865 Madison Avenue, between 71st and 72d Streets. Burial is to be announced.

In many years of receiving honors and tributes, the most recent was conferred on Mr. Murrow on March 5, 1965, by Queen Elizabeth II, who named him an honorary Knight Commander of the Order of the British Empire.

On September 14, 1964, President Johnson awarded him the Medal of Freedom, the highest civilian honor a President can confer on an American citizen.

Mr. Murrow's career with the Columbia Broadcasting Co. spanned 25 years. It ended in January 1961 when President Kennedy named him head of the U.S. Information Agency.

In October 1963, a malignant tumor made the removal of his left lung necessary, and 3 months later he resigned as head of the Agency. Last November, Mr. Murrow again underwent surgery.

BROUGHT CONTROVERSY INTO HOMES

Mr. Murrow achieved international distinction in broadcasting, first as a radio correspondent reporting from London in World War II and then as a pioneer television journalist opening the home screen to the stimulus of controversy. No other figure in broadcast news left such a strong stamp on both media.

In an industry often given to rule by committee, Mr. Murrow was always recognized as an individual, whether in the front lines of the war, in the executive conferences of a network or, in what he enjoyed most, in planning his next story. His independence was reflected in doing what he thought had to be done on the air and worrying later about the repercussions among sponsors, viewers, and individual stations. The fruits of his determination are shared today by newsmen at all networks; they enjoy a freedom and latitude not yet won by others working in the medium.

Mr. Murrow was a realist about fame. He could not walk a block in New York without pedestrians turning for a look or a bore trying to strike up a conversation. But in the context of television he knew the value of adulation. "It can get a lot of things done," he once remarked. That was his concern.

In the last war, Mr. Murrow conveyed the facts with a compelling precision. But he went beyond the reporting of the facts. By describing what he saw in visual detail, he sought to convey the moods and feelings of war.

Had a London street just been bombed out? The young correspondent was soon there in helmet, gray flannel trousers and sport coat, quietly describing everything he saw against the urgent sound patterns of rescue operations.

Or he would be in a plane on a combat mission, broadcasting live on the return leg and describing the bombing he had watched as "orchestrated hell."

He flew 25 missions in the war, despite the opposition of top executives of the Columbia Broadcasting System in New York, who regarded him as too valuable to be so regularly risked. In the endless German air raids on London, his office was bombed out three times but he escaped injury.

Mr. Murrow, never fevered or high-blown, had the gift of dramatizing whatever he reported. He did so by understatement and by a calm, terse, highly descriptive radio style. Sometimes there was a sort of metallic poetry in his words.

"BLOOD ON THE PANES"

In one memorable broadcast he said that as he "walked home at 7 in the morning, the windows in the West End were red with reflected fire, and the raindrops were like blood on the panes."

For a dozen years, as radio's highest paid newscaster, he was known by voice alone to millions of his countrymen. "This (pause) is London," was his matter-of-fact salutation, delivered in a baritone voice tinged with an echo of doom. Later it was, "This (pause) is the news."

Then television added to the distinctive voice an equally distinctive face, with high-domed forehead and deep-set, serious eyes. Mr. Murrow's casual television manner was superimposed on a quite obvious native tension.

As the armchair interviewer on "Person to Person," Mr. Murrow carried out a gentlemanly electronic invasion of the homes of scores of celebrities in the 1950's from Sophie Tucker through the evangelist Billy Graham.

The darkly handsome Mr. Murrow, his brow knotted and two fingers holding his ever-present cigarette, sat in the studio facing a greatly magnified television image of his subjects at home. He would make what one writer called "urbane small talk" with them, generously admiring their children and perhaps inquiring exactly where that handsome vase on the side table had been acquired. It was not momentous, but it was interesting.

SERIES OF DOCUMENTARIES

From 1951 to 1958 Mr. Murrow also did a series of news documentaries under the title "See It Now." In the 1953–54 season the telecast studied the various aspects of the impact of the emotional and political phenomenon known as McCarthyism.

Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, Republican, of Wisconsin, was then conducting his crusade against alleged Communist influence. Some regarded it as a hard, honest search for subversives by a zealous patriot; others saw it as a demagogic opportunism, the exploitation of a real issue for the purpose of gaining political influence by intimidation.

The debate over Senator McCarthy, was supercharged with emotion and fervent belief. Since commercial television thrives by giving little offense, the medium had given the matter gingerly treatment.

Mr. Murrow and his long-time coeditor, Fred W. Friendly, broke this pattern decisively on Wednesday evening, March 10, 1954. Using film clips that showed the Senator to no good advantage, the two men offered a provocative examination of the man and his methods.

The program, many thought, had a devastating effect. McCarthyism did lose public force in succeeding months. "The timing was right and the instrument powerful," Mr. Murrow said to the telecast later.

DECIDED TO GO AHEAD

Jack Gould, television critic of the New York Times, wrote that "Mr. Murrow decided to go ahead with the program at a time when passions in the broadcasting industry were running wild on the issue of Communist sympathizers and dupes. It was the autonomy of the Murrow-Friendly operation, often the source of internal controversy within CBS that got the vital show on the air."

That autonomy was a singular thing in network broadcasting. It was based on Mr. Murrow's immense prestige, initially gained when he became one of the first radio war correspondents and built a superb news staff for CBS in Europe.

Mr. Murrow, one writer said, "has achieved a position at CBS that is outside, and basically antithetical to, the corporate structure of authority" and he thereby enjoyed a large measure of "freedom from authority of all

kinds." He ran his own news island within the network for many years.

"See It Now" employed five full-time camera crews and they went anywhere in the world. A sponsor paid $57,000 a week for the show, but Mr. Murrow did not limit himself to that if he thought a better show could be done for more. The network paid the difference.

"They come to me, the vice presidents, and say, 'Look, there's so much going out of this spout and only so much coming in.' And I say, 'If that's the way you want to do it, you'd better get yourselves another boy,'" Mr. Murrow once said.

REDUCTION IN AUTHORITY

When "See It Now" became "CBS Reports" in 1958–59, the network diffused the responsibility for documentary telecasts and Mr. Murrow's authority was reduced. "He was blocked," one friend wrote, "in his raging desire to get the network he loved onto new paths of glory."

On "Small World," from the fall of 1958 to 1960, he brought top world figures together by remote telecasting and moderated their continent-spanning discussions. But it was known that he was not very happy at the network then.

Egbert Roscoe Murrow was born on April 25, 1908, at Pole Cat Creek, N.C., a "mixture of English, Scotch, Irish, and German" descent. He changed his first name to Edward in his second year at college.

His father, a tenant farmer, moved to Blanchard, Wash., where his son grew up in the great Northwest and worked on a survey gang in the timberlands during summer vacations.

In 1930 he graduated from Washington State College with a Phi Beta Kappa key. He became president of the National Student Federation that year, a job that paid $25 a week with a basement office in New York.

In 1932 he became assistant director of the Institute of International Education. He met Janet Huntington Brewster, a Mount Holyoke graduate, on a train that year and 2 years later they were married in the bride's hometown, Middletown, Conn.

HIRED IN 1935

In 1935, Mr. Murrow was employed by CBS as director of talks and education. Part of his work was to address important groups on the potential of radio as a medium of education.

He was in New Orleans in 1937, attending a meeting of the National Education Association, when he received an unexpected call from headquarters asking if he would go to Europe.

His answer—"yes"—was the decisive turn of his career. He later said that it had led to his having "a front row seat for some of the greatest news events of history."

The young man, then 29, became the network's one-man staff in Europe, a pleasant life. He arranged cultural programs and interviewed leaders. Though his office was in London, he traveled extensively, typically visiting Rome for a week to arrange a Vatican choir broadcast.

As war began to seem inevitable he hired William L. Shirer, a newspaperman, to cover the Continent. Both he and Mr. Shirer were arranging musical broadcasts when Hitler marched into Austria.

Mr. Murrow flew to Berlin and chartered a Lufthansa transport to Vienna for $1,000. He rode a streetcar into the city in time to watch the arrival of goose-stepping German troops.

For 10 days he was allowed to broadcast, and he described the nation's swift transition to a subject state. Life changed drastically for the young newsman. At home, millions hung on his and Shirer's words.

HE HIRED THE STAFF

As news chief for CBS in Europe he hired the men who were to become the network's famous roster of war correspondents—among them Eric Sevareid, Charles Collingwood, Howard K. Smith, Richard Hottelet, Cecil Brown, and Larry LeSueur.

"I'm hiring reporters, not announcers," Mr. Murrow told "the shop" (as he usually called New York headquarters) when CBS executives complained that he was hiring men who sounded "terrible" on the air. Their on-the-scene reports reached into farm and city homes from New England to the Pacific States, bringing the realities of war close.

One former staff member recalled the instruction Mr. Murrow gave to his newsmen.

The reporter must never sound excited even if bombs are falling outside, Mr. Murrow said.

Rather, the reporter should imagine that he has just returned to his hometown and that the local editor has asked him to dinner.

"After dinner," Mr. Murrow counseled "your host asks you 'Well, what was it like?' As you talk, the maid is passing the coffee and her boyfriend, a truckdriver, is waiting for her in the kitchen and listening. You are supposed to describe things in terms that make sense to the truckdriver without insulting the intelligence of the professor."

Mr. Murrow's wartime broadcasts from Britain, North Africa and finally the Continent gripped listeners by their firm, spare authority; nicely timed pauses; and Mr. Murrow's calm, grave delivery. One observer wrote that his voice always "conveyed the impression that he knows the worst."

He was the first allied correspondent inside the Nazi concentration camp at Buchenwald. Near 300 bodies, he saw a mound of men's, women's and children's shoes.

"I regarded that broadcast as a failure," he said. "I could have described three pairs of those shoes—but hundreds of them. I couldn't. The tragedy of it simply overwhelmed me."

Returning to the United States in 1946 after 9 years overseas, he became a vice president of CBS in news operations. He soon found executive tasks—in-and-out baskets, memos, conference, and the rest—wearisome. He was away from the microphone for 18 months. "I wanted to be a reporter again because I needed the dignity and satisfaction of being a reporter," he said.

CARRIED FOR 13 YEARS

On September 29, the former war correspondent went on the air with his evening radio report, "Edward R. Murrow With the News." It was carried by 125 network stations to an audience of several million people nightly except weekends for 13 years.

Unlike most news commentators, Mr. Murrow did not allow his sponsor to break into the news with a middle commercial. When he had finished giving the news and doing what he called the "end piece"—the graceful essays that caused him to be regarded as "the social philosopher of radio correspondents"—the closing commercial would be read. To hold the audience, Mr. Murrow would then come back with a brief "Word for Today," usually a quotation appropriate to the news that had gone before.

His sign-off on both radio and television was a crisp, "Good night, and good luck."

By 1949 Mr. Murrow was earning $112,000 a year, which jumped to about $240,000 when he became the only major radio news personality to make a full successful switch to television. "Hear It Now," the radio historical documentary series he started in 1948, also made the transition to television, becoming "See It Now," which ran for 7 years.

Mr. Murrow often expressed a preference for the radio medium over the television medium. He enjoyed the speed with which radio could cover a breaking news story, but more particularly he preferred the absence of any intrusions between a commentator's thoughts and his audience. In radio the merit of an opinion alone held a listener's attention, he noted, while in television pictorial considerations had a strong influence.

Mr. Murrow and his wife occupied a 10th-floor apartment at 580 Park Avenue and a log house in Pawling, N.Y., with acres thick with pheasant and ducks, a trout stream, and nine holes of golf nearby.

Off camera Mr. Murrow was a convivial companion, given to a whisky sour at lunch, a relish of journalistic shoptalk, and amusement and exasperation over the ways of the television business. He appreciated humor if it had style and from years on the air instinctively leaned to the short sentence. On hazardous missions overseas he was usually the coolest passenger.

If Mr. Murrow had one private concern about his professional life it was that he might slip into the role of the television news prima donna reading the words of some anonymous rewrite man.

An often chaotic schedule necessitated some measure of assistance in script preparation but he felt it was his obligation to be in the field more often than not. His restlessness was always in evidence.

WON FOUR PEABODYS

Mr. Murrow won the Peabody Award for excellence in broadcasting in 1943, 1949, 1951, and 1954. William S. Paley, president of CBS, called him "a man fitted for his time and task—a student, a philosopher, at heart a poet of mankind and, therefore, a great reporter."

In a similar vein, Carl Sandburg, the poet, inscribed a photograph of himself, "To Ed Murrow—reporter, historian, inquirer, actor, ponderer, seeker."

Mr. Murrow was more modest in his self-assessment. "My father did not go so far as to say that there's something dishonest about a man making a living by talking, but he did think there was something pretty dubious about it," he once remarked.

Mr. Murrow became the Nation's chief tactician in the propaganda war when President Kennedy chose him as Director of the U.S. Information Agency in January 1961.

The appointment ended a 25-year association with CBS—he had been a member of its board of directors from 1947 to 1956—and removed Mr. Murrow from the domestic broadcasting scene. His salary was $21,000 a year.

From Washington, he directed the output of prodigious amounts of news and propaganda, sending the Nation's message in manifold forms to all the nations of the earth. He emphasized plain speaking and straightforward reporting in 789 weekly hours of broadcasting and in the daily 10,000-word wireless file of news to newspapers in 100 cities overseas.

PROFESSIONAL EMPHASIS

Mr. Murrow aimed at putting a more professional emphasis on Voice of America broadcasts, with shorter, crisper reports. Because he believed that explained verity was more persuasive than sheer propaganda, he told Agency writers to report the facts in perspective, the bad as well as the good.

He defended the Agency's policy of distributing news of racial flareups in this country, saying such events could not be kept a secret and arguing that there was no choice but to present the facts with balanced interpretation.

"We cannot make good news out of bad practice," he said with typical pith when Senators criticized his staff for not depicting things as generally rosy.

At one point, Murrow the reporter came into a singular conflict with Murrow the propagandist. Before joining the Agency, he had narrated the telecast "Harvest of Shame," a chilling documentary on the exploitation of migrant farm laborers in the United States.

The British Broadcasting Corporation bought the film from CBS. In an unusual

intervention by a Government official, Mr. Murrow telephoned the BBC and asked that the film not be used.

The BBC announced that it had bought the film in good faith and added, with what must have seemed stunning irrelevancy to Mr. Murrow, that it had "the greatest faith in Murrow," meaning the reporter.

WAS A CHAINSMOKER

When the film was shown, a London critic wrote: "The documentary blazed fiercely with Murrow's incomparable indignation * * * fury backed by hard fact on film."

As the Nation's best-known chainsmoker—he smoked 40 to 50 cigarettes a day—Mr. Murrow once sat through a half hour televised roundtable discussion without lighting a single cigarette. A reporter called the USIA to see if he had quit smoking. "His ashtrays are still full," he was assured.

Mr. Murrow was frequently mentioned in 1962 as a possible Democratic candidate for the U.S. Senate, but he said that he had never "had a horizon of more than 90 days."

In a congressional hearing in 1962, Senator STUART SYMINGTON, of Missouri, called Mr. Murrow's estimate of the cost for use of communications satellites by the USIA "obviously ridiculous." Mr. Murrow replied calmly, "I respectfully suggest that the Senator's estimates have no claim to any higher validity."

LEADERS OFFER TRIBUTES

Besides President Johnson's tribute to Mr. Murrow, there were a number of others.

Adlai E. Stevenson, U.S. representative at the United Nations, said that "few voices in my generation were better known. He brought into the homes of millions many of the great events of our time. Ed Murrow served the cause of truth gallantly, even as he served his fellow countrymen and his Government."

Mayor Wagner said that Mr. Murrow had "served his Nation and the cause of freedom throughout the world with brilliance and devotion. I was honored to count him among my friends."

Mr. Paley, now chairman of the board of CBS, said that the newscaster was one of the Nation's "most dedicated and eloquent spokesmen.

"No one will ever be able to fill the unique place Ed Murrow held in broadcasting—as a great journalist, as the originator of an oversea reporting organization, unequaled anywhere * * * as one who set standards of excellence that remain unsurpassed."

The two other television networks also issued statements.

David E. Lilienthal, former head of the Atomic Energy Commission, said, "He stands with Churchill as proof that only one man, be he brave enough, can turn the tide against tyranny and fear."

Increasing Manufacturing Inroads in Retail Sales

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following letter by Mr. George Burger, vice president of the National Federation of Independent Business, concerning my bill, H.R. 566, which is designed to prohibit the sale of tires at the retail level by the manufacturers. Following Mr. Burger's letter is an article, "Anatomy of Industry Concentration," from the April 1965 edition of the National Independent which also concerns this increasingly serious problem.

The letter and article follow:

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
San Mateo, Calif., April 14, 1965.

Subject: H.R. 566.

Hon. ABRAHAM J. MULTER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: It is our opinion that the purpose of the above bill which you have sponsored in this Congress, and in other recent Congresses, is important if there is to be any free enterprise in the rubber tire industry. The wresting of control and the increasing inroads by major tire manufacturers in the retail field is alarming, and their increasing ties with major petroleum companies is playing no minor role in the distribution of tires through their filling station operators throughout the Nation.

It is to be noted that in a recent publication it was stated in substance that the proposed legislation now pending in the Congress that tire sales be made only to independent dealers will be killed as the big oil companies and tire manufacturers who have the power to block it are in opposition.

It will be well to review the attached article which appeared in the National Independent, April issue, "Anatomy of Industry Concentration." It is an indication of what is taking place right at this moment due to the ties existing between major rubber companies and major petroleum companies in the sale of tires; and the net results of such operations which are reducing the numbers of small producers and, more important, independent dealers of all descriptions nationwide.

Bear in mind that at the moment the major tire manufacturer involved has announced plans to acquire the smaller rubber company. Even more important, there is now pending in the Supreme Court action regarding the relationship between Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co. and Atlantic Refining Co., which case is awaiting the Court's decision on the Government's findings. It is to be noted also that similar cases by the Government between other major rubber and major oil companies are still pending for final court action. If the decision of the High Court is against the Government, it will mean the increasing need for Congress to approve the above bill at the earliest possible moment.

I believe it would be of interest to you and your colleagues if you could find it convenient to insert this letter and the attachment in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Sincerely,

GEORGE J. BURGER,
Vice President.

ANATOMY OF INDUSTRY CONCENTRATION

The record shows that the Lee Rubber & Tire Corp, withdrew as a serious competitor among the remaining tire manufacturing companies about 3 years ago when the firm's management lost control to a New York syndicate headed by a financier sometimes described as a "shrewd raider" of corporations. It wasn't long before the firm went on the auction block.

For all practical purposes, however, the 50-year-old Pennsylvania-based tiremaker's real troubles began after monopoly business was given a free reign—and that happened years ago.

Now that Goodyear has picked up Lee's option here is another instance where any Government action on the antitrust front, if it comes at all, would amount to closing the barn door after the horse is stolen.

"America is at the crossroads. It must face up to the alternative paths lying ahead. Will it follow the road to monopoly * * * or the road to a restoration of competitive free enterprise?"

These words were written in 1962 by Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, then chairman of the House Small Business Committee which had produced a voluminous report on a decade of merger activity among the largest U.S. corporations.

A few years later and America in 1965 apparently has yet to make a decision regarding increasing industry concentration. Still hanging fire is the question of whether this country will act in time to preserve, in PATMAN'S words, "the American ideals of opportunity for small, locally oriented companies to enter business and thrive and grow."

The rubber tire industry, too, is at the crossroads. Within the short space of 4 years three independent tire manufacturers have disappeared from the competitive scene and have been reduced to the status of mere divisions of major producers. The loss of Dayton, Seiberling, and Lee might be compared to a former burst of merger activity when prior to World War II Goodrich bought Brunswick, Diamond, Hood, and Miller, the U.S. Rubber Co. was permitted to acquire Fisk and Gillette, and Goodyear was allowed to absorb Kelly-Springfield.

What's wrong? PATMAN said in 1962 that "despite the noble efforts designed (by Congress) to preserve opportunity for small, local enterprise, big business has grown apace * * * and has fashioned new techniques of controlling markets and enhancing its powers."

He warned at that time of a move toward "a new phase of industrial domination and control of American industry" which threatens to turn independent small businessmen into "clerks and hired hands."

For those interested in cold, hard statistics the HSBC reported that the Nation's top 500 industrial firms gobbled up some 3,404 other companies in the space of 11 years. Many of these merged firms were former competitors. This activity was most prominent in the dairy products, paper, chemical, aircraft, and retail food fields.

The Borden Milk Co. is an outstanding example of a nationally known firm affected by the merger virus. During the period 1951–61 Borden acquired no less than 121 smaller competitors. Federal Trade Commission observed that the firm was sweeping the country clean of competition. (In this respect it is interesting to note a press release of HSBC of March 11, 1965. A subcommittee of the small business panel will conduct another investigation "to determine whether large dairies are taking unfair competitive advantage of smaller operators.")

SOME QUESTIONS FOR DEALERS, SMALLER PRODUCERS

Here are some questions dealers and smaller tire producers ought to be asking as the onrushing trend toward consolidation and concentration makes itself felt in the rubber tire industry. What will be the impact of recent mergers on market control? Are the dominating tire makers' making survival difficult or impossible for the remaining smaller producers (at present there are nine left)? Is the growing scarcity of smaller producers placing restrictions on independent retailers by limiting their choice of suppliers? And are the large integrated tire makers by virtue of their activity in the retail field drying up opportunity for independent retailers?

By posing these questions we do not mean to infer we have the answers; no more, apparently, than the Congress and antitrust agencies have them.

We do, however, have a fair idea of the conditions in industry which produce concentration and monopoly.

TBA MONOPOLY STRAPPED LEE

The failure of Lee Rubber & Tire Co., for example, can in large measure be traced to that company's loss of business to the TBA monopoly enjoyed almost exclusively by the major producers. We turn to FTC Docket No. 6486, dated March 9, 1961, in the matter of Goodyear's TBA contract with Atlantic Refining Co. There are ample instances found in these FTC allegations to substantiate this claim. Furthermore, it should be noted, the U.S. Court of Appeals in Chicago on April 24, 1964, upheld FTC's case and denied Goodyear's petition to set aside the Governments order to break the TBA contract.

"The success enjoyed by Goodyear * * * in selling to Atlantic has been purchased at the expense of competing TBA suppliers," FTC noted. The "competing supplier" in this case happened to be Lee.

Returning to the docket we read this description of events which led to Lee's loss of business (between 1948 and 1950 Atlantic's sales of TBA was $22 million) to Goodyear, the major company which now has an option to buy the smaller company.

"Sometime in 1932, Atlantic commenced to purchase 'Lee' tires from the Lee Rubber & Tire Corp., and to resell such tires to its wholesale and retail petroleum distributors." Note that under this plan Atlantic bought, warehoused, shipped, and sold the tires to its outlets. Thus the oil marketer was competing in the market by performing a distinct economic service. And note too that an Atlantic spokesman commenting on the arrangement with Lee, said: "We receive a good gross margin in keeping with the duties left to us."

Also note that Atlantic's dealers were satisfied with the arrangement. The oil firm conducted a brand-preference survey among its dealers in 1948 and 1949 and got following result: "67 percent of the Atlantic dealers contacted indicated that they would rather obtain their TBA requirements from several sources rather than a single source, the principal reason given therefor being price advantages and the variety of brands."

Notwithstanding, negotiations for exclusive TBA contract between Atlantic and the major tire producers were set in motion. One result was that operations under the so-called "sales commission" plan with Goodyear commenced on an experimental basis in Atlantic's Newark, N.J., section in June 1950. It proved successful to Atlantic and Goodyear. But not for Lee and other small competitors.

Subsequently, Atlantic gave Lee the boot and took on the Goodyear TBA line. An Atlantic official boasted to his superior: "We are relieved of the purchasing function * * * do not warehouse or deliver any merchandise, we are not involved in the handling of accounts, we do not issue catalogs or price books nor do we have to provide point-of-sale promotion helps." All that Atlantic had to do, he commented, was to "assist in the selling job as well as in the dealer training and merchandising task, and for this effort receive a commission which * * * has been averaging well over 9 percent."

Lee vigorously protested the loss of its right to compete in an open market for this business, but in vain. FTC puts it this way: "The sales gain accruing to Goodyear * * * was accompanied by a corresponding loss in sales by Lee" even though Lee had opened new factory branches in Hartford, Conn., Providence, R.I., and Syracuse, N.Y., to accommodate this business. Within nine months after Atlantic began sponsoring Goodyear TBA Lee dourfully reported that only "25 percent of the Atlantic business will be salvaged this year (1951)."

Lee sales VIP's wrote bitter letters to Atlantic complaining of the methods employed to grease the shift from Lee to Goodyear at Atlantic's outlets. But these missales were exercises in futility.

Another unrewarding dividend derived from such TBA agreements must be pointed out, and that is the devasting effect they have on smaller tire producers who need to build a strong network of distrbution through independent dealers. You can assess their chances at success in this vital area when you consider that even the tire distributors of the majors with TBA ties are eliminated in competing for the business of "captured" gas stations. FTC illustrates this point when it charged that "competition among Goodyear wholesalers for the business of Atlantic accounts has been eliminated through the assignment of each Atlantic account to a designated supply point." While there were 1,155 Goodyear dealers in the Atlantic marketing territories assigned to Goodyear only 128 of these dealers were tapped as "supply points." The remainder of Goodyear dealers, like dealers handling smaller company lines, "are substantially foreclosed from access to Atlantic accounts."

Multiply this effect on free competition by the number of TBA agreements in force between the major tire and oil firms and you get an indication of what is involved.

Proposal for Peace in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

A VIEW OF THE NEWS—GETTING INVOLVED IN VIETNAM

(By Clarke Ash, associate editor of the Miami News)

What can one Miamian do to end the mess in Vietnam? John R. Bethea doesn't know for sure but he aims to find out.

Bethea is a young (33) social science instructor at the University of Miami who believes teachers should become involved in world events.

Currently, he is looking for ways to spread the word about a promising plan to get the United States out of the Vietnam conflict without abandoning the country to the Communists.

The plan is not Bethea's. It was advanced by a fellow educator at the University of Chicago, Dr. Gilbert F. White, professor of geography. After first appearing in the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, it is being distributed by the American Friends Service Committee, whose pamphlet came into Bethea's hands.

Essentially, White's plan would substitute a massive, multination economic assistance program for the lone military hand the United States is playing today. About 20 nations would be involved in both an economic and military venture which would help stabilize not only Vietnam but also Laos, Cambodia, and other troubled countries of southeast Asia.

RED ATTITUDE

What makes anyone think the Communists would hold still while all this is going on? No one knows that they would, of course. But optimism springs from the fact that they are already cooperating to some degree in a little-known development program of vast potential on the southern Mekong River Delta.

Some 20 nations are working there with remarkable unanimity of purpose on a program begun in 1957 by the U.N. Economic Commission. The plan has such vast popular support that so far the Communists have kept hands off.

Dr. White suggests that the present project, now in the planning and engineering phase, be greatly expanded by the participating nations. The Mekong is to this region what the Mississippi is to the United States, the Nile to northeast Africa, the Amazon to South America, with huge untapped potential for hydroelectric power and agriculture. The benefits of its development would extend all the way to Red China. It would be to the advantage of the nations supplying the economic assistance to join in a multination police force to assure political stability while the project was underway.

This is but a sketchy outline of a proposal which Bethea can propound in detail and at length. He believes that if enough people can be sold, their combined voices will be heard in Washington.

RIGHT DIRECTION

Maybe Washington is already tuned in. Last Thursday, President Johnson emerged from a Cabinet meeting with the announcement that the United States would consider a sort of "Marshall plan" of economic and social assistance for Southeast Asia if peace were restored in Vietnam.

The President did not mention the Mekong River development specifically, but the idea would seem to mesh with his thinking. If he has any trouble selling the public on this new direction, Mr. Johnson should have an ardent supporter in Dr. White and his convert in Miami, John Bethea.

A PROPOSAL FOR PEACE IN VIETNAM [1]

A peaceful and honorable resolution of the conflict in South Vietnam and Laos may be found in a bold plan for land and water development which already unites factions in four nations of southeast Asia. For 7 years, Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, and South Vietnam have been working with little publicity and without disagreement on a huge development program. These four countries, which do not cooperate in anything else, have reached accord on development of the Lower Mekong Basin.

Work already is underway in drawing engineering designs, moving earth for dams, building powerplants, cultivating pilot farms, and training village technicians. Even guerrilla troops have not halted field work.

If the United Nations were to designate this area for international development according to the plan already drawn by the four nations, there is a strong possibility that peace could be achieved in a common pursuit of agricultural and industrial growth. This is a solution to southeast Asian violence which would make sense to peasants in rice fields and to American taxpayers * * *. The United Nations might be expected to provide a blue-helmeted watch and ward service for those sectors of the project area where security is threatened. It could do this on the invitation of the country concerned. Cambodia and Tailand would have no immediate need beyond protection of their borders. Laos and South Vietnam would find it essential in the areas where civil unrest has been intense * * *.

This type of agreement would be fundamentally different from the cease-fire that is

[1] Excerpts from "Lower Mekong," by Gilbert F. White, professor of geography at the University of Chicago. The article was published by the "Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists," December 1964, and reprinted by the American Friends Service Committee, 1185 Sunset Drive, Coral Gables, Fla.

envisioned under a neutralization treaty. The four countries, the United States, North Vietnam, and other interested nations would commit themselves primarily to advance a great development program for the welfare of the people * * *. It would substitute a development goal for an indistinct battle line, and it would permit the United States to withdraw gracefully in favor of an international force committed to that goal. Financial obligations of the United States would in the future be linked with contributions of money and people from other nations.

A PROPOSAL FOR SOLUTION OF THE VIETNAM CONFLICT

In addition to the obliterating threat of a nuclear war, there are two other overriding issues which threaten the security of all societies. One problem is the unrest and instability of two-thirds of the world's population, which is suffering from malnutrition or worse. Much of this unrest is caused by the fact that these people are beginning to smell the "aroma" of what might be theirs if they could only develop economically. Second, it is common knowledge that there exists in the world an enormous variety of young, emotional national states. These nations have learned well from the history of the older Western nation states. Understandably these young nations make on occasion what might seem to be, from our viewpoint, inappropriate and unrealistic demands.

However, one consistent and valid demand made by these nations is that it be possible for them to achieve a reasonable degree of economic stability. Economic stability is for many of these countries the essential prerequisite to social and political stability. When feasible, the program of development should be an international cooperative venture.

Thus, with the background given by Gilbert White's article, it seems reasonable that the United States might offer to allocate a significant portion of its yearly foreign aid appropriation to the existing international economic venture in the Mekong River Delta. This action would promote long range political and social stability. This type of positive action would meet a common need of all emerging countries—economic development. The project by its very nature would promote regionalism and provide an example of cooperation among small nation states.

The obvious fact is that world peace is the responsibility, militarily and economically, of all nations. The United States should offer to redirect its energies from military to economic development if a group of nations would agree, with the consent of the South Vietnam Government, to bring into South Vietnam a sufficiently large force to help that Government and people maintain their political and territorial integrity.

This plan does not hope that South Vietnam will finally become either capitalistic or socialistic. The end result for all of the small countries in this area will probably be a mixture of both economic systems. This plan does involve the determination that no single country will dominate the peninsula known historically to the westerner as French Indochina. Most nations, including many of the emerging nations, should be willing collectively to resist aggression of this kind.

This plan is an honorable alternative to the present U.S. course of action. In the positive sense of being creative, the Mekong River Delta project promises regionalism and long-range social and political growth.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

JOHN R. BETHEA.

MIAMI, FLA.

How the Handicapped Are Overcoming Barriers to Employment in My Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER S. BARING
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the prize-winning entry of Miss Melody Jean Smith of Reno, Nev., in the 1965 national "Ability Counts" contest sponsored by the Presidents' Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

Miss Smith won fourth place and will be presented with her award at the opening ceremonies of the committee's annual meeting on April 29.

The essay follows:

HOW THE HANDICAPPED ARE OVERCOMING BARRIER TO EMPLOYMENT IN MY COMMUNITY

(By Melody Jean Smith, Reno High School, Reno, Nev.)

Addressing the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped in April of 1964, President Johnson said, "I am convinced that it is morally right—socially just—economically sensible—and administratively feasible to open the door of employment opportunity to handicapped but job-qualified Americans." Many handicapped individuals in my community have opened that door—the door which leads to their employment and to their acceptance as productive members of society.

That a moral imperative endows every human being with dignity and worth is unquestioned in our society, yet complete social justice has not been attained. There are still many prejudices against handicapped individuals.

Achieving social justice for these handicapped is never the work of a single individual or a single agency. Hundreds of people and many facilities are involved in overcoming barriers to the employment of the handicapped: rehabilitation counselors, physicians, psychologists, social workers, and prosthetic experts; plus rehabilitation centers, workshops, hospitals, and schools. The President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped has a network of governors' committees and local committees carrying information and inspiration to every part of the country. The work of these groups has resulted in modification of the hiring practices of employers.

One of the great steps made in the past few years has been the removal of architectural barriers such as steep flights of steps and narrow doorways that cannot admit employees confined to wheelchairs. Last year when my community's new multimillion-dollar bank building was completed, Mr. Albert Alegre, the building manager, stated, "The handicapped were considered when this building was planned." A ramp leads to the building's automatic doors, and the elevators, drinking fountains, and restrooms of the interior are easily accessible to the handicapped. A newly built Employment Security Office Building and an almost completed city hall also have street level entrances accessible to the handicapped.

Federal-State agencies working as partners in action have made rehabilitation and placement of the handicapped administratively feasible. Disabled persons are referred to the Division of Vocational Rehabilitation from many sources: doctors, schools, welfare agencies, and employment services. Medical data, case study, and an appraisal of the client's ability enable the counselor to work out an individual rehabilitation plan. The services may include medical care, the supplying of artificial limbs, training, transportation, and maintenance during rehabilitation, the supplying of occupational tools and equipment, and job placement.

In my community by means of a grant from the Max C. Fleishmann Foundation, funds from the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, and contributions from individuals and organizations in Nevada, a much-needed occupational training center is being initiated. This center will provide necessary training for disabled people in order that they may become self-supporting.

The money spent for the construction and operation of this training center is well spent, for rehabilitation of the handicapped is economically sensible. In Nevada, 113 persons were rehabilitated during the fiscal year 1963–64. These individuals had earned $62,088 annually before rehabilitation; after rehabilitation they were earning $491,296 annually, an increase of over 600 percent. It is estimated that during the rest of their lives they will pay back about $10 in income tax for every dollar invested in their rehabilitation.

Hiring the handicapped is also economically sensible for the employer. Publicized studies show that properly placed handicapped persons are equally or more productive than their fellow workers and that they have better attendance and safety records.

Many handicapped persons in my community have overcome the characteristic barriers to employment—social, architectural, prejudicial—and are now proving that "ability counts." Although Mr. Howard McKissick is a disabled veteran, his consistent reelection to the post of county commissioner attests to his efficiency and the voters' gratitude. Mrs. Lillian Barnum, who lost her legs when she was eight, is a dedicated worker for the Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped. In spite of the loss of his right arm, Mr. Howard Farrell is an excellent accountant for the Internal Revenue Service. Mr. Maynard Yasmer, severely crippled by polio, necessitating his being confined to a wheelchair, has achieved distinction as a rehibilitation counselor.

These people are among those who have overcome barriers to employment in my community. Many more need help. This help is being provided by the many agencies and individuals that concern themselves with this problem. Through diligent work, my community is learning that it is "morally right—socially just—economically sensible—and administratively feasible" to rehabilitate and hire the handicapped.

Firearms Control Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT E. SWEENEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, on March 16, 1965, I introduced a bill, H.R. 6346, to amend the Federal Firearms Act. These amendments on firearms are not designed to cause injury to the sport-loving public, nor those engaged in legiti-

mate sports activities involved in the sale, importing, and manufacturing of firearms. On all levels of law enforcement, responsible experts have deplored the absence of laws limiting the use of guns. This Nation has witnessed a chronology of violence which documents better than any statistics the fact that there is a serious misuse of firearms going on at the present moment.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join ranks with distinguished Americans, led by U.S. Senator THOMAS J. DODD, in the effort to secure congressional legislation in this area.

I call your attention to an editorial entitled "A Parting Shot" which appeared in the Washington Post today, Wednesday, April 28, 1965:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 28, 1965]

A PARTING SHOT

For 77 consecutive days—11 full weeks—this page has carried an editorial about guns. It has done so because of a belief that the almost uncontrolled distribution and availability of firearms in the United States presents a senseless peril to public safety and because of a strong desire to bring this peril to public notice. This kind of effort to arouse public opinion constitutes, we think, one of the first functions of a free press.

The stream of editorials has produced, in unprecedented volume, a responding stream of letters to the editor—most of them critical of the editorials, many of them insensately angry. Some of the editorials were meant to be informative—to document the danger and to describe what seemed to us appropriate legislative remedies. Some were frankly meant to be provocative—to arouse a sense of outrage by recounting tragedies reported as commonplace in the news pages every day. Some were meant to rebut the standard arguments of the National Rifle Association and other opponents of the President's recommendations for firearms control. Some were meant to be sardonic or shocking—and seemed, perhaps, no more than smart aleck.

Since we propose now to declare a moratorium, or temporary cease-fire, on the subject, it seems opportune to recapitulate our reasons for wanting effective firearms control and to restate the kinds of control we deem effective. Guns are indubitably dangerous. About 5,000 homicides and more than 8,000 suicides are committed through the use of guns every year in the United States. Many of these killings could have, and perhaps would have, been accomplished by other means; but guns made them easy.

To begin with, guns contribute to crime. Possession of them emboldens many to undertake assaults or robberies; and it leads to many fatalities which might not have resulted if these crimes had been undertaken with less lethal weapons. In a 3-year period, according to FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, 168 law-enforcement officers were murdered in the performance of their official duties. Firearms were used in 162 of these killings, with revolvers and automatic pistols accounting for 131 of the deaths and rifles and shotguns for 31; knives, clubs, and other weapons were responsible for the remaining 6.

Even more tragic, in a way, is the death toll from guns used by those not intending to commit crime—the killing of children by demented parents, the killing of wives and husbands and lovers and relatives and neighbors in pointless quarrels, the killing of youngsters by other youngsters who did not know the gun was loaded, or by sheer accident or carelessness, the killing, altogether at random, of innocents who happened to be at hand when some drunk or fool was skylarking with a gun. Not a day passes in any major American city without some such tragedy.

For these reasons, we want to prevent, or at least diminish, the possession and easy acquisition of guns by criminals, drunkards, juveniles, drug addicts, and the mentally ill. We are convinced that this can be done—to the vast betterment of the general welfare—without preventing the legitimate enjoyment of firearms for hunting, collecting, target shooting, and, where necessary, self-defense by responsible, law-abiding, qualified adults.

Nationally, we urge adoption of the bills introduced by Senator THOMAS DODD to implement President Johnson's gun control proposals. In brief, these would rigidly limit the importation of guns—mainly castoff military weapons—from abroad; prohibit mail-order sales of firearms to individuals by limiting firearms shipments in interstate commerce to shipments between licensed importers, manufacturers and dealers; and help States to control the firearms traffic within their borders by requiring that any gun purchaser be a bona fide resident of the State in which the gun is purchased.

Locally, we urge the registration of all firearms; the limitation of ownership to persons over 21 years of age who have not been convicted of a crime, who have not been adjudged mentally incompetent and who have demonstrated by test a knowledge of the rules of safety for handling firearms. In addition, because pistols are peculiarly dangerous and peculiarly susceptible to employment in the commission of crime, we urge that the possession of a pistol be narrowly limited to bona fide collectors, to target-shooters whose use of them will be carefully controlled by regulation, and to persons who, in isolated places and special situations, are adjudged in accordance with fixed standards, to have a genuine need of them for self-protection.

There is nothing in these proposals, we think, which infringes on the constitutional right to keep and bear arms as that right is related to the maintenance of a well-regulated militia. There is nothing in these proposals which interferes with participation by responsible adults in the great and popular sports of hunting and target shooting, or in the hobby of gun collection. The frontier is gone in the United States. Americans today live increasingly in crowded urban centers where the indiscriminate possession of guns has become a deadly danger.

In a country where four Presidents have fallen assassinated by gunfire and where guns exact a terrible toll in death and tragedy every year, sportsmen can fairly be asked to incur minor inconvenience for the sake of the general welfare. It is time for America to come of age. Disarmament needs to begin at home.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

SENATORS WITH RESIDENCES IN WASHINGTON

OFFICE ADDRESS: Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

[Streets northwest unless otherwise stated]

Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey

Aiken, George D., *Vt.*
Allott, Gordon, *Colo.*
Anderson, Clinton P., *N. Mex.* — 6 Wesley Circle
Bartlett, E. L., *Alaska*
Bass, Ross, *Tenn.*
Bayh, Birch E., *Ind.*
Bennett, Wallace F., *Utah*
Bible, Alan, *Nev.*
Boggs, J. Caleb, *Del.*
Brewster, Daniel B., *Md.* — 1327 33d St.
Burdick, Quentin N., *N. Dak.*
Byrd, Harry Flood, *Va.* — The Shoreham
Byrd, Robert C., *W. Va.*
Cannon, Howard W., *Nev.*
Carlson, Frank, *Kans.* — Sheraton-Park
Case, Clifford P., *N.J.*
Church, Frank, *Idaho*
Clark, Joseph S., *Pa.*
Cooper, John Sherman, *Ky.*
Cotton, Norris, *N.H.*
Curtis, Carl T., *Nebr.*
Dirksen, Everett M., *Ill.*
Dodd, Thomas J., *Conn.*
Dominick, Peter H., *Colo.*
Douglas, Paul H., *Ill.*
Eastland, James O., *Miss.* — 5101 Macomb St.
Ellender, Allen J., *La.*
Ervin, Sam J., Jr., *N.C.*
Fannin, Paul J., *Ariz.*
Fong, Hiram L., *Hawaii* — 5519 Uppingham St., Chevy Chase, Md.
Fulbright, J. W., *Ark.*
Gore, Albert, *Tenn.*
Gruening, Ernest, *Alaska*
Harris, Fred R., *Okla.*
Hart, Philip A., *Mich.*
Hartke, Vance, *Ind.*
Hayden, Carl, *Ariz.*
Hickenlooper, Bourke B., *Iowa.* — 5511 Cedar Parkway, Chevy Chase, Md.
Hill, Lister, *Ala.*
Holland, Spessard L., *Fla.* — Sheraton-Park
Hruska, Roman L., *Nebr.*
Inouye, Daniel K., *Hawaii*
Jackson, Henry M., *Wash.*
Javits, Jacob K., *N.Y.*
Jordan, B. Everett, *N.C.*
Jordan, Len B., *Idaho*
Kennedy, Edward M., *Mass.*
Kennedy, Robert F., *N.Y.*
Kuchel, Thomas H., *Calif.*
Lausche, Frank J., *Ohio*
Long, Edward V., *Mo.*
Long, Russell B., *La.*
McCarthy, Eugene J., *Minn.* — 5916 Bradley Blvd., Bethesda, Md.
McClellan, John L., *Ark.*
McGee, Gale W., *Wyo.*
McGovern, George, *S. Dak.*
McIntyre, Thomas J., *N.H.*
McNamara, Pat, *Mich.*
Magnuson, Warren G., *Wash.* — The Shoreham
Mansfield, Mike, *Mont.*
Metcalf, Lee, *Mont.* — 453 First St. SE.
Miller, Jack R., *Iowa* — 5417 Kirkwood Dr., Bethesda, Md.
Mondale, Walter F., *Minn.*
Monroney, A. S. Mike, *Okla.*
Montoya, Joseph M., *N. Mex.*
Morse, Wayne, *Oreg.* — 4000 Mass. Ave.
Morton, Thruston B., *Ky.*
Moss, Frank E., *Utah*
Mundt, Karl E., *S. Dak.* — 122 Schotts Court NE.
Murphy, George, *Calif.*
Muskie, Edmund S., *Maine*
Nelson, Gaylord, *Wis.*
Neuberger, Maurine B., *Oreg.*
Pastore, John O., *R.I.*
Pearson, James B., *Kans.*
Pell, Claiborne, *R.I.* — 3425 Prospect St.
Prouty, Winston L., *Vt.*
Proxmire, William, *Wis.*
Randolph, Jennings, *W. Va.* — 4608 Reservoir Rd.
Ribicoff, Abraham A., *Conn.*
Robertson, A. Willis, *Va.*
Russell, Donald S., *S.C.*
Russell, Richard B., *Ga.*
Saltonstall, Leverett, *Mass.* — 2320 Tracy Pl.
Scott, Hugh, *Pa.*
Simpson, Milward L., *Wyo.*
Smathers, George A., *Fla.*
Smith, Margaret Chase (Mrs.), *Maine.*
Sparkman, John, *Ala.* — 4928 Indian Lane
Stennis, John, *Miss.*
Symington, Stuart, *Mo.*
Talmadge, Herman E., *Ga.*
Thurmond, Strom, *S.C.*
Tower, John G., *Tex.*
Tydings, Joseph D., *Md.*
Williams, Harrison A., Jr., *N.J.*
Williams, John J., *Del.*
Yarborough, Ralph, *Tex.*
Young, Milton R., *N. Dak.* — Quebec House So.
Young, Stephen M., *Ohio*

OFFICERS OF THE SENATE

Secretary—Felton M. Johnston.
Sergeant at Arms—Joseph C. Duke.
Chief Clerk—Emery L. Frazier.
Secretary for the Majority—Francis R. Valeo.
Secretary for the Minority—J. Mark Trice.
Chaplain—Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D.

STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences

Messrs. Anderson (chairman), Russell of Georgia, Magnuson, Symington, Stennis, Young of Ohio, Dodd, Cannon, Holland, Mondale, Tydings, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Hickenlooper, Curtis, Jordan of Idaho, and Aiken.

Committee on Agriculture and Forestry

Messrs. Ellender (chairman), Holland, Eastland, Talmadge, Jordan of North Carolina, McGovern, Bass, Montoya, Mondale, Russell of South Carolina, Aiken, Young of North Dakota, Cooper, Boggs, and Miller.

Committee on Appropriations

Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Russell of Georgia, Ellender, Hill, McClellan, Robertson, Magnuson, Holland, Stennis, Pastore, Monroney, Bible, Byrd of West Virginia, McGee, Mansfield, Bartlett, Proxmire, Yarborough, Saltonstall, Young of North Dakota, Mundt, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Kuchel, Hruska, Allott, Cotton, and Case.

Committee on Armed Services

Messrs. Russell of Georgia (chairman), Stennis, Byrd of Virginia, Symington, Jackson, Ervin, Cannon, Byrd of West Virginia, Young of Ohio, Inouye, McIntyre, Brewster, Saltonstall, Mrs. Smith, Messrs. Thurmond, Miller, and Tower.

Committee on Banking and Currency

Messrs. Robertson (chairman), Sparkman, Douglas, Proxmire, Williams of New Jersey, Muskie, Long of Missouri, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. McIntyre, Mondale, Bennett, Tower, Thurmond, and Hickenlooper.

Committee on Commerce

Messrs. Magnuson (chairman), Pastore, Monroney, Lausche, Bartlett, Hartke, McGee, Hart, Cannon, Brewster, Mrs. Neuberger, Messrs. Bass, Cotton, Morton, Scott, Prouty, Pearson, and Dominick.

Committee on the District of Columbia

Messrs. Bible (chairman), Morse, McIntyre, Kennedy of New York, Tydings, Prouty, and Dominick.

Committee on Finance

Messrs. Byrd of Virginia (chairman), Long of Louisiana, Smathers, Anderson, Douglas, Gore, Talmadge, McCarthy, Hartke, Fulbright, Ribicoff, Williams of Delaware, Carlson, Bennett, Curtis, Morton, and Dirksen.

Committee on Foreign Relations

Messrs. Fulbright (chairman), Sparkman, Mansfield, Morse, Long of Louisiana, Gore, Lausche, Church, Symington, Dodd, Clark, Pell, McCarthy, Hickenlooper, Aiken, Carlson, Williams of Delaware, Mundt, and Case.

Committee on Government Operations

Messrs. McClellan (chairman), Jackson, Ervin, Gruening, Muskie, Ribicoff, Harris, Kennedy of New York, Metcalf, Montoya, Mundt, Curtis, Javits, and Simpson.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs

Messrs. Jackson (chairman), Anderson, Bible, Church, Gruening, Moss, Burdick, Hayden, McGovern, Nelson, Metcalf, Kuchel, Allott, Jordan of Idaho, Simpson, and Fannin.

Committee on the Judiciary

Messrs. Eastland (chairman), McClellan, Ervin, Dodd, Hart, Long of Missouri, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Bayh, Burdick, Tydings, Smathers, Dirksen, Hruska, Fong, Scott, and Javits.

Committee on Labor and Public Welfare

Messrs. Hill (chairman), McNamara, Morse, Yarborough, Clark, Randolph, Williams of New Jersey, Pell, Kennedy of Massachusetts, Nelson, Kennedy of New York, Javits, Prouty, Dominick, Murphy, and Fannin.

Committee on Post Office and Civil Service

Messrs. Monroney (chairman), Yarborough, Randolph, McGee, Brewster, Hartke, Burdick, Russell of South Carolina, Carlson, Fong, Boggs, and Simpson.

Committee on Public Works

Messrs. McNamara (chairman), Randolph, Young of Ohio, Muskie, Gruening, Moss, Metcalf, Jordan of North Carolina, Inouye, Bayh, Montoya, Harris, Cooper, Fong, Boggs, Pearson, and Murphy.

Committee on Rules and Administration

Messrs. Jordan of North Carolina (chairman), Hayden, Cannon, Pell, Clark, Byrd of West Virginia, Curtis, Cooper, and Scott.

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

Mr. Chief Justice Warren, of California, Hotel Sheraton-Park, Washington, D.C.
Mr. Justice Black, of Alabama, 619 S. Lee St., Alexandria, Va.
Mr. Justice Douglas, of Washington, 4852 Hutchins Pl.
Mr. Justice Clark, of Texas, 2101 Connecticut Ave.
Mr. Justice Harlan, of New York, 1677 31st St.
Mr. Justice Brennan, of New Jersey, 3037 Dumbarton Ave.
Mr. Justice Stewart, of Ohio, 5136 Palisade Lane.
Mr. Justice White, of Colorado, 2209 Hampshire Rd., McLean, Va.
Mr. Justice Goldberg, of Illinois, 2811 Albemarle St.

OFFICERS OF THE SUPREME COURT

Clerk—John F. Davis, 4704 River Rd.
Deputy Clerk—Edmund P. Cullinan, 4823 Reservoir Rd.
Marshal—T. Perry Lippitt, 6004 Corbin Rd.
Reporter—Henry Putzel, Jr., 3703 33d St.
Librarian—Helen Newman, 126 3d St. SE.

UNITED STATES JUDICIAL CIRCUITS

JUSTICES ASSIGNED

TERRITORY EMBRACED

District of Columbia judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. District of Columbia.

First judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Goldberg. Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island.

Second judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Harlan. Connecticut, New York, Vermont.

Third judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Brennan. Delaware, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Virgin Islands.

Fourth judicial circuit: Mr. Chief Justice Warren. Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West Virginia.

Fifth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Black. Alabama, Canal Zone, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas.

Sixth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Stewart. Kentucky, Michigan, Ohio, Tennessee.

Seventh judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Clark. Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin.

Eighth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Arkansas, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, South Dakota.

Ninth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice Douglas. Alaska, Arizona, California, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, Oregon, Washington, Guam, Hawaii.

Tenth judicial circuit: Mr. Justice White. Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, Wyoming.

Appendix

Senator Randolph Stresses Strength of Citizenship Responsibility in Address to Student Body in Law Day, U.S.A., Commemoration at Morgantown, W. Va., High School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JENNINGS RANDOLPH

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, on Friday, April 23, it was my privilege and challenge to speak before the student body of the Morgantown, W. Va., High School in observance of Law Day, U.S.A. Scott Davis, dedicated principal, and his capable teaching staff, were also present.

Established in 1958, Law Day is celebrated on May 1 and is now a permanent national event. It is a time for Americans to reaffirm their loyalties to the United States and rededicate themselves to the ideals of equality and justice. It has been said that "the trouble seems to be that too many people think the law should be enforced, and not enough think it should be observed." The purpose of Law Day is to change this idea.

In our country May Day is a commemoration of the laws which make us free men, a contrast to the communistic celebration which emphasizes military force.

Mr. President, I addressed 1,600 high school students assembled by the Key Club, of Morgantown High School, in coordination with the Monongalia County Bar Association. The program included remarks by Key Club President-Elect Sam Marino, current President Roger Warsewich, and Vice President Gary George.

Representing the Morgantown civic leaders and the Monongalia legal group were: Mayor Arthur Buehler; Albert Morgan, president of the bar association; Robert Goodwin, chairman, Law Day committee, bar association; Robert Creel, vice president, Kiwanis; Steve Gatrell and Albert Tennant, faculty advisers of the Key Club; and Rev. Jerry Rector, campus minister, of West Virginia University.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this address, "Citizenship and the Rule of Law," to the Morgantown High School students be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CITIZENSHIP AND THE RULE OF LAW

(An address by Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH, of West Virginia, Morgantown High School, Law Day, Morgantown, W. Va., Apr. 23, 1965)

It is indeed a pleasure to be here in your high school to join in your observance of Law Day.

This is a relatively young celebration—younger than any of you. May 1, 1958, was the first time that Law Day was observed. President Dwight D. Eisenhower issued the first proclamation designating May 1 as Law Day, U.S.A.

Because the leaders of our country felt that Law Day was a day worthy of commemoration, Congress passed a joint resolution in 1961 designating the first day of May as a permanent national observance. This resolution stated that Law Day, U.S.A. "* * * is set aside as a special day of celebration by the American people in appreciation of their liberties and the reaffirmation of their loyalty to the United States of America: of their rededication to the ideals of equality and justice under law in their relations with each other as well as with other nations; and for the cultivation of that respect for law that is so vital to the democratic way of life."

May Day itself has traditionally been a notable occasion for centuries—dating back to pagan celebrations. The Maypole and the Maypole dance date back further than some of the codes of law which are forerunners of the law to which we pay tribute today. Perhaps some of you would prefer the traditional dances of yesteryear to the speechmaking of today—but, if it were not for the rule of law which exists in our land today, even dancing, traditional or otherwise, might be impossible. Many of you have read that the "twist" was outlawed by the Communist leaders, along with Western jazz. As Americans we do not believe in such arbitrary restrictions. Can you imagine the President and the Government of the United States denying you the right to do the frug and the watusi?

And dancing is but one of many individual activities which is regulated behind the Iron Curtain. I have no doubt that if our President did seek to outlaw social dancing, considerable opposition could be found within the White House itself with his two daughters as its leaders.

On May 1 we express formal tribute throughout our land to the faith of every American in the rule of law and its supremacy in the lives of all freemen. One of the reasons that Law Day, U.S.A., came into being was to provide a dramatic contrast to communism's May Day. What better contrast can be made to the missiles and troops parading past Red Square in the Communist celebration of May Day than the peaceful observances, such as ours, that will take place throughout the country? The Communist rule is a rule of force. Under Red rule the rights and liberties of the individual seem to be secondary to the interests of the all-powerful state and the few men who govern it.

What is the rule of law that we commemorate? It is our system of laws that protects the rights of people, assures the freedom and dignity of the individual, and enables impartial courts to settle disputes fairly. The rule of law derives its principles from our Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and our legal system created by our Constitution to safeguard the rights set forth in these documents.

What are the first words that come to your mind when you think of the United States of America? Democracy? Freedom? Government by law? What is government by law? Do we need it? Let's imagine a football game where there are no rules. It would be havoc.

So in everyday life we must have rules and laws and penalties for their violation. Suppose in this same football game the referee made his own rules, judging each player by his own whims? It wouldn't be much of a game. Government without law can result in dictatorship, with each leader determining what is lawful. The same rules might not apply equally to everyone. With each new leader there might be a change of law. The result would be instability. Citizens would have no standards to guide them.

Our laws come from the people, and through our legislatures. They reflect the belief of most of us as to what is right and necessary for the orderly conduct of our society. If we don't like a law, we can attempt to change it. I receive letters every day from people who want to change laws; yet, they abide by them until they can be changed. The rights of all Americans depend on our respect for the law. You cannot play a football game without rules nor can we have a working society without laws and respect for the rule of law.

We live under a system, fortunately, where supremacy of the law exists. Our unique constitutional structure in which the separation of powers is accomplished and the rights of our individual citizens are defined, has resulted in the elevation of law to a position of supremacy as a component of our democracy. The supremacy of law has great significance today at the international level.

Destruction, in this nuclear age, could conceivably be accomplished in a matter of minutes—by pushing a button. The world and the hope for world peace seems now to have only one hope of survival and that survival can only be accomplished if we turn to the rule of law as a means for bringing peaceful solution to problems between nations.

The theme for this year's Law Day is "Uphold the Law—A Citizen's First Duty." You, as students, may be able to accomplish little as arbiters of the international crises we face today; you can, however, contrbiute individually to a greater society in the exercise of your responsibilities as citizens.

What do your duties as a citizen include? First, the duty to obey the laws, the duty to respect the rights of others, the duty to inform yourself on issues of Government and community welfare, the duty to vote and to serve on juries (when you are old enough), to serve and defend your country, to assist those that enforce the law, and the duty to practice and teach the principles of good citizenship.

As young citizens you may have unfortunately given the rule of law a negative emphasis, thinking of it as a series of prohibitions. But, law can be an instrumentality of man and a positive force for social order.

The law prohibits you—yes—but it also protects you. For example, it protects you here at school; your cafeteria is regulated by certain health and sanitation laws applying to public eating places. You are protected as you sleep at night by building codes and fire prevention laws. Law can be restrictive, but its values far outweigh its restrictions.

It is essential under our system of government that we abide by the restrictions of law which are protective and essential and we must assume the responsibilities of citizenship. Every American citizen, including each student in this high school, should make every day Law Day by doing whatever he can each day to foster respect for law and order and insure the many blessings of liberty we enjoy in this Republic.

In Praise of Randy Matson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER ROGERS
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, one of the great new stars on the American sports scene is a young man from my hometown, Pampa, Tex. He is Randy Matson, the 20-year-old son of Mr. and Mrs. C. W. Matson, of Pampa, and a student at Texas A. & M. University. Randy was a silver medal winner in the Olympics last fall in Tokyo—and on Friday, April 9, he threw the shot 67 feet, 11¼ inches to establish a new world's record.

Randy's goal is to toss the 16-pound shot past the 70-foot mark, the goal that stands as the shotputter's equivalent to the 4-minute mile.

There is no doubt in my mind nor among his many other friends and neighbors in Pampa that he will accomplish this feat, and will also break the discus record for good measure.

Ron Cross, the city editor of the Pampa Daily News, wrote following Randy's feat in setting the new shotput record that Randy has been "breaking records and collecting trophies" since he was 12 years old.

A fellow who never progressed beyond high school track but still had a few medals for memories could get an inferiority complex visiting Randy Matson's home in Pampa.

Cross wrote:

The Texas A. &. M. sophomore has more medals, ribbons, plaques, and trophies at 520 West Browning than you can look over in a reasonable amount of time.

Randy Matson was featured in the sport section of the current Time magazine. An excellent article on an excellent subject, pointing up that Randy Matson has the great qualities America has always admired, the championship character that goes with championship performance.

We are all so very, very proud of Randy.

The Time article, entitled "The Champ From Pampa," is as follows:

THE CHAMP FROM PAMPA

Into the shotput circle at Texas A. & M. University stepped Randy Matson, 20, cupping a 16-pound steel ball in one huge hand as if it were an egg. Sucking in his breath, he tucked the ball behind his right ear, crouched low, and tapped the ground once, twice, three times with his left toe. Then, with a prodigious grunt that could be heard a full 100 yards away, he hurled himself across the ring. The shot sailed through the air and bit into the dirt, 67 feet, 11¼ inches away. "That one felt pretty good," sighed Sophomore Matson. It should have; by 1¼ inches he had broken Dallas Long's world record in the shotput.

BIG MAN AROUND TOWN

His feat this month came as slight surprise to anyone who knew James Randel Matson—including Dallas Long. By the time he was 18, Charlie Matson's boy was already a big man around the Panhandle town of Pampa, Tex. Naturally—he stood 6 feet 6½ inches tall and weighed 210 pounds. He also averaged 15 points a game for Pampa High's basketball squad, ran 50 yards for the winning touchdown against archrival Amarillo High, and was practically a one-man track team—heaving the 12-pound shot 66 feet, 10½ inches, hurling the discus 192 feet, 3 inches, running 100 yards in 10.3 seconds. More than 100 colleges made him offers, and the University of Southern California assigned Old Grads Long and Parry O'Brien to take the prize prospect in tow. They proudly showed him the library, the dormitories, all those longlegged girls. Pity. They should have spent more time showing him the gym.

They did at A. & M. in College Station, Tex., where the gym is a big attraction. The nearest bottle of liquor is 7 miles away, and the sidewalks seem to roll up of their own accord at 6 p.m. "I wanted a place where I could study and train and nothing else," explains Shotputter Matson, a gentle giant who calls everybody "sir" or "ma'am" and hardly goes anywhere without bringing along his pet shot in a brown bowling bag. As far as he's concerned, the M in A. & M. stands for Emil Mamaliga, 44, an assistant coach for the varsity swimming team, who started Randy lifting weights to build up his rangy frame. "You can't fire a 16-inch shell from a PT boat," Mamaliga insisted. "You have to have a big, heavy ship." By last fall's Olympics in Tokyo, Matson tipped the scales at 260 pounds, astounded everybody by flinging the shot 66 feet 3¼ inches. As it turned out, Randy had to settle for a silver medal when Long managed 66 feet 8½ inches on his fourth toss.

A STRING OF FIRECRACKERS

Long, 24, wisely retired on the spot. Last February in Dallas, Matson smashed the world indoor record with a put of 66 feet 2¼ inches; earlier this month in Austin he warmed up for his outdoor recordsmasher with a toss of 67 feet 9 inches. "I've never seen anything like it," exclaimed Stanford's venerable Coach Payton Jordan, who worked with Randy at the Olympics. "His foot explodes, his calf explodes, his thigh explodes, his hip, his back, his shoulder, his triceps, and right out to the very tips of his fingers. It's like a whole string of firecrackers going off"

Matson's goal is 70 feet, the shotput equivalent of the 4-minute mile in 1954, and he's getting closer every day. Then what? Well, if he gets bored, he can switch to the discus. Two weeks ago, just for kicks, he hurled one 201 feet 5½ inches—a foot farther than Al Oerter's winning throw at the 1964 Olympics.

Pastor Sees Freedom Threatened in Negative Attitude Toward Deity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STROM THURMOND
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have been impressed by an article published in the Washington Post of April 24, 1965, about the Reverend Richard Stephenson, pastor of Columbia Baptist Church, in Falls Church, Va. I do not know Reverend Stephenson, but his comments in this article, written by Kenneth Dole, are most apropos, and I feel that they merit the attention of the Members of Congress.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Pastor Sees Freedom Threatened in Negative Attitude Toward Deity," be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 24, 1965]

WASHINGTON CHURCHMEN: PASTOR SEES FREEDOM THREATENED IN NEGATIVE ATTITUDE TOWARD DEITY

(By Kenneth Dole)

Admitting he may be guilty of oversimplification, the Reverend Richard M. Stephenson, a brilliant scholar who has built up the largest Baptist church in northern Virginia, asserts all philosophies fall into two categories:

Either they declare salvation is of God or they declare it is of man.

Asserting that because Americans, affected by "mental laziness and the desire to be comfortable at all costs," are yielding to the latter persuasion, American freedom is threatened, he says.

The churches, infected by "a spirit that will not trade comfort for a cross," are coming close to being "only defenders of the status quo" and are not energetically combatting the secularistic trend through Christian evangelism, he points out.

The pastor of the Columbia Baptist Church, Falls Church, turns to Woodrow Wilson and the Founders of the Republic to support his belief that freedom depends upon God rather than man. From Wilson's last public address, he quotes: "Our civilization cannot survive materially unless it is redeemed spiritually. It can be saved only by becoming permeated with the spirit of Christ, and being made free and happy by the practices which spring out of that spirit."

Thomas Jefferson wrote, "God, who gave us life, gave us liberty." And Mr. Stephenson adds, "only a vital religious faith" can preserve our liberties.

Then he affirms:

"Democracy as we know it depends on religion, the Christian religion. Let us not bend over backward to satisfy the godless cry of every humanist and every atheist that cries out over a supposed infringement of rights.

"If it is intolerant to have faith in God and to insist that our institutions and government be conducted upon basic religious foundations, then let us be intolerant. If our democracy should vanish it would be because we have not been sufficiently Christian."

Through positive language like this, Mr. Stephenson has illuminated and stimulated the thinking of his nearly 2,500 members, attracted also by his cordial, humorous makeup.

Telling of his courtship, during his first pastorate in Fort Myers, Fla., he divulges how he used a borrowed book to advance his suit. He heard that Noralee Mellor, a Presbyterian, had a certain book, a college annual, he needed, and he called at her home to borrow it.

That was in 1948, and he has not returned it yet. Several times he went to Miss Mellor's house to return it, and each time he told her, "You know, I forgot to bring that book with me." Without the book he booked her for good; they were married the next year.

"Maybe someday I'll come across that book and bring it back," he says with a smile.

The son of a Southampton County (Va.) peanut grower and Baptist Sunday school superintendent, Mr. Stephenson decided on the ministry in his last year at Hampden-Sydney (Va.) College. "I didn't see a blinding light or burning bush; I just had an inner conviction that this was what I was to do."

He had been valedictorian of his high school class, and graduated from college magna cum laude. He was president of the Students' Christian Association and a member of two honorary fraternities. He completed his preparation for the ministry at Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville.

Mr. Stephenson has held many offices, including president of the Baptist General Association of Virginia. His extracurricular activities have not prevented him from tripling his church membership since 1950, nor from devoting himself to his family.

Perhaps he was thinking of his two young daughters and son when he preached recently on God's plan for young people. He spoke of the tremendous decisions each young person is forced to make.

"Youth whispers its great messages," he said, "points to its great goals, calls for hard labor and application, for clean living and the avoidance of that which will hurt or defile the soul."

Prohibiting the Use of Mail Covers and the Maintenance of Lists of Addressees Receiving Communist Political Propaganda

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a bill to prohibit the use of the device of mail covers and the maintenance of lists of addressees receiving Communist political propaganda.

I introduced this legislation because I believe American citizens have a right to personal privacy. I do not believe our postal officials should have the authority to keep or release lists of names of persons who are writing to a certain citizen or of those to whom he writes. That is possible under the present mail cover system.

Furthermore, I do not believe the Post Office Department should keep or release lists of those postal patrons who wish to receive second- and third-class mail that has been determined to be Communist political propaganda mail from abroad. Their names should not be subject to inquiry just because they have made a request to receive such material.

I would like to quote a recent statement by Jerome J. Keating, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers:

> The sanctity of the mails is the last bastion of personal privacy.

I wholeheartedly agree, and for that reason I have introduced legislation to halt the use of mail covers and prevent the maintenance of lists of those persons who do wish to receive certain Communist mailings for personal or professional reasons.

During testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure recently, Mr. Keating covered the subject of the use of mail covers and at the same time defended the honor and honesty of our dedicated postal employees. I am in complete agreement with Mr. Keating's position on both of these matters and would call his statement to the attention of my distinguished colleagues. Under unanimous consent I include in my remarks Mr. Keating's testimony as it appeared in the April 1965 issue of the Postal Record:

KEATING DEFENDS HONOR OF POST OFFICE EMPLOYEES—NALC LEADER'S TESTIMONY PROTESTS PEEPHOLES, COVERS

"It is not the peepholes that are responsible for the high degree of honesty in the postal service—it is the people."

This ringing affirmation of the integrity of postal workers was the keynote of the testimony of Jerome J. Keating, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, when he testified, on February 24, 1965, before Senator EDWARD V. LONG's Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure. The Missouri Senator's committee is investigating alleged intrusion by Federal agencies into the personal privacy of American citizens, and Keating had a great deal to say about post office "peepholes" and the use of mail covers.

In regard to the observation galleries (or "peepholes"), the NALC president pointed out that they exist in 5,260 postal buildings in which 20 or more people are employed. "What happens in the 39,340 other postal facilities which house fewer than 20 employees?" he asked. "Are these unfortunate post offices and stations dens of iniquity where thievery is commonplace and depredation a way of life?"

Keating scoffed at this suggestion, venturing the opinion that dishonesty runs higher in the larger installations where peepholes exist than in the smaller offices, where they do not exist. He said that human beings are basically either honest or dishonest, and that a dishonest employee is not going to be dissuaded from his normal inclinations just by the off chance that a post office inspector may be possibly staring at him at that particular moment through a spyhole.

Out of a total work force of almost 600,000 people, only 590 postal employees (including postmasters and supervisors) are accused of dishonesty in an average year. This is a record of integrity almost completely unparalleled in our modern society, Keating said. He contrasted it with the record in the banking business, where about one-eighth of all the banks in the country are victimized by their own employees and officers in the course of a given year.

Proceeding from the theoretical to the practical, Keating pointed out that Department figures show that it costs approximately $2.5 million a year to build and maintain these spying devices, more than 10 times the amount that is recovered from employee depredators. In addition, the observation gallery system necessitates that lights be kept close to the ceiling, so they wont obstruct the view of peeping inspectors. This causes eyestrain and inefficiency among employees. Also, post office machinery and cases often have to be arranged specially to afford the inspectors a better view. This leads to inefficient arrangements, interfering with the flow of the mail.

"Peepholes are an anachronism in the labor management climate of 1965," the NALC president said, "They degrade the inspector by converting him into a kind of Peeping Tom, and they degrade the postal employee by treating him like some caged and untrustworthy animal."

THE "MAIL COVER"

As for the mail cover system, Keating attacked it as a violation of the sancitity of the mails. He argued that this procedure of writing down the names and addresses of people writing to a certain citizen, and those to whom he writes, should be strictly limited to the categories involving national security and the security of the mails "and as much as possible within those two categories."

He cited all the sneaky new electronic devices that are easily available to the public for overhearing conversations through walls, or even when held a block away, as well as other examples of spying apparatus. "The sanctity of the mails is the last bastion of personal privacy," Keating said. "We should protect this bastion of personal privacy down to the last ditch."

He added that letter carriers are so imbued with the philosophy that a personal letter is sacrosanct that it goes against their conscience and every instinct they have to be forced to cooperate in a mail cover. "They feel sullied and besmirched when they have to do so," he declared. "They don't like to do it, and I don't blame them one bit."

Earlier, Chief Inspector Henry B. Montague (whom Keating hailed as a personal friend and "the most humane and capable man to serve in the position he now occupies during the 41 years I have been in the service") defended the peepholes and mail cover as essential tools of the Post Office inspector's trade. He claimed that 72.5 percent of all arrests for depredation are achieved because of use of the peepholes. (Keating, on the other hand claimed that during more than four decades of postal service, he has only known one case where the peepholes were directly responsible for an arrest.) Montague also said that the use of mail covers was essential in tracking down fugitives from justice, in cracking pornography cases, in apprehending spies and subversives, etc.

Senator LONG, and the counsel for the committee, Bernard Fensterwald, Jr., gave Chief Inspector Montague a rough inquisition lasting about 3 hours. (Senator LONG overrode Montague's objection to the term peepholes, incidentally, by saying: "They're holes, aren't they? They're used for peeping, aren't they? That makes them peepholes.")

Another contretemps occurred when the chief inspector gave his honest opinion that peepholes had never been used to spy into ladies' washrooms or swing rooms (where female employees change their clothes). Patrick J. Nilan, legislative representative of the United Federation of Postal Clerks then testified that peepholes were in use that very day in the female swing room in the Minneapolis Post Office. This was news to the chief inspector who said the offending apertures would be blocked up immediately. (It has later transpired that other ladies' swing

rooms—notably in San Francisco—are still accessible to spying inspectors.)

The insistent questioning of Senator LONG, Mr. Fensterwald, and Cornelius Kennedy, minority counsel for the committee, brought forth the fact that a "mail cover" is permitted by the inspection service upon the request of almost any law enforcement agency, right down to a justice of the peace in a small community. It was also developed that a "fugitive from justice" could be construed as a man who had failed to pay a traffic ticket, and couldn't be found by the traffic court.

When testimony is heard from all witnesses, the Long committee is expected to come forward with some concrete suggestions as to how the privacy of the individual can be protected from indiscriminate snooping by his Government, or from any extension of the "big brother" syndrome so dramatically portrayed in Orwell's "1984."

EXCERPTS OF STATEMENT OF JEROME J. KEATING, PRESIDENT, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS BEFORE THE SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE, FEBRUARY 24, 1965

I want to state, first of all, that I am grateful for the opportunity of coming before you today and expressing my views, and the views of our members, on two subjects which intimately and seriously concern the dignity of the postal service and the sanctity of the mails, as well as the principle of personal privacy, which I consider an essential element in any democratic society.

Before proceeding with this statement, I would like to go on record as saying that—although over the years I have often disagreed with the Postal Inspection Service—I have nothing but admiration and a warm regard for the present Chief of the Inspection Service, Mr. Henry B. Montague.

I have known Mr. Montague for many years. I consider him to be the most humane and the most capable man to serve in the position he now occupies during the 41 years I have been in the postal service.

I find I must disagree with Mr. Montague's official position on both the matter of peepholes in post offices and mail covers, but I do so without rancor, and with full regard for the fact that we both approach these subjects from widely different points of view.

I would like, if I may, to discuss the subject of observation galleries and catwalks, better known as "peepholes" first.

OBSERVATION GALLERIES

These ancient devices are an anachronism in the labor-management climate of 1965. Moreover, as I shall demonstrate, they are a wastefully extravagant anachronism. They interfere with the efficiency of postal operations, and they are injurious to employee morale.

Observation galleries—or peepholes—are, most unfortunately, standard equipment in almost every postal facility in the Nation with 20 or more employees. It is estimated that about 5,260 postal buildings now contain them out of a total of 44,600 buildings altogether. Ever since they came into being around 1875, they have been a sore point with postal employees. The National Association of Letter Carriers has crusaded against them ever since we were organized, 76 years ago.

We were delighted and relieved last December when Postmaster General John A. Gronouski finally closed down the disgusting devices by which the inspectors could spy upon postal employees while performing their natural functions in post office washrooms. These degrading devices had a seriously detrimental effect upon employee morale for many years. It was argued that, if this restraint upon the felonious intents of postal employees were eliminated, wholesale theft and depredation would run riot in every post office in the land.

Of course, no such thing has happened.

Now that there is some hope that the spyholes will be eliminated from the workroom areas and the swing rooms of post offices as well, the same scaremongering arguments are being set forth.

I don't think these arguments have any merit whatsoever.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that a human being is basically either honest or dishonest. If he is dishonest by nature, the fact that, by some chance, a postal inspector might possibly be observing his actions from behind a one-way glass window will not deter him from yielding to his natural inclinations. This kind of a threat does not act as a deterrent any more than does the threat of capital punishment acts as a deterrent to would-be murderers and rapists.

I recall reading that, in 18th century England, when convicted thieves were executed publicly and most painfully, common pickpockets used to have a field day working among the spectators at the foot of the gallows. If a man is a thief, he will continue his trade until he gets caught, and he always believes that he is smart enough to avoid detection.

THE 590 OF 600,000

During an average year, approximately 590 postal employees—of all ranks and stations—are arrested for suspected dishonesty. This is out of an entire employee force of almost 600,000 persons.

This is a record of honesty and integrity almost unparalleled in any walk of life in the 20th century. It is unmatched in either private industry or in Government.

I would like to contrast this figure with the fact that during 1960—a typical year—1,771 banks—or about one-eighth of all the banks in the United States—were victimized by their own employees. In that typical year, 152 bank presidents were caught with their hands in the till. In fact, 58 percent of all the thefts were perpetrated by bank officers, and only 42 percent by bank employees.

But, the inspection service says the reason the degree of honesty is so high in the postal service is because they have the peephole system to keep employees honest.

I might point out that only 5,260 postal facilities with 20 or more employees are burdened with these archaic spying devices. What happens in the 39,340 other postal facilities which house fewer than 20 employees? Are these unfortunate post offices and stations dens of inequity where thievery is commonplace and depredation a way of life?

I am sure you will find that this is not the case. I have never seen any figures presented by the Inspection Service on this subject, but I feel in my heart that the same degree of honesty prevails in the smaller offices as in the larger offices. If there is any difference at all, I would hazard a guess that the degree of honesty is even higher in the smaller offices and stations where no peepholes exist.

It is not the peepholes that are responsible for the high degree of honesty in the postal service—it is the people.

I have said, Mr. Chairman, that this system is an extravagant anachronism. It has been estimated that it adds as much as 25 percent to the cost of a new building to provide it with observation galleries and peepholes, although Chief Inspector Montague now says that this cost is much lower. We are informed that it costs the Department almost $2.5 million a year to build and operate this spying system, or about 10 times the amount recovered from postal depredations.

In addition, these galleries eat up usable space. They require false walls, false ceilings, special soundproofing, special materials.

When galleries are installed in existing buildings, the problems are even greater, and even more expensive. Usually the mechanical equipment has to be shifted around so as to make room for the galleries. This not only costs a great deal of money, but it also interferes with the efficiency of the operation.

Wherever there are observation galleries, lighting fixtures are often placed high above the workroom floor, close to the ceilings, so they will not obstruct the vision of the inspector at his spy hole. This means that the employees must work with inferior lighting, to the detriment of their eyesight and efficiency.

And, of course, the effect on employee morale is very poor. We all like to think of the postal service as an honorable profession, filled by men and women who are respected in their communities, and who take pride in their occupation. This is the ideal. But the glow rubs off of the ideal to a very great extent when a postal employee knows that he is subject to surreptitious observation, like a convicted felon in Sing Sing, or like a croupier or a blackjack dealer in a Nevada gambling house.

The Inspection Service does an outstanding job of apprehending depredators. They do it through the use of decoy letters and by their own specialized system of narrowing down the number of suspects to the one guilty person. They do not need these peepholes. They degrade the inspector by converting him into a kind of Peeping Tom, and they degrade the postal employee by treating him like some caged and untrustworthy animal.

The postal service would be far better off if these nefarious devices were prohibited by law. The National Association of Letter Carriers sincerely hopes that these anachronisms will be banished from all postal buildings.

MAIL COVERS

In regard to mail covers, we feel that this practice should be confined to cases involving the national security and the safety of the mails.

The sanctity of a first-class letter is an American invention. The Continental Congress, in 1789, declared that the privacy of personal letters should be inviolate. This was a revolutionary idea at the time, and it arose because the English Crown had ordered postmasters in the American colonies to open and read personal letters in the hope of uncovering incipient sedition. The Americans so resented this practice that they insisted upon prohibiting it when they brought forth a new nation upon this continent.

I have no idea how widespread the practice of using mail covers is. However, I do know of cases in the past when it has been used as a retaliatory measure.

Certainly the use of the mail cover system for other than security or the safety of the mail is both reprehensible and unjustifiable. The system permits the Inspection Service or other law-enforcement agencies to go on "fishing expeditions" to develop derogatory information against someone whom they only vaguely suspect of some form of wrongdoing.

Surely this is contrary to the tradition and the practice of the common law.

We live in an age when personal privacy is under constant attack. Telephone tapping has become a commonplace. Hidden, recorders no bigger than a tie clasp will take down your every utterance without your being aware of it. National magazines print advertisements for devices which will let you listen in on whatever goes on in the room next door, or even in the next block. They solicit orders for cute gadgets that will let you spy into another room without the slightest possibility of detection. Unless we stop this terrible trend everywhere, big brother and all the little brothers will all have complete access to our most innermost thoughts and desires.

The sanctity of the mails is the last bastion of personal privacy in our modern life.

We should protect this bastion of personal privacy right down to the last ditch.

When members of the National Association of Letter Carriers must cooperate in operating a mail cover, they feel sullied and besmirched by what they have to do. They are so imbued with the philosophy that a personal letter is sacrosanct, that it goes against their conscience, and every instinct they have. They do not like to do it.

I don't blame them one bit. In cases involving the national security, there is some justification for this practice. There is also some justification when the safety of the mails is involved. But the practice should be restricted to those two categories—and should be restricted as much as possible within those two categories. This is a practice that should be used most sparingly and most cautiously, because it endangers one of the most precious principles in our democratic way of life.

"Confederate Air Force" Protests Unauthorized Use of Its Name

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, Mercedes, Tex., is the headquarters of an organization called "the Confederate Air Force," which is composed of former World War II pilots who dedicate themselves to the preservation and exhibition of World War II aircraft.

Last year, I was fortunate to visit the headquarters of this group, and I was very impressed by its dedication to its purpose and the pride it has in its organization. These men own some very rare World War II aircraft, and fly them at their own expense, at air shows over the Nation.

It is not surprising that the "Confederate Air Force," of Mercedes, Tex., was disturbed by the unauthorized use of its name by airplanes which dropped leaflets on civil-rights marchers in Alabama; and the group has registered a protest against such misrepresentation.

So that the denial of any connection between this action and the "Confederate Air Force" may be given wide distribution, I ask unanimous consent that a letter which I received about this matter, along with a telegram sent to me, and an article published in the March 23, 1965, issue of the Valley Morning Star, of Harlingen, Tex., be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter, telegram, and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CARTER, STIERNBERG, SKAGGS & KOPPEL,
Harlingen, Tex., April 5, 1965.

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: You will remember that on one of your visits to the valley last year I took you by the headquarters of the Confederate Air Force at Mercedes.

This organization is nonprofit in character and is composed of former World War II pilots. Their only purpose is the preservation and exhibition of World War II aircraft.

In connection with the Selma, Ala., civil rights march, the national press recently reported that certain leaflets were dropped by an aircraft on the civil rights marchers. These leaflets, apparently threatening economic reprisals against the marchers, were signed "Confederate Air Force."

The local members of the Confederate Air Force have issued various statements, and I enclose a clipping explaining their position. They would greatly appreciate it if it were possible for you to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of their denial of implication in the Alabama incident.

With best personal regards, I remain,
Sincerely yours,

JACK SKAGGS.

Senator RALPH YARBOROUGH:

The Confederate Air Force emphatically denies any connection with the dropping of leaflets today in Selma or any place else, for that matter. We would like to locate the pilot or get the aircraft numbers of the plane used, and we will file charges against the pilot for falsely representing himself as a member of the CAF. We have but one purpose, and that is the preservation and enshrinement of World War II aircraft and the pilots that flew them and helped keep this Nation free. We are a patriotic organization; we are nonpolitical in nature and have no affiliation whatsoever with any of the white supremist groups. We do not have a single member in the Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi area, nor do we have any aircraft closer than 1,500 miles from Selma. The Confederate Air Force deeply regrets its implication in this issue.

Col. BOB KENNY,
Public Information Officer, Confederate Air Force.

[From the Harlingen (Tex.) Valley Morning Star, Mar. 23, 1965]

DENY "RAID"—CONFEDERATE AIR FORCE ANGERED BY UNAUTHORIZED USE OF NAME

MERCEDES.—Angry denials flew from Rebel Field, headquarters of the Confederate Air Force, Monday, after it was reported a Confederate Air Force plane "bombed" civil rights marchers in Alabama with white supremacist leaflets.

"We're attempting to get the license number and name of the pilot, who is liable for suit for misprepresentation," Col. Bill Adams, Rousseau, Minn., newspaper publisher and a CAF public information officer, said.

"A stigma could be attached to the CAF. We don't desire any publicity of this sort."

Col. Lloyd Nolen, of Mercedes, pointed out emphatically the valley-based organization "is a patriotic group of volunteers dedicated to establishing a permanent flying museum of World War II fighter aircraft."

Nolen said the CAF name is copyrighted.

"We've got our attorneys checking into it," Nolen added.

Adams noted members specifically are forbidden to use CAF planes in political or business activity.

He said the CAF has no members in the Alabama, Mississippi, Georgia area and also has no light planes such as reportedly was used in dropping the leaflets.

"All of our planes are fighter planes of World War II," he said. "Someone has taken it upon himself to misrepresent the CAF."

U.S. Censorship Policy in Viet Assailed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, there is growing concern over the effects the administration's censorship policies regarding news from Vietnam will have. This could create a very severe problem in conduct of foreign affairs, as nothing can so quickly weaken the resolve of a country as lack of confidence in the actions its government is taking.

This lack of confidence can quite easily grow out of a lack of information on just exactly what the United States is facing in southeast Asia.

The following column by David Lawrence, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on April 27, 1965, points out the fact that there is a clear distinction to be made between withholding military information that could benefit our enemies, and a policy of censorship that seems to seek to stifle press coverage on all aspects of the Vietnam situation.

U.S. CENSORSHIP POLICY IN VIET ASSAILED
(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON.—Editors at their annual meetings in New York and Washington in recent days have been discussing the policy of the Johnson administration in dealing with the news emanating from the battle areas in Vietnam.

What seems to have aroused most of the criticism is the clumsy way the administration has been handling the problem, rather than the objectives sought. For everyone agrees that, when American lives are being risked in a war, the press should cooperate in withholding any information which might possibly get to the enemy and impair the effectiveness of this country's military operations.

Both in World War I and in World War II there prevailed what was called a "voluntary censorship," and the press effectively withheld military information that could possibly benefit the enemy. The press was fully acquainted with the dangers of letting the other side know anything about plans, including the departure of planes or ships to secret destinations.

There would be no difficulty at all today if the administration here were to allow these matters to be handled solely by the military, so that only information relating to troop movements or air and naval operations would be temporarily suppressed. What seems to have stirred up the controversy is that the administration has put in the hands of a propaganda-agency officer the task of acting virtually as a censor.

Not only is he permitted to withhold information about certain diplomatic activities but he also seems to be able to prevent the newspapermen from covering the Vietnam war in the places where they ought to be permitted to go.

In the major wars of history, our military authorities have always provided facilities for war correspondents. These newsmen spend much of their time with the fighting forces,

but do not send out dispatches which could possibly transmit any important information to our adversaries.

The assigning of a member of the staff of the U.S. Information Service—established by Congress as a propaganda organization—to deal with the press at Saigon and to withhold military information is not in line with historical precedent or custom. It is not surprising, therefore, that newspaper editors have severely criticized such a procedure.

Secrecy is of the utmost importance, but it should be confined entirely to military matters. The press should be free to make its own comments whenever it wishes, provided it does not disclose military plans. But even the news of military operations should not be permanently suppressed.

There comes a time, after the event, when it is proper for a disclosure to be made so that the American people will know what has really happened. The timing of such an announcement might well be within the discretion of the military authorities, but to hold it back indefinitely contradicts basic American practice in dealing with the press during a war.

It has been argued by some of the newspaper editors that they cannot comment effectively on military operations if they are not permitted to get the facts of what actually is happening. Thus, sometimes equipment will be unsatisfactory and certain types of guns or planes will have been used which are not suited for the operations in which they are employed. All this is something which can better be examined, perhaps, by committees of Congress, though critical articles written on the spot in war areas often point up the necessity for such investigations.

Perhaps the whole controversy would not have reached the climax that it has in recent weeks if there had not been a prelude; namely, an era of so-called managed news at the Pentagon. This has left an unfortunate blemish on the record. For when the only news given out is designed to accomplish a political purpose, confidence on the part of the public in the accuracy of what is printed is bound to wane.

Fundamentally, there is no sound reason for suppressing the news of military operations altogether. The only issue is when such announcements should be permitted. Also, criticism of military operations should be carefully weighed by newspapermen, lest they disclose data which the enemy should not be allowed to get.

There have been sharp comments from Government officials concerning the dispatches written by correspondents in Vietnam who have been merely exercising their right to express opinions on the diplomatic aspects of the war. There has been, to be sure, a lot of news from various countries on the delicate subject of peace negotiations, and this, in some instances, the administration would probably have preferred to see handled with more caution. But the right of the press to discuss nonmilitary news is inherent in a system such as has long prevailed in America during war and peace.

Water Quality Act of 1965

SPEECH

OF

HON. ROBERT E. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (S. 4) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the establishment of standards of water quality to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Chairman, we come this afternon to the close of a debate which has certainly been a distinct compliment to this House. This bill has received the unanimous support on both sides of the Committee on Public Works, and is a piece of legislation which reflects with great credit upon the Committee on Public Works and its distinguished chairman. However, Mr. Chairman, this is a piece of legislation that reflects with great credit upon the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, JOHN BLATNIK, the father and the foremost exponent of clean water in America.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased, coming from the State of Ohio, to add my support to these needed amendments to this program and to note with pride the splendid spirit of bipartisan unity that made the amendments to the original S. 4 bill possible.

Mr. Chairman, we have shown by amendment and by the remarks here during the debate this afternoon that there seems to be agreement that the Federal Government in its attack upon water pollution must proceed cooperatively, with State and local governments and with the vast American industry as well as in cooperation with every agency throughout the land interested in winning ultimately the fight for clear water.

This bill is void of any accusatory tone and is, indeed, a constructive, intelligent approach which has already brought a response from State governments. Now at the moment of the adoption of this bill I am proud to announce to the House that there is in the Great Lakes region, about to be reconvened a five-State regional conference of State Governors to join with the Federal Government in streamlining America's program for clean water. I am proud to participate in this debate and to support this bill.

Inventors Sign Away Patent Rights Before They Invent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, in relation to H.R. 5918, a bill which I have introduced that would make it unlawful for an employer to require a patent assignment from a prospective employee as a condition of employment, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an article in the Los Angeles Times of April 13, 1965. This article, written by Mr. Richard L. Vanderveld, takes an objective look at the situation today's employed inventor finds himself in.

With unanimous consent, I am inserting the text of the article at this point in the Record:

INVENTOR GRUMBLES GROW OVER SIGNING AWAY OF THEIR RIGHTS

(By Richard L. Vanderveld)

Scientists and engineers are beginning to raise voices against gun-to-the-head renunciation of patent rights.

Senator RUSSELL B. LONG, Democrat, of Louisiana, is pressing for greater Government control of inventions conceived under Government-funded programs.

Industry argues all will lose if its creative energies are repressed.

These are the main sides to a question—who should get the fruits of invention—that is exciting warm debate in the councils of labor, industry, and Government.

As matters stand, industry is in the driver's seat.

Although patents are issued only to individuals, it's reckoned that about two-thirds of all patents these days wind up as corporate property through contractual assignment of rights by employees.

Also, the Defense Department, the biggest bankroller of research programs, has followed a policy of letting private firms in its hire take title to inventions and requiring only a royalty-free, nonexclusive license for the Government.

Some other Federal agencies, including the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, have not been so liberal toward industry on the patent question. The result has been confusion and some agitation for a unified policy.

A number of the country's leading legal minds in the patent area gathered recently at Lake Arrowhead and plunged into trends and issues affecting the employed inventor.

Gerald D. O'Brien, head of the NASA patent section, sounded the keynote of the conference with this observation.

"The current trend toward the acquisition by the Federal Government of exclusive rights in inventions made under Government-sponsored research and development contracts tends to diminish markedly the traditional incentives which serve as stimuli to the employed inventor."

Other speakers, expressing much the same idea, may have felt obliged to please their hosts, but the barking was too loud and articulate to be wholly devoid of bite.

The conference was sponsored by the Council of Engineers and Scientists Organizations—West under the auspices of the UCLA Institute of Industrial Relations. The council represents five independent unions of engineers, scientists, and technicians in southern California.

This group is supporting legislation which would make it illegal to have employees sign agreements relinquishing rights to inventions as a condition of employment. This is viewed as an extreme position—subject to compromise.

The sponsor of the bill, Representative GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., Democrat, of California, was present at the Arrowhead conference. He said it stood little or no chance unless its beneficiaries got behind it.

COMPANY TAKES RISK

Industry insists contractual assignment of patent rights is justified. Its reasoning is that when a company hires a man to do inventive tasks and gives him the tools it's taking all the risks and the man is only doing what he's been paid to do when he invents something.

Any compensation beyond salary for an invention in this situation is strictly out of the goodness of industry's discretionary ("ex gratia" in legal parlance) heart, it's explained.

Industry also claims technical types by and large don't aspire for wealth anyway, that they're more than happy to be left alone

with test tubes, centrifuges, and wind tunnels, draw a reasonable salary and bask in acclaim of their associates. And this idea is not too vigorously contested by scientists and engineers themselves,

In a report extolling the U.S. patent system, Du Pont phrased it this way.

"In Du Pont, contributions are recognized through salary increases and bonuses. For creations of extraordinary worth, bonuses are very substantial.

"The benefits to the inventor are not to be judged purely in monetary terms, though. Working in such companies as Du Pont, he has elaborate equipment at his disposal and has an opportunity to work full time at the business he likes best, the business of technical innovation, discovery, and invention."

The Du Pont study also suggested the little man working alone hasn't much hope any more. "Invention is now very much an institutional endeavor," it said.

The conferees at Lake Arrowhead went into the change from an individualistic to a collective research environment, the implications of the ever-increasing complexity of modern science.

They discussed the difficulties of apportioning credit to various members of a research team for purposes of reimbursement.

DISTRUST FEARED

They also acknowledged fear in some quarters that money could bring avarice into the laboratory, sow distrust among colleagues, and undermine cooperative effort.

But John C. Stedman, University of Wisconsin law professor and one of the country's foremost patent authorities, told the Arrowhead conferees much could be done to broaden award and incentive programs.

Referring to the billions of dollars being spent by the Government on research, Stedman said:

"There is some speculation that the public is not getting its money's worth. There are fewer inventions and patents in proportion to the people engaged in research and the money spent on it.

"There is concern that engineers and technicians are not putting out their best effort and are not being used to the best advantage. Some feel they are too far removed from the incentives in terms of patents, profits, and prestige."

Indianola, Iowa, Tribune Comments on the First 100 Days of the New Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERT BANDSTRA
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, the Congress has been criticized in recent years for delay and inaction on important pieces of legislation. But that criticism, however justified, has not been heard in the last few months.

Because of the constructive legislative record made during the first 100 days of this session, the Congress has gained a reputation for action. This has not gone unnoticed by the press or the public.

As an example of the editorial comments on the record of the Congress thus far, I commend to my fellow Members an article by Mr. Earl Godwin from the April 19, 1965, issue of the Indianola Tribune of Indianola, Iowa.

The editorial accurately reflects, I think, the new spirit behind the legislative work in the Congress.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I hereby include the editorial:

CHANGING ATTITUDES

(By Earl Godwin)

After the election of John F. Kennedy as President of these United States, news analysts speculated that his first 100 days in office could be expected to resemble the same period under Franklin D. Roosevelt. Roosevelt's first 100 days in office saw Congress produce more major legislation than any other similar period. The Kennedy administration was not without some very productive and far-reaching legislation, but it fell short of the high goals expected by some observers, and the first 100 days did not live up to advance predictions.

Although Lyndon Johnson has been in office much longer than 100 days, he has just about finished that much time since taking the oath of office as an elected President. The Congress that was elected, along with Mr. Johnson, last November, is just over 100 days old. Without the commotion and fanfare that usually goes with major happenings, this Congress is producing some of the most sweeping social legislation to move through Washington this century. Other Congresses have passed one, or perhaps two, such major bills in their 2 years of existence, but this session promises to go much further. Already passed is a bill that extends, for the first time, substantial Federal aid to local elementary and high schools. This marks a major breakthrough in an area that has long been unapproachable on the Federal level.

Action is pending now on major changes in the Nation's voting laws, and will undoubtedly be completed in the near future. This is a measure that will have drastic and long-range effects upon the political makeup of a large portion of our country. As recently as 4 years ago, it would have been insane to predict the passage of such a bill as is about to emerge from Congress, even though it is 100 years overdue. Today, it is moving through Congress as though it is the normal course of events. Times do change.

The same could be said about other items, most notably the so-called medicare measure. The question has shifted from whether or not such a bill shall pass, to what coverage shall be afforded by the legislation. Legislation that was impossible only 4 years ago is now accepted as a reality. Large attacks on poverty have been launched, with other programs in the mill. A realistic Presidential Succession Act even seems within the realm of possibility this year.

The list could be expanded quite a bit from these mentioned. In some respects, it is hard to comprehend the overall effects of the legislation that is being written. Our country seems to go for years at a time with little or no major change, and then suddenly leap convulsively forward. Just now, we seem to be in the middle of one of the most dramatic changes ever.

A Better Postal Service, a Better America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, as member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee for the past 8 years I have continually fought for better postal service in the United States. To this end I have stressed the Post Office Department must have enough personnel to properly handle the mail and adequate appropriations to give the American people the type of postal service to which they are entitled.

In this regard, under unanimous consent, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial, entitled "A Better Postal Service, a Better America," published in the Postal Record of April 1965.

This editorial was written by the very distinguished president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, Jerome J. Keating. He is a veteran of our postal service and knows whereof he speaks:

A BETTER POSTAL SERVICE, A BETTER AMERICA

(By Jerome J. Keating)

We are in hearty accord with President Johnson's objective to build a Great Society to make life a little better for the people in America who are having difficulties eking out a proper economic existence. In this area economists, social workers, and labor leaders have always been gravely concerned about the effect that mechanical and scientific advances have upon jobs for our working people.

In the early years factory workers fought against mechanical innovations. Mechanization, automation, and now cybernation are expected to reduce the number of jobs that are available for the person wishing to earn a living. All of these innovations, however, have meant increased production, better standards of living, and the creation of new jobs in other areas. The number of new jobs have not kept pace with the lost jobs and population increases.

Stuart Chase, writing prior to and during the depression of the 1930's, analyzed what was happening in the United States of America and what would be necessary to cushion the shock of unemployment. He pointed out that the new methods would mean a tremendous reduction in the number of jobs available for the working people in America, and predicted that more and more people would leave productive enterprises and enter into the service enterprises. He predicted that there would be expanded services in this Nation of ours as a result of our increased productivity. In some areas this prediction has been entirely accurate. Many new industries that specialize in personal services have been developed.

However, the reverse has happened in the postal service. Service has not been extended—service has been reduced. It is very difficult for people who work in the postal service to understand a government moving in two separate directions—on the one hand, it is creating programs which have as their basic purpose establishing new jobs and putting people to work; on the other hand, putting a ceiling on the number of people that can be employed in an essential industry like the Post Office Department.

Five percent of the total working force in America was unemployed in the month of February 1965; 900,000 of these unemployed people had been jobless for 15 weeks or more; and half of the total had been idle for 26 weeks. In addition to the totally unemployed, there are 2 million workers in America who work less than 35 hours a week—not because of the establishment of a shorter workweek, but due to the fact that people are employed on a part-time basis.

At the same time, personal consumption expenditures in 1964 rose by 6.5 percent to a total of $399.3 billion. This is evidence that there is substantial prosperity in many elements of our economy; it is ironic indeed that so many American people cannot find employment.

The Government is spending a substantial amount of money retraining people and

creating jobs to put them to work. Actually, the Government could take care of a substantial part of this unemployment by hiring people who are needed in the postal service, and this at a savings to the Federal budget.

In the postal service, we have had the Whitten rider which has placed a ceiling upon the number of people that we need to properly handle the mail; we have had the Bureau of the Budget ceiling; we have had the ceiling imposed by inadequate requests by the Post Office Department for the necessary amount of money to give the American people the postal service they should have. All of these ceilings have made for poorer service and have added to the total of unemployed in this country.

It seems to be entirely consistent that the Government should reverse the policy of artificial ceilings and hire the approximately 50,000 people who are necessary to provide good postal service. The needs of the Nation would indicate more jobs and the Federal Government has recognized this by creating programs to employ more people. Would it not be more consistent with good procedure to hire the necessary people for the work that should be done, remembering that the Post Office Department is necessary to our economy? The volume of sales and the volume of business is dependent upon good mail service. The Postmaster General recognized the importance and responsibility of the Post Office Department in a speech delivered to the United Rubber Workers Legislative Institute on March 17, 1965. In discussing the need for observation galleries, he stated:

"Each year, we carry through the mails literally trillions of dollars worth of money, negotiable checks and goods; post office money orders, stocks, dividends, utility bill payments, social security and Veterans' Administration checks, bank deposits, and charitable contributions. I have a sacred trust to see that this material is delivered safely and to protect the sanctity of the seal."

We do not share the Postmaster General's opinion on the need for observation galleries in post offices, but we do feel that he has a sacred trust to see that the mail is delivered safely and to protect the sanctity of the seal. We also believe that he has a further trust to see that the mail is delivered promptly with the greatest dispatch possible, and that the best of service should be maintained through the maintenance of adequate collection service and delivery service of both letters and parcel post.

Must Reason Perish?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, my attention was drawn to an arresting article which appeared in Paris in Le Figaro, on March 25, 1965, captioned, "Must Reason Perish?" written by Mr. A. N. Spanel, the founder and chairman of International Latex Corp.

This is at once an appeal to reason and a brilliant defense of the traditional bonds that exist between the United States and France; historic bonds in freedom's cause sealed with the precious blood and lives of the best manhood of both our nations.

Mr. Spanel convincingly elucidates that a genuine Western unity must be rooted in aggregate strengths and shared purposes; and that the long-advertised Communist plan for world dominion can never be realized by them "without the unwitting collaboration of the free world itself"—a collaboration which unhappily is now measurable by the very dimension of the divisiveness that exists between France and the United States.

I am persuaded that heads of states in this world will long remember the essence of this paragraph in his article:

A great French diplomat and historian, Andre Francois-Poncet, wrote recently, in Le Figaro of March 11: "No one will be able to convince us that it is a good bargain for France to exchange American friendship for Soviet or Chinese friendship."

Here is a timely and important presentation for the American and French people. It is noteworthy that the following conclusion was read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 12, 1961:

It is a certainty that no private citizen in American history has given so much of himself and of his company in thought, effort, and treasure, in order to establish stronger bonds between the people of the United States and France, as Mr. Spanel has since 1939.

Freemen everywhere will join in prayer that Mr. Spanel's plea for Western unity will be given top priority, now.

I, therefore, under unanimous consent, include this article by Mr. Spanel in the Appendix of the RECORD:

MUST REASON PERISH?

(By A. N. Spanel)

We live in an era of crowding change. The tempo of history has never been more rapid, the shifting patterns formed by the kaleidoscope of events have never been more startling. Yet there are values that do not change—values which provide the points of reference, stars to help chart the course, for those in any country called upon to steer the ship of state.

Most important among these fixed points in our Western civilization, the North Star for our guidance, has been human freedom. This is the central value for which the best blood in America, France, England, and other leading nations has soaked the earth, generation after generation, in Europe, Asia, and the Americas.

Let no one scoff at this as a mere truism. All the great principles we live by are truisms, haloed by centuries of thought, experience, and sacrifice. If we forget them or belittle them, we risk not only our lives but our souls.

Under all the political noise of our time, the defense of freedom wherever it may be menaced is still the paramount objective. People born into our civilization and nurtured on its greatness know this instinctively. And never has this knowledge been more vital than in our own generation, confronting the life-and-death challenge of world communism.

This is the writer's fundamental premise. We believe that a flourishing freedom, rooted in both faith and strength, is indispensable if we would safeguard all the values we cherish. We believe, moreover, that its preservation cannot and must not be the dedicated task of any one nation—not even if it is history's most powerful nation militarily and industrially.

To be specific, we believe that without the full participation of France in this task, France with all she symbolizes in thought, culture and human spirit, the decline of the West would be inevitable.

CRUCIAL CHOICE

We must ask ourselves: What are free men to believe and live by? Shall it be the pronouncement that "We have no perpetual allies and we have no perpetual enemies, our interests are perpetual"? Unfortunately this century-old piece of cynicism is currently caricatured in a Western "alliance" in a sad state of divisiveness, shadowed by hostility and mutual suspicions on both sides of the Atlantic.

Or shall it be a genuine Western unity, resting on shared strengths and purposes in freedom's cause? A unity that, when necessary, compasses even the sacrifice of immediate self-interest for the long-term self-interest of our common destiny?

In this context and for more than 25 years we have tried to interpret France and the French people to the United States—and the American people to France. In this long endeavor we have spared neither ourselves nor our substance in order that the enduring values for both nations might be made more visible through the fogs of irritations and misunderstandings.

Why have we done this? Because of a deep sense of the decisive importance of Franco-American friendship and solidarity for the fate not alone of our two peoples but of the whole world of freedom. What is at stake is not merely an "alliance" in the formal, legalistic sense but a traditional community whose common appreciation of freedom has been sharpened and shaped by united struggle against looming dangers.

NOISY DIPLOMACY DAMAGING

More than ever, we are rooted in the conviction that the basic values of freedom and human dignity, for which Frenchmen and Americans have paid so much in blood and treasure, must not be allowed to perish. A few months ago, as the dictates of Western unity were being more perilously obscured, we wrote in these columns:

"It is as though we were living in some other age and not in the present nuclear one where unity spells life—and disunity, death; where aggregate free world strength may save this world, and weakness born of disunity, bring on its destruction.

"What are the answers to some of the issues that are making a mockery of the Western alliance? They are certainly not to be found in the angry propaganda blasts to which people are subjected here and in Europe. Nor can differences between allies be resolved in atmospheres of noisy diplomacy designed to 'marshal' public opinion."

These words were written, as we said then, because "free-world nations on both sides of the Atlantic were supporting their own interests and views with a stubbornness that defies reason and consequence." We repeat them because that suicidal trend has become, if anything, more emphatic and irrational.

The tragic irony of it is that, despite surface changes and tactical moves to confuse us and to disarm us psychologically, the Communist commitment to the liquidation of freedom has remained inflexible. The Communist world remains faithful to its Mein Kampf for global dominion. It is today what it was from the beginning: a clear blueprint for the attainment of one Communist world.

And the Communists know—what too many of us seem intent on forgetting—that their plan can never be realized without the unwitting collaboration of the free world itself. Their strategy remains what it has always been: to subvert, divide and rule.

THE VALUES WE KILL

In the face of this ever-present threat, this great historic challenge to freedom, how utterly trivial are the bickerings, the commercial competition, the seeking for spheres of influence which more and more seriously are splintering our world.

A great French diplomat and historian, André François-Poncet, wrote recently, in Le Figaro of March 11: "No one will be able to convince us that it is a good bargain for France to exchange American friendship for Soviet or Chinese friendship."

By the same token, no one will convince Americans that anything which undermines what M. François-Poncet called "the sacred tradition of the age-old bonds between France and the United States" can be less than a disaster for both countries.

We stand at a crossroads of history where we dare not, if we still cherish human freedom as our principal value, allow considerations of short-term profits and prides to take precedence over the age-old imperatives of our common cause.

Every American schoolboy knows a wise statement made by Benjamin Franklin, an unflinching friend of France, as the Founding Fathers gathered in Philadelphia to sign the immortal Declaration of Freedom. "We must all hang together," he said, "or assuredly we shall all hang separately." That warning is as relevant for the free world peoples today as it was for the 13 American colonies in 1776. Our freedom is indivisible, and only the shortsighted or the frivolous would knowingly take part in its division.

What Americans call "isolationism" has become an anachronism in the shrunken, interdependent world of our times. Let us be clear on the fact that it is no less anachronistic for France than for the United States.

The View From Abroad Regarding the Employee Inventor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, during the recent symposium held on April 8, 1965, celebrating the 175th anniversary of the U.S. patent system, some of the most pertinent remarks dealing with the problem of the employed inventor and his legal relations with his employer were made by Dr. Fredrik Neumeyer.

Dr. Neumeyer, who is a citizen of Sweden, is one of the leading patent scholars in Europe, and has been making a special study of the employee-inventor's status for a number of years.

Formerly the head of the patent department of the Swedish State Telephone & Telegraph Administration, he has written on the subject in various European and international periodicals, and lectured on it in several European countries. In 1962 the Subcommittee on Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary published a study prepared by Dr. Neumeyer in the form of a committee print entitled "The Law of Employed Inventors in Europe."

In view of this extensive background, I am sure that my colleagues will find Dr. Neumeyer's remarks at the symposium related to the employed inventor to be most illuminating. Dr. Neumeyer is currently spending 1 year in the Department of Economics, Princeton University, as a visiting fellow. He is now working on a study concerning the legal and practical situation of employed inventors in the United States.

The text of his speech on April 8 is as follows:

I was asked to say some words about the view from abroad regarding the employee-inventor. I have to start out with some very short remarks as to the general situation in this country which always will have an impact on all of us in the Western World.

Every reader of a newspaper in this country knows what gigantic amounts of money are now spent by Government, industry, and universities, to keep scientific research going. We hardly react when we read that the President estimates Federal expenditures for the coming year at more than $15 billion (of which $6.9 billion will be spent on space projects). Industry-financed research and development was already in 1961, up to $4.6 billion (with more than $870 million spent in chemical and electrical industry each).

If we have a look upon who is going to carry out this work and to create all these new weapons, machines, vehicles, products, and systems for new power, more speed, better food or medicines, we see that the Federal Government (in 1962) employed totally more than 144,000 scientific and technical personnel, of which more than 50,000 were so-called R. & D. personnel. Private industry occupied at the same time totally more than 850,000 scientists and engineers, of which more than 303,000 were R. & D. scientists and engineers.

When we learn that by far the largest share of research performance in industrial firms is devoted to projects "advancing new scientific knowledge with specific commercial objectives" and to the translation of research findings into actual products and processes, we understand readily that there must be a steady stream of engineering innovation, often in the form of inventions which can be protected by patents.

Now, it is just as obvious that the vast majority of all these creative persons are employees of some kind. They work either for a Government agency, for an industrial corporation, or for a university as employer. The mutual relations between the employer and the inventing employees are not regulated by Federal statutory law in this country (except for certain specific rules regarding Government employees) and there exists an almost unlimited freedom of contract in the field (limited only by the Statute of Frauds or eventually by the antitrust laws).

In spite of the fact that the research activities in which inventions can be created do not have the same size in Europe as they have in the United States, European countries have laid down considerable efforts to regulate the legal relations between employers and employees making inventions. These efforts go in certain countries back to times before the turn of the century and the basic problems have been observed since the early days of industrialization. More than a dozen countries had promulgated legal provisions regarding rights and obligations of employed inventors. I would say that we have five different main systems which have been used to solve these problems in Europe.

I

The first and historically the earliest system was the insertion of provisions concerning employee inventors into patent law. This solution was adopted by Austria, Finland, the Netherlands, Italy, Canada, and Japan (in chronological order). A similar form of regulation was adopted by the Soviet Union and other Eastern European countries through the enactment of laws regulating inventive activities based, of course, on the socialist economic system. Laws following the general principles of the Soviet concept of labor and of the place of inventive activity in planned industrial production were issued in Yugoslavia in 1948, in Bulgaria, Rumania, and the German Democratic Republic in 1951, in Poland in 1951–52, in Hungary in 1953, and in Czechoslovakia in 1957.

II

The second type of system was that adopted in Switzerland, where provisions concerning employee inventors were inserted into the law concerning contracts and the employer-employee relationship, the so-called law of obligations.

III

The third method consists in passing a special law devoted exclusively to the rights and obligations of employee inventors and their employers, and the legal problems arising from these relations.

The first modern law of this type was issued by Sweden in 1949, followed by Denmark in 1955 and the Federal Republic of Germany in 1957. In the course of the unification of law which is being carried out in the Nordic countries special enactments regarding employee inventors, based on the Swedish and Danish models, are being prepared in Finland and Norway.

IV

The fourth type of legal solution relies mainly on precedents established by courts and by official boards specially instituted to give guidance in the matter. This method, which is exemplified by the United Kingdom and the United States, must naturally be based on individual cases of legal conflict, either between two private parties or between a private party and the Government. Hence it cannot cover the whole field consistently and comprehensively, since the rules originating from these decisions depend necessarily on a number of accidental circumstances. From a detailed study of common law and judge-made law it is, however, possible to distinguish certain basic principles applicable to employee inventors, in the United States, akin to the principles operating in other countries.

V

Finally there are some countries where the relations between employee inventors and their employers are regulated by collective agreement, in some cases alongside one or other of the four methods outlined above, but more typically in countries where there is at present no specific legislation on the subject (e.g., in France). Collective agreements are, as a rule, concluded only for a limited period and may vary from one industry to another.

The oldest regulation by patent law (of the classical type) was in Austria. The Austrian Patents Act of June 11, 1897, contained the following provision:

"Workmen, salaried employees and civil servants are considered to be the authors of inventions made by them in service unless otherwise stipulated by agreement or by service rules. Any provision in contracts or service rules by which a person employed by an enterprise, or a civil servant, is deprived of the reasonable benefit of an invention made by him in service is without legal effect."

The Swiss legislator has brought the problems of inventions made in the course of employment under the law of contracts, which in turn is part of the Swiss federal commercial law. In 1911 the first Federal Law of Obligations, which had been promulgated in 1881, was basically revised and reissued as Book V of the Swiss Civil Code. In title X of this book we find a section 343 regulating inventions made by employed persons. This section provides as follows:

"Inventions made by an employee in the course of his work belong to the employer if inventive activity is comprised in the service duties of the employee or, where this

is not the case, if the employer has expressly retained a right to them.

"In the later case the employee is entitled to reasonable special compensation if the invention is of considerable economic value.

"When assessing this compensation regard must be had to the assistance given by the employer and to the use made of his property."

This single provision within the framework of a very extensive law leaves a number of problems untouched; some of these may be solved by the general law, which in Switzerland may mean the individual laws of 22 different cantons.

No statute concerning employees' inventions exists in the United Kingdom. Since, however, Great Britain was among the first European countries to establish the modern factory system in which the question of employees' inventions arises and to enact a law for the protection of inventions, the earliest judicial decisions regarding the origin, ownership, and use of inventions produced by employee inventors and their compensation date from the beginning of the 19th century. Disputes had to be brought before the courts for decision according to common law and the principles of equity. Many of the early questions in this field were answered according to the rules governing relations between "master and servant" and conditions of labor contracts (express or implied) as deduced from the judicial decisions of many centuries' standing.

An early British court problem (1825, 1834) concerned, for instance, the authorship of an invention where it had to be decided whether or not the servant was merely carrying out the instructions of his master, being no more than a tool for putting his master's idea into the tangible form which is the subject of a patent. Another basic question analyzed and decided by the courts was: Who is a servant? A skilled chemist, although his employment involved manual labor, was held not to be a servant. A contractor, being a person who has entered into a contract to execute certain specific work, is subject to the orders of his employer only to the extent that the terms of his contract so provide. He is not under the control of his employer.

Within this short program I can only add that practically any existing European law or court in this field, as a rule, considers seven questions as basic ones:

1. To which group of employed individuals (what category) does an employee belong?

2. What type of intellectual work has been produced by employees?

3. Has title or part of the title to inventions been acquired by the employer?

4. Which principles of compensation for such inventions have been used?

5. Which category of employee-inventions does apply?

6. Is it stipulated how controversies and differences of opinion in this field are to be settled?

7. What rules apply to inventions made by employed inventors after their employment has finished?

With these remarks I may just have opened the view through a small window, a view known more or less to experts in American corporations and Government agencies with wide international connections and interests. There is more to study and think about for people interested in an increased output of employee inventions and better labor relations everywhere.

President Makes Sense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, most military experts agree that with the current international balance of power between the Soviet Union and the United States, that a nuclear war could now only start by mistake or miscalculation. There perhaps is another way. If the Soviet Union commits itself indelibly to the North Vietnamese; and if North Vietnam is committed to the Vietcong; and if the United States remains committed to the people of South Vietnam, it could happen that a second nuclear war could be precipitated, not by the great powers, the United States and the Soviets, but by minor political segments in southeast Asia who are too inculcated with the stubborn mandarin personality to envision the results of this action extending beyond the Gulf of Tonkin.

My hometown paper, the Vallejo Times Herald, recently editorialized on this matter as follows, and pointed up the need for the U.S.S.R. and the United States to negotiate on their own terms forthwith.

PRESIDENT MAKES SENSE

President Johnson's speech to the world this week on the Vietnam situation reflects good sense. In effect, the Chief Executive was summing up what he considers the goals of the United States and the free world in that section of the globe. He also recognized the inescapable fact that the free world is destined to coexist with the Communist world or neither will exist.

The far-reaching suggestion by the President that the Soviet Union join with the United States in helping to develop this backward region of southeast Asia is a bold step. From a coexistence viewpoint, he is asking the other major power in the world to assist in insuring the freedom and development of southeast Asia and at the same time he has widened the breach between the Russians and the Chinese. His failure to specifically include Red China in his proposals indicates that he believes the Chinese are not yet ready to sit down and talk as a mature, sensible nation. These Chinese activity in Korea, their vilification of the United States and their growing criticism of the Soviet Union makes them a suspect participant in any peace talks.

President Johnson demonstrated the determination of the United States to carry on the war against the Communists if peace talks could not bring about a settlement in that area. He cited the U.S. position that the maintenance of Vietnam as a free and independent state is essential to the peace of Asia. He made it clear that the United States, under no circumstances, would withdraw from that area—only if a peace settlement with built-in guarantees can be reached.

The President and the rest of the Nation are wary of warfare, but the Nation generally is convinced that retreat in the face of Communist incursion can be fatal. Since former President Truman laid down the guidelines for containing Communist encroachment in all parts of the world, the United States and the free world have followed this no-retreat policy successfully.

Mr. Johnson, in reiterating this policy, has made it clear that in peace or war, the U.S. position in southeast Asia will remain firm.

An American Basketball at Moscow University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I was interested to read a United Press International report today from Indianapolis, Ind., that the U.S. All Stars defeated the Soviet Union Nationals by a score of 78 to 73 in a basketball game that attracted nearly 14,000 fans. It was also noteworthy that last night's victory gave the American team a 4-to-1 edge in the five games played with the touring Russians.

I call this to the attention of my colleagues because of a pleasant experience which developed from a meeting I had with an American student at the University of Moscow when I was in Russia last November on a study mission with the Europe Subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

I enjoyed a pleasant conversation at the Prague Restaurant in Moscow with Mr. Edward Milton Ifft, of 239 Alameda Road, Butler, Pa., a member of the University of Moscow basketball team who informed me that the pleasure of his association with the university team was alloyed by the fact that the team played with a basketball produced in Red China.

Upon my return to the United States I related this experience to Mr. John B. Colt, export manager of A. G. Spalding & Bros., Inc., Chicopee, Mass., who agreed with me that it is not fit and proper for an American to be playing the American game of basketball with equipment produced in China and he thereafter forwarded as a gift a "Made in America" basketball to Mr. Ifft.

This week I have received from Mr. Ifft a very interesting letter which gives evidence that this basketball is being worked into a game of goodwill which could, ultimately, lead to possible exclusion of Red Chinese-made balls from the basketball courts of Moscow. I presume that in the current series of exhibition games here between Russian and American teams American-made equipment is used exclusively and I suggest that Russian coaches should be encouraged to advocate greater use of American equipment in practice sessions.

Given a choice I would prefer to play ball with the Russians than with the Chinese under American rules and with

American equipment and it is conceivable that out of this relatively minor experience there could develop a new phase in East-West relations. I have expressed my thanks to Mr. Colt and to Mr. Ifft for their participation and I am sure that all of us would welcome the opportunity to encourage and to develop a familiarity with American equipment on the part of Russian athletes.

Mr. Ifft has assured me that the American-made basketball which was sent to him by Mr. Colt will have a "long and useful career here at the Moscow University" in spite of the fact that his initial effort to have it used was not successful because of the reluctance of the opposing team to use an unfamiliar ball.

I am including here the letter I received this week from Mr. Ifft, together with my initial letter to Mr. Colt and his reply:

FEBRUARY 10, 1965.

A. G. SPALDING & BROS., INC.,
Meadow Street, Chicopee, Mass.

GENTLEMEN: During a recent trip to Moscow I made the acquaintance of one of our American students who is studying at the University of Moscow. He is a basketball player and a member of the University of Moscow team. However, in describing his experiences with that group he told me that his pleasure was alloyed by the fact that they were playing with a basketball produced by the Red Chinese.

It occurred to me that under the circumstances you might consider making a good American basketball available to Mr. Edward Milton Ifft, APO 664, Box M, New York, N.Y. not only to give him satisfaction, but to prove the superiority of American-produced athletic equipment.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN S. MONAGAN,
Member of Congress.

A. G. SPALDING & BROS. INC.,
Chicopee, Mass., February 19, 1965.

Representative JOHN S. MONAGAN,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MONAGAN: Thank you very much for your interesting letter of February 10th telling us of one of our American students studying at the University of Moscow.

I agree with you entirely that it is not fit and proper for an American to be playing the American game of basketball with equipment produced in China.

We are going to send to him a contribution of a really fine basketball just as soon as we determine from him whether their sport is played indoors or outdoors, as this would make a difference in the type of ball which we would supply.

My sincere thanks to you for bringing this matter to our attention.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN B. COLT,
Export Manager.

Representative JOHN S. MONAGAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MONAGAN: I am one of the American students you met at the Prague Restaurant in Moscow several months ago. At your suggestion, the Spalding Co. has sent me, free of charge, one of their basketballs to present to the Moscow University team, of which I am a member. I presented the ball to the team just before a game last week. Our players were quite impressed and were ready to use it immediately as the game ball. Interestingly enough, the visiting team was a bit afraid of a new and unfamiliar ball and we ended up using one of the usual Chinese balls. Nevertheless I have no doubt our basketball will have a long and useful career here at Moscow University.

I am very glad you followed up your idea, as it was indeed a fine gesture. Thank you very much for allowing me to join with you and the Spalding people in helping, in some small way, to increase the considerable reservoir of goodwill toward us which exists among the ordinary Soviet people.

Yours truly,

EDWARD M. IFFT.

Oklahoma Publisher Evaluates Rayburn Building

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEED
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding editors and publishers of Oklahoma, Mr. Ed Livermore of the Sapulpa Daily Herald, visited Washington recently for a series of editors' meetings.

Mr. Livermore is well known as a man of conservative and fiscally sound views. He described his reaction to the Rayburn House Office Building in his regular column, "The Editor's Notebook," for April 12, 1965, as follows:

THE EDITOR'S NOTEBOOK
(By Ed Livermore)

Congressman TOM STEED has taken a bit of ribbing about his part in the huge new Rayburn Office Building for Members of Congress. STEED served as chairman of the committee which approved the plans, contract, and specifications of the building.

A couple of weeks ago we took a tour of the building and visited several of the congressional suites. Frankly, we were surprised. We figured on finding something like the Taj Mahal, with congressional staffers tiptoeing around on belly-deep carpet. It wasn't quite that way.

In fact, we'd say the office accommodations in the Rayburn Building were not a bit beyond those you'd find for any $30,000 per year employee. And that's the salary you pay your Congressman these days. The working space and accommodations for staff members is a vast improvement over those archaic quarters in the Old House Office Building. But they weren't as good as you'll find in any of a dozen oil company offices in Tulsa. And the furniture was far from elaborate. The offices we visited seemed already just short of crowded for space.

Of course, the cost of constructing anything in Washington is unusually high. Five different unions are involved in delivering a lone typewriter table from the street level to an upper story. You can imagine what the building trades do in a situation where they get anything they want. With 190 million of us footing the bill, the sky's the limit. Walls of the Rayburn Building are thick enough to withstand anything short of an atomic blast, and the building will be there for at least a century, thank goodness. As to the operators for the automatic elevators, they were there and on the job. There's no denying that.

We didn't find a single gold doorknob, nor a room outfitted in silver mosaic. Being only a "common John" taxpayer, we fail to understand all we should about construction. But we'll wager they didn't waste one-tenth the dough on the Rayburn Office Building that was shot down the rathole on the Aswan Dam, and we've heard precious little out of the New York Times about that bit of economic ignorance.

One way to look at it—if we spent money foolishly at least American taxpayers got a hunk of it, thus making it just a detour on the way back to the tax office.

Article II of American Bill of Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, over the years there has been great interest manifested, discussions and controversy on the construction of the Constitution protecting rights of people.

One of the most controversial issues and sensitive problems today is with the sale, transportation, and ownership of firearms. For the last several years bills have been introduced in the Congress dealing with this subject matter. There were a number of bills introduced in the last Congress and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, but due to the heavy schedule of the committee and the circumstances, hearings were not held. In this 89th Congress several bills have been introduced, some of which have been referred to our committee. Attention has also been given to this subject in the Senate.

Much has been said and written on the subject in the public press and other media. Mr. Alex Washburn, editor of the Hope Star, a daily newspaper in my native county and district, has written an interesting editorial in his daily column in which he points out some of the interesting and important questions in connection with this issue. I commend it to you and the Members of the Congress and invite your attention to it. Therefore, under unanimous consent, I include it with these remarks in the RECORD.

ARTICLE II OF AMERICAN BILL OF RIGHTS

The first 10 amendments of the Constitution of the United States are known as our "Bill of Rights."

Article I guarantees freedom of speech and press and the right to petition—but right behind it is article II which declares: "The right of the people to bear and keep arms shall not be infringed."

It is important to know that our forefathers gave such prominence to arms among the common people because at this moment Congress is debating a Johnson-backed proposal to regulate all traffic in weapons.

Ostensibly the administration measure is supposed to halt the sale of weapons through mail-order houses, but the National Rifle Association asserts it goes far beyond this and is an infringement upon the rights of the people.

Harlon B. Carter, president, announced after the ARA convention last weekend that while his group opposes the administration bill it will support laws imposing heavy penalties for crimes committed with firearms.

The ARA speaks with the voice of commonsense. The administration is put in the foolish position of saying that because there are motor accidents therefore the sale of

automobiles should be prohibited. But ARA argues in effect: "Nonsense—make and enforce severe penalties against irresponsible drivers."

Government has taken away from the private citizen the right to own gold.

Now it proposes to forbid the private ownership of firearms.

It is a paradoxical situation which reminds me of what I saw in Mexico City years ago (1940). The government of then-troubled Mexico had thousands of police, but so little confidence in their loyalty that they wouldn't permit the policemen to carry guns.

But our situation is vastly worse, because in our country the suspected ones are not the police but the people.

Centerville, Iowa, Newspaper Cites Need for Constitutional Amendment on Presidential Disability

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BERT BANDSTRA
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. BANDSTRA. Mr. Speaker, on April 13 the House of Representatives gave its approval to a constitutional amendment that provides for the orderly transfer of executive power in case of Presidential disability.

The amendment also contains provisions to insure that the office of Vice President will not be come vacant in the event of a President's death, as has occurred 16 times in this Nation's history.

The Senate, on February 19, approved an amendment similar in intent but different in wording. Both versions of the amendment have been sent to a conference committee, and I am hopeful that the differences in the two proposals can be resolved to the satisfaction of both Houses.

Of course, great care should be taken in drafting a constitutional amendment. The wording should be such that no doubts are cast on the meaning or intent of the provisions. Any constitutional amendment, before it leaves the Congress, should be as close to perfection as is possible.

At the same time, there is no reason for undue delay. I sincerely believe that the vast majority of Americans are in favor of an amendment on Presidential disability and continuity. And I am equally certain that if such an amendment is approved by the Congress it will be ratified by the States.

As evidence of the popular support for this amendment, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an editorial from the April 22, 1965, issue of the Centerville Iowegian of Centerville, Iowa. The pending amendment, as the editorial points out, deals with vitally important constitutional questions that should have been resolved long ago.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I hereby include the editorial:

DISABILITY PROGRESS

It is of no small importance that a proposed constitutional amendment to deal with presidential disability has passed its first major hurdle on the way to adoption. Until now Congress has been far too lackadaisical about this and the related problem of assuring that the office of Vice President shall not be vacant.

Both matters are encompassed in the bill approved by an overwhelming House majority. The public interest would be served if the Senate would now speedily pass a similar measure and thus get the amendment proposal to the States for ratification. Though there is little doubt of ultimate approval, no undue delay is warranted.

This is underscored by the fact that events of recent history—President Eisenhower's severe illness while in office, and the assassination of President Kennedy—have clearly shown the gaps in our present basic law on these questions. As things stand, the Constitution does not provide clearly for procedure in case of presidential disability and makes no provision at all for filling a vice-presidential vacancy at the time it occurs. Current law on presidential succession, which places the Speaker of the House and the President pro tempore of the Senate next in line, is quite unsatisfactory.

The measure approved by the House is a rational approach to handling these problems. The Senate bill, though it differs procedurally, is similar. There has been some objection that these proposals are too detailed, that any amendment should instead be written in the broadest possible language to permit flexibility under changing conditions. But since the present inadequacy of law on these points springs in part from a failure to spell out the matter in detail, the present approach seems wise. Let us hope that the matter can be brought swiftly to a conclusion.

Estes Kefauver Memorial Park

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD FULTON
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, 2 years ago this body lost one of its most distinguished former Members and the people of the State of Tennessee lost one of their ablest and most outstanding Senators at the death of Estes Kefauver.

He left the Congress with an excellent record as a legislator and chamption of the common man. He left Tennessee a better place in which to live, do business, and raise a family because of his efforts in our behalf.

Estes Kefauver was a man of many talents and interests. One of these interests was in the field of conservation and water resource development. Much of the work that has been done for Tennessee by the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Corps of Engineers, and other waterway programs was advanced significantly by Senator Kefauver.

He was especially valuable in securing congressional approval for the J. Percy Priest Dam and Reservoir named in honor of the late Member of this body from Nashville.

Today the Corps of Engineers is developing a 416-square-acre park on the Priest Reservoir in Davidson County, Tenn., on the Hamilton Creek embayment between the communities of Una and Smith Springs. This park will be developed for picknicking, boating, fishing, and other recreational activities.

Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to name this park the "Estes Kefauver Memorial Park" in honor of the late Senator from Tennessee who did so much for this project in Nashville and similar projects across Tennessee.

Our Irish Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, at the annual St. Patrick's Day dinner of the Irish-American Social Club held in Waterbury, Conn., on March 14, 1965, the Reverend William Hart, M.S., of the LaSalette Seminary in Cheshire, Conn., delivered one of the most scholarly and moving addresses that I have ever been privileged to hear. Combining great industry, profound scholarship, and exquisite literary skill, Father Hart produced a literary masterpiece which will long live in the minds of those who had the good fortune to hear him.

In order that this product of Father Hart's skill and devotion may have the broader audience which it deserves, I place it in the RECORD following these remarks.

"THE CURSE

For the lady who threatens to leave if I talk more than 30 minutes. A curse from "Righteous Anger": "May she marry a ghost and bear him a kitten, and may the High King of glory permit her to get the mange."

A curse I particularly like by my favorite Irish dramatist, J. M. Synge.

"Lord, confound this surly sister,
Blight her brow with blotch and blister,
Cramp her larynx, lung, and liver,
In her guts a galling give her.
Let her live to earn her dinners
In Mountjoy with seedy sinners:
Lord, this judgment quickly bring,
And I'm your servant, J. M. Synge."

OUR IRISH HERITAGE

Right Reverend Monsignor, Your Honor the Mayor and Mrs. McNellis, distinguished Member of the U.S. Congress, Mr. MONAGAN and Mrs. Monagan, friends; this evening I choose to speak to you about two great periods in Irish history: Catholic Ireland of the "Celtic Twilight" and Christian Ireland of the 19th-century "Irish Literary Revival." Though almost a thousand years separate those two periods, taken together they form the most significant part of our Irish heritage, a heritage we may not ignore without loss to ourselves and to Western civilization.

We are our heritage. To know it is to know ourselves. To know ourselves is to realize our mission in today's world and to prepare for our destiny in tomorrow's. So the piper here calls the tune and he plays "Ourselves To Know."

What is said here tonight bears witness to the power of the faith, the honor of the Republic, the nobility of the arts. What is said, gratefully acknowledges our debt to the Protestant patriot Anglo-Irish of the revival. Finally, all is said that we may foster in our young an informed interest in and an honest love of Ireland.

P. H. Pearse, leader of the Easter Week insurrection of 1916, was a schoolmaster and a poet. His little poem "I Am Ireland" will be my guideline. Listen to it.

"I am Ireland.
I am older than the old woman of (Bare).[1]
Great my glory, I that bore Cuchulain the valiant.
Great my shame, my own children that sold their mother.
I am Ireland.
I am lonelier than the old woman of (Bare)."

GREAT MY GLORY

Early Irish saga literature reveals a pagan Celtic world of barbaric splendor: wild with the heroic deeds of Conchubar, Cuchulain, Ossian and Finn; sad with the tragic beauty of Deirdre, the children of Lir and the sons of Tuireen; dark with the dread druid's pagan superstition; a world of kings roaring drunk at the mysteries of life and death; queens laughing and weeping in the wind's rage; warriors bare-fisted fighting the ocean waves; poets loving the land, the hills, the cliffs and clouds; old men talking in a dark night of Samhain and waiting for better days.

Into this Celtic world of a hundred-hundred kings came Patrick in 432 with bell, book, candle, cross and shamrock to win the five-fifths of Ireland: Ulster, Munster, Leinster, Connaught and Meath, to the three personed—one God. Into the Celt's natural virtues of courage, piety, imagination and zeal, Patrick poured the grace of the supernatural and the miracle of the Irish was worked. Almost overnight the island of kings and warriors became an island of saints and scholars.

Within a century of Patrick's death a tidal wave of monasticism rolled over Ireland. From Enda's lonely monastery perched on the cliffs of Inishmore far out in Galway Bay to Kevin's Bed in Glendalough, from Finnbaar's in Cork to St. Brigid's in Kildare, and beyond Clonmacnois across the sea to Columcille's Iona and Aidan's Lindisfarne on the English coast—Irish monasticism flourished. Theirs was a penance and prayer so fierce and austere that today historians chill to read what heroic and often puritanical virtue flamed on the lonely coasts of Connaught, Donegal, Derry, and Meath. From the ridge of the world those great Celts set out in their frail boats, exiles for Christ, sailing to the Orkneys, the Faroes, even to Iceland. Through England, France, Italy, and the Germanies their restless, sandled feet stirred the dust and leaves while their hearts quickened souls to the word of God. Jewels in a Tara brooch, their monasteries treasured and preserved the wisdom of the ages while barbarian hordes thundered the forests and plains smashing the lamps of learning, darkening the plain with ignorance, sinking man in the muddy instincts of the brute. The monastic roll call of these warrior exiles is a Gaelic litany of brilliants: Aidan of Lindisfarne, Colum of Iona, Colman of Luxeuil, France, Gall of St. Gall, Switzerland, Fursa of Perrone, Cilia of Wurzburg and Fergal of Salzburg.

GREAT MY SHAME

Yet, as so often happens, while these men grew hard and thin in exile, back home their brother monks grew fat and soft, and the sheep ran wild. Even though a man like Malachy of Armagh, and orders like the Cistercians and Augustinians initiated countless reforms of Irish life and morals, still a little more than a century after Brian Boru's Good Friday victory over the Vikings at the Battle of Clontarf in 1014, down in Rome overzealous Irish reformers were complaining to Pope Adrian IV about "the enormities of the vices of their people." (Informers in our midst even then.) It was a sorry day. Henry II of England had long been trying to hoodwink the Pope into letting him add Ireland to his English empire that he might proclaim, as he said, "the truths of religion to a rude and ignorant people." Henry got what he wanted. A Papal Bull called on the Irish to receive Henry as their lord. The Irish, naively thinking they were just exchanging one high king for another, gave him the Gaelic greeting of "a hundred thousand welcomes." [2]

MY OWN CHILDREN THAT SOLD THEIR MOTHER

Shame. With Henry's permission the renegade Dermot of Leinster raised an army of Anglo-Normans, mostly Welsh and Flemings, and with Strongbow (Richard de Clare) stormed Waterford, struck across the mountains to take Dublin and then sat down with Henry to divide the land between the Normans and a few native kings who paid tribute to the Crown. With sword and castle the Normans maintained the land given, but in the end through marriage and custom the Irish absorbed them. Eventually the Normans became ipsis Hibernicis Hiberniores—more Irish than the Irish themselves. Not so the English.

Till the advent of Henry VIII, Gaelic Ireland managed to survive by rebellion, conflict, the intrigue of politics and by war itself. With Henry, however, and his brilliant bookish, bastard daughter "Bad Bess," all hell broke loose in a religious war: Protestant England and Catholic Ireland. Pius V issued a papal bull depriving Elizabeth of her claim to rule either Ireland or England. From that time on the Irish cause and the Catholic faith were indissoluble linked. Nevertheless Elizabeth wore the crown and poor Erin, the crownless queen, sat in the dust, chained hand and foot, her broken sword fallen, and mournful memories lying heavy on her heart.

Under Elizabeth 210,000 acres of Irish lands went over to English Protestant owners and tenants for planting. On Christmas Eve 1601 O'Neil and O'Donnal were crushed at Kinsale. Gaelic Ireland was finished. What Elizabeth had begun, Oliver Cromwell completed. He performed the autopsy and conducted the requiem. Before that monster left Ireland, famine, plague, deportation, and wholesale slaughter cut the population in half. 850,000 Irishmen disappeared. The Irish papist landowners who didn't go to heaven, hell, or Connaught, went in bondage to Boston and in black slavery to the West Indies. Twenty million acres of the best Irish land were given outright to Protestant settlers. By 1691 the "wild geese," the Irish aristocracy and the best fighting men, had flown to the Continent. The conquest was complete. Gaelic Ireland was a corpse.

I AM LONELIER THAN THE OLD WOMAN OF BARE

All that makes a people a people the new colonists set out to destroy: the land, the people, the culture. A fundamental schism was created in Irish life: Catholic Ireland and Ascendancy Ireland, the Connaught cabin and the Big House. A Protestant nation was born and it was built on the infamous penal code that denied every Catholic Irishman the three things most dear to every freedom-loving man: (1) the effective ownership of his land, (2) an active voice in his country's government and public life, (3) the free exercise of his faith. For all Irishmen, Catholic and Protestant, the penal code was a catastrophe.

That situation forced the Protestant Ascendancy to create an Anglo-Irish culture of their own—if they could; but the competition with England was too strong. Too many of their best minds—Sheridan, Swift, Goldsmith, Burke—gravitated to London. The 18th century made it abundantly clear to the Big House that if there was ever to be a distinctly Irish culture again, the Anglo-Irish alone could not provide it. With London as the political and cultural capitol, to be Anglo-Irish could mean nothing.[3]

I AM IRELAND

By the end of the century, 1798, Catholics and Protestant, Irish and Anglo-Irish, finally realized that Irishmen would never win their civil, religious, and cultural rights—that Ireland would never be free—until Irish and Anglo-Irish put aside their religious differences and united on republican principles. This was part of the conviction that inspired the insurrection of 1798 under the leadership of Protestant Wolfe Tone. The insurrection failed. Tone was sentenced to death. Death took him but not before the torch had been passed to William Orr, to the Sheares brothers of Cork, to Robert Emmet, to Russell and others. While these Anglo-Irish patriots were dying for Ireland at the very time that their own class was losing more and more of its political and economic power, Irish Catholics for the first time in a century were finding leaders in their own ranks.

A young lawyer, a man of the people, a Gael of the Gaels, Daniel O'Connell, came walking out of Kerry. He found his people slaves, he left them men. In 1829 Daniel O'Connell, the first Irish Catholic member of the British Parliament, won the Catholic Emancipation Act. Civil rights returned to the people. Fifty years later, after the great Famine and the abortive 1848 revolution of the Young Irelanders, Michael Davitt won back the ownership of the land. At long last the right to ownership, the right to worship. One right to win back—the right P. H. Pearse proclaimed from the Easter footsteps of the GPO in 1916—the right "to national freedom and sovereignty," to the "Irish Republic as a Sovereign Independent State."

Great my glory, I that bore Cuchulain the valiant. Great my shame * * *. The future was bright. Charles Stewart Parnell, champion and chief of the Irish, was leader of the Irish Party in the British House of Commons. He was well on the way to winning home rule for Ireland when politics and not ethics, money and not morals, had Captain O'Shea on Christmas Eve 1889 file divorce proceedings against his wife citing Parnell as corespondent. When the divorce was granted the following November, Parnell was ruined. Clergy and mud-cabin laity, English liberals and Irish turncoats tore him to pieces. In a year he was dead and so it seems was the hope for home rule. Politicians saw his marriage to Kitty O'Shea and his death as ignominy for them and Ireland. Not so the writers of the Irish revival. To them Parnell was still the chief, the slain prophet, like to the heroic Cuchulain in his loyalty to land and clan, like to Cuchulain even in his marital infidelity. Thus the Anglo-Irish writers filled their poems and plays with the memory of valiant Cuchulain and in that way caused the driving spirt of Parnell to live on so that later, looking back, Yeats could ask:

"What stood in the Post Office
With Pearse and Connolly?
What comes out of the mountain
Where men first shed their blood?
Who thought Cuchulain till it seemed
He stood where they had stood?" [4]

Never would the writers have been able to do so much for the freedom of the people and the nation had not their own scholars and historians of the Royal Irish Academy begun the study of ancient Irish literature.

---

[1] I'm not sure of the spelling or punctuation because I took this from a phonograph recording.

[2] Cead mile failte.

[3] This paragraph is a partial paraphrase and condensation of ideas expressed by Vivian Mercier and David Greene in their introduction to "1,000 Years of Irish Prose" (New York: Grossett and Dunlap, 1961, pp. xi-xii.

[4] From "Easter 1916."

Petrie, O'Curry, O'Donovan, O'Grady, Joyce, and Hyde opened up the ancient literary heritage with their many translations of Irish texts into English. Thus Yeats, Synge, Lady Gregory, and AE, reading and realizing the scope and grandeur of Celtic Ireland were able in their plays and poems to recreate for readers of modern English, a literature and mythology which had been dead for nearly a thousand years. Through their works they excited a new respect for the Gaelic past and drew this forth to a new respect for the Irish peasantry—the rightful heirs of old Ireland. Once again the country people became conscious and proud of their heritage. Farmers and herders, fishermen and tradesmen, beggars and ballad singers, began to realize that the greatness of the past was here with them in the present. Self-respect, pride of blood and love of nation, dignity and personal worth—all that England had robbed, surged back full tide into Irish hearts. Men reasoned: if the simple life of a farmer or fisherman could on the stage be made the stuff of great tragedy and riotous comedy, then there must be true value in that humble life. If our writers and dramatists can stand with the best, then why not we? If greatness is ours, then we can fight and die for that one gift without which there is no lasting greatness—the freedom to be the masters of our own destiny. "There are many things more horrible than bloodshed; and slavery is one of them."[5]

At the head of the literary revival stood William Butler Yeats. He was its priest and its soul. The Abbey Theater was his church and his pulpit. It was a people's theater, an Irish theater, because it was involved in the people's cause. The language, the rhythms, the emotions, the imagination, the life and hope of Irish peasant life became the heart of the Abbey.

Irish history, old and new, came alive on its stage. Out of the Celtic world came "Deirdre" to the call of "AE." From the famine, Yeats brought forth "The Countess Cathleen" and from the insurrection of 1898 the lovely "Cathleen Ni Houlihan"; both were Ireland and "she had the walk of a queen." While Lady Gregory brought back the romantic days of "Gods and Fighting Men," J. M. Synge captured the living tragedy of the western isles in "Riders to the Sea" and boldly portrayed the laugh and tear, the sneer and beer, at the heart of Connaught life in "The Playboy of the Western World." As the Irish would have it, the sure test of an Abbey success was to have a riot in the theater. One riot went on for a week.

Well, riots and all, we owe a great debt of gratitude to the writers not only for their contribution to the nationalist cause but also for having initiated an honest criticism of Irish life. Gone was the romantic conception of "Ould Ireland" as always heaven, holy, and honorable. When she walked like a queen they said so; and when she talked like a bitch they said so. Gone too was the 19th century "stage Irishman," that vile caricature of the national character whom G. B. Shaw described as "generous, drunken, thriftless, with a joke on his lips and a sentimental tear always in his eye" and indulged by English audiences "because he flattered their sense of superiority." Again, Yeats and Synge must be thanked for paving the way and providing the models that the present generation of Irish authors could feel were native to Ireland and worthy of imitation. They cleared the way for O'Casey, O'Connor, O'Faolain, O'Flaherty, Clarke, Joyce, Stephens, Behan and a host of others. Finally, those Anglo-Irish writers are to be thanked for the nobility they brought to their art and the consequent glory to Ireland. Though their art was national in that it revealed the ideals and identy of a nation, it was not propaganda. They did not adulterate art, they ennobled it. While Yeats introduced a new method of acting and speaking, while Willie and Frank Fay raised shopkeepers and gasmen to the stature of renowned actors, while Synge and Lady Gregory fashioned a new poetry and Irish rhythms for their plays, the world stood in awe to see so much genius burst upon it, in so short a time, and from so small a place.

Thus today students in American universities and people of culture everywhere "are interested in modern Irish literature not because it either flatters or lessens the Irish in the eyes of the world, but because its achievement is formidable and significant. It produced two dramatists of genius in Synge and O'Casey, the most original and most controversial novelist of our generation in Joyce, and William Butler Yeats, whom T. S. Eliot described as 'the greatest poet of our time.'"[6]

What is our Irish heritage? It is faith in God and trust in His divine providence. It is faith's power to make the weak strong and the timid bold; the power to inspire courage and to march on in the face of a thousand difficulties. It is the Irishman's simple trust in God's providence and His holy will. The hierarchy of our own archdiocese is witness to the continuity of our Irish Catholic faith: O'Brien, Donnolly, Hackett, and Hines. The three cardinals of our eastern seaboard are a triumvirate of Gaelic aristocracy: Cushing the warrior, Spellman the statesman, Sheehan the educator. Finally in a world that has made a business and a neurosis out of security and insurance against every eventuality but eternity itself, the Irishman's simple trust in divine providence is the one voice calling that it is still God's world.

What is our Irish heritage? Commitment to and involvement in the body politic of the Nation and the world. Only a people who have lived the slavery, injustice, degradation and chaos of a captive nation know the priceless value of freedom, justice, equality, and order. Only a people of 700 years captivity can adequately appreciate the terrifying emotional forces and passionate beauty of a captive race violent to be free. No wonder that Ireland, schooled so long in the struggle for sovereignty, should raise up children dedicated by faith and blood to the preservation of the inalienable rights of man, committed to the due process of law, and anxious for the health of the entire community. This is the political heritage come down from Wolfe Tone, from Emmet, from O'Connell, Davitt, Parnell, Connolly, Pearse, and J.F.K.: courage, patriotism, dedication. Any wonder then that so many Irish are in government: Dempsey the Governor, the boy from Tipperary; Mulrevy, the attorney general, Bailey and Quin and more? Any wonder that the distinguished Representative of the Fifth Congressional District should be the recipient of the Award from Captive Nations? Any wonder that the mayor of this city should spend himself and be spent in the hundred daily seeming trivialities and serious realities heaped on the shoulders of a public servant? He knows only too well that setting the table properly can be as important as the dinner itself; that the simple name chosen for a civic endeavor can be as important as the endeavor itself. Lastly, our Irish heritage is literature. We are a people with a touch of the poet; a taste for the beauty that is a reflection of the divine; a love of nature that has Irish coins struck not in the image of man but in the image of the salmon, the stallion, the deer, the greyhound. No need to repeat the distinction won by the Irish in poetry, prose, and the theater.

There is need only to emphasize the truth that Irish life: religious, political, cultural, has always fought for the spiritual values, the enduring supernatural.

As a race, that has been our destiny: to defend the primacy of the spirit; to assert that man is in the image of his Maker and not the chance creature of blind evolution and revolution. In a world: standarized, mechanized, commercialized, vulgarized, materialized, automated, and ZIP-coded—the Irish sound the trumpet to the free, the beautiful, the natural and the supernatural, the humane and the spiritual.

The Irish heritage: the power of faith, the honor of the Republic, the nobility of the arts.

In the spirit of an Irish battle, I began with a curse; now I close with a toast.

"The Midland Toast

"Long roads and stony ditches
And here's to nice girls
And to hell with riches."

"The Connacht Toast

"Health and long life to you,
The woman of your choice to you,
Land without rent to you,
And death in Erin."

[5] P. H. Pearse, "The Coming Revolution," November 1913.

[6] Mercier and Greene, p. XXIII.

Gold and Sanity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RONALD BROOKS CAMERON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of my colleagues and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an interesting statement on gold and the balance of payments which was written by Mr. Bryan Stevens, a resident of my congressional district.

The statement follows:

GOLD AND SANITY

(By Bryan Stevens)

The time has come to bring some degree of sanity and objectivity to the current public discussions of gold and the U.S. balance of payments. Columnists, politicians, and bankers have discussed the issue from many points of view, but none have offered much more than opinion, and very little of the opinion is supported by evidence.

There are two main aspects to the so-called gold problem. The first is the simple quantitative fact that there is not enough gold in the world to carry the burden as medium of exchange in international trade. The second aspect is in the history of U.S. gold policy. A review of U.S. policy since 1933 will show the inevitability of the reduction of U.S. gold reserves to around $5 to $7 billion over the next 5 to 10 years.

The story of gold goes back into antiquity. During the Middle Ages it served as a medium of exchange, but when the new economic conditions of the 14th and 15th centuries brought about a widespread system of money transactions, the gold supply was found to be inadequate for this purpose. It was then that the fabled alchemists began their attempts to transmute lead and other metals into gold. Long before the turn of the 20th century there was no longer enough gold even to serve as an international monetary reserve. The belated result was a worldwide demonetization of gold in the 1920's and 1930's. The problem became more acute during the period ending in 1959 as new gold production was less than half the increase of

world monetary reserves. The rate of disparity has accelerated in the last 5 years.

During the 1920's the dollar and the British pound sterling temporarily solved the gold shortage, but this ended in disaster in 1929–30. After World War II, the entire burden fell upon the dollar—a burden that cannot long be borne by the dollar alone.

The second consideration in the gold controversy is the history of U.S. gold policy. In 1933 the United States went off the gold standard. Shortly after, the price of gold was pegged at $35 per ounce by act of the Congress. This price was somewhat above the market price of gold at the time, and the United States began to acquire gold at a rapid rate.

U.S. gold reserves in 1933 were $4,036 million. One year later, at the new price of $35 an ounce, the reserves had doubled for a total of $8,238 million as other nations, business organizations, and individuals sold their gold to the U.S. Treasury.

By the mid-1930's, preparation for World War II was beginning. The United States became the arsenal of democracy. European nations turned to the United States for munitions of war. Foreign currencies rolled into the United States, and were converted back to the buying countries for gold. By 1940, the U.S. gold horde had reached $21,995 million, an increase of 500 percent in 7 years.

In the post-World War II period, purchases from the United States for rebuilding European economies, and the paying off of debts owed to the United States brought the U.S. gold reserves to a peak of $24,564 million in 1949.

As the European powers began to achieve stabilization of their economies around 1957–58, U.S. gold reserves began to diminish, for these powers began to buy back the gold they had sold to the United States in the 1930's and 1940's, as the expansion of international trade throughout the world increased the need of all nations to increase their gold reserves. In addition many new nations made their appearance on the international scene. They too required gold reserves. A more normal international distribution of the world gold supply began to develop. That trend is still in effect, and will probably continue over the next few years.

It seems ridiculous to assume that postwar recovery and reconstruction of the war-torn countries, and the tremendous expansion of postwar international trade could take place without being accompanied by a redistribution of the world gold supply, which in 1963 was only $42,285 million.

The recent propaganda effort by France in publicizing the purchase of several hundred million dollars' worth of gold from the United States is inconsequential. It was an attempt to panic the financial and business community in the United States in order to discourage American investment abroad. With less than $1 billion claim on U.S. gold, when France owes the United States more than that in long-term loans, it is obvious that the effort was an attempt to embarrass the United States in order to slow U.S. private investment in French and European industry.

To actually do damage to the American financial structure, even if it were possible, would drag the rest of the Western economies down, also, including the French economy. The French Government was and is aware of this fact, and it is aware of its own limitations in this respect. Otherwise the attempt would never have been made. The French business community would never have allowed it.

There is, however, a real problem. The American dollar cannot expand with the pace of the expansion of international trade. The dollar can carry the burden of acting as the international medium of exchange and reserve for only a few more years. There must be some effort now to call a conference to develop an international banking and clearinghouse system and an intergovernmental currency before international finance is strangled.

A Wyoming Valley and an Airplane

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TENO RONCALIO
OF WYOMING
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, in my current copy—April 1965—of the AOPA Pilot, I was pleased and proud to note an article, entitled "A Wyoming Valley and an Airplane." This magazine is the official publication of the Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association.

The article tells of the Intermountain Manufacturing Co., of Afton, Wyo., and the high performance of its product—the CallAir agricultural spray plane. This airplane has been the subject of much recent national attention. In addition to the presently cited article, the CallAir was presented along with color cover pictures in the May 1964 issue of Flying and the March 1965 issue of the AOPA Pilot. These articles prove that industry cannot find a better home than in Wyoming.

Hunting, fishing, room to expand, a labor supply of happy and historically conscientious hard-working people, the intellectually stimulating pure air of Wyoming, the beauty of the Rocky Mountain area, nearness to such fabulous recreation areas as Wyoming's Yellowstone and Teton Parks—all this couples with a most favorable tax base.

Take heed, leaders of industry, the following article may provide a most important example of how you can grow with Wyoming:

A WYOMING VALLEY AND AN AIRPLANE

(By Frank A. Tinker)

(NOTE.—Mutual cooperation of Afton townspeople and CallAir help preserve an agriculture plane factory and the economy of Star Valley, Wyo. Young workers resist lure of big city and stay home.)

Afton, Wyo., is almost a typical western valley town, which is to say that it's a better place than most to live in. Situated in the middle of the State's western Star Valley, it has depended historically upon agriculture, lumber, and its excellent cheese for economic health. Across the main street hangs a huge arch comprised entirely of elk horns, giving some idea of the hunting available in the mountains nearby.

But this alone is not what makes the rather remote town unique. At its southern extremity squats a heterogenous collection of buildings, some old and some still under construction. From this rude complex emerges, in numbers, a fine agricultural aircraft.

"Here?" ask the summer tourists as if our whole automobile industry did not originate in a rural woodshed. "So far from everything?"

Yes, here. And not far at all from things that really make living pleasant. For Afton builds the CallAir agricultural plane, whose gross sales last year topped a million bucks.

A few years ago Afton was also regrettably typical of many other communities in all sections of the country. As the valley paper's assistant editor explained, "The dairy farms had kept us going as long as milk was heavily subsidized. When that ended the farmers either upgraded their production or were forced out."

A sad number were in the latter category. Although many would have rather stayed, particularly younger men, in order to earn a living they had to abandon the small family farm and head for the metropolitan regions and the faceless existence of a city wage earner. By the early 1960's the population of the area had declined by some 20 percent. Stores in Afton stood empty, the ominous signs of ghost town status were visible, and Lincoln County itself was declared a depressed area.

Worst of all, it appeared that the aircraft plant, small in size but large in its effect on the local economy, was about to close for good even in the face of a burgeoning demand for good agricultural planes.

The first Call plane had been built in the 1930's by Reuel Call (AOPA 88470), native of the area, who placed his factory here for the good reason that it was his hometown. In those days competition was not so fierce and perhaps the construction of aircraft was more a labor of love. Later, type certificates were issued to the standard Call passenger plane and the Interstate Cadet, which were sold to a limited general market without a great deal of promotional whoop-la.

But in 1953 a young A and E machanic named Herb Andersen arrived in Afton from Los Angeles and signed on with the company. Being short on funds and long on love for aircraft, a chronic combination, Herb lived for a time in the factory loft. A box of crackers and a bottle of milk, gulped alternately, provided what breakfast was needed—and could be afforded. After hours, he worked on the job of redesigning the Call plane into an aerial applicator. Call finally saw the model which Herb had made, was moderately impressed, and the A–5 was eventually put into production. Since that time the name CallAir has meant ag planes to most people.

Not long after, Herb Andersen went on to Mooney and would up as vice president in charge of production. In 1960 Piper enticed him away to help with their new facility in Vero Beach, Fla. Meanwhile, back in Star Valley, the Call operation had been incorporated, the management had changed hands, and the company had gone into a severe decline. So severe, in fact was this setback that CallAir had closed its doors, passed into receivership, and its assets were scheduled to be liquidated at public sale. It looked as though the end of the line had arrived not only for a name in aircraft but for one of the few remaining props to the valley's economic structure.

This was a crisis which faced—and faces still—similar areas from Pennsylvania to Oregon. One thing it had, however, which some of the others may have lacked, was a group of resident businessmen who retained faith in the small business concept which had sustained CallAir through many lean years. Long before Federal offices, with appropriate fanfare, had set up the many redevelopment agencies for certain areas, these citizens had instituted some of the same self-help features which later became standard Government procedures. One of these was an investment fund, the Star Valley Development Association, which now came to the assistance of CallAir.

First, it was ascertained that if sufficient private local capital was forthcoming a Small Business Administration loan could also be obtained. Second, and perhaps most important, in order to assure investors of a salable product and an efficient operation, it was recognized that capable and imaginative management had to be obtained. A call went out to Herb Andersen, on the assumption that the Afton life and the challenge

at CallAir, which had now become the Intermountain Manufacturing Co. (Imco), would compensate for the smaller financial returns offered. Carl Petersen (AOPA 229386), who had assisted in the original drawings and flight testing of the old Call aircraft, was persuaded to sign on as sales manager and given a free hand in merchandising.

At the receivership sale there was exactly one bid, which was that of the local combine. The money which the association gave went to stock purchases, backing bank notes, and direct loans to the company. The Small Business Administration loan helped to meet current expenses and obtain materials. There were, in addition, enough usable parts and supplies on hand to form a backlog for the new company.

The outlook, however, was anything but cheery. CallAir's buildings, when Herb Andersen moved in, were full of junk and their water pipes were frozen solid. Local hope may have been high, but faith was scarce. There was available in the meager budget just $30,000 and 6 months to get a redesigned plane approved and on the market.

Back to the loft. The small staff worked and lived at the plant. When the day's labor went beyond endurance, they rested on the floor before starting again. But the old CallAir A–5 gradually gave way to the reworked A–9. This prolonged brain-busting session began in April of 1962, continued through the summer, and reached its apex that fall. It was November when the A–9 was given its certificate under part 8. Armed with promising data on the new plane, Carl Petersen took off for an applicators' convention in Texoma and the home staff held their breath.

A week later the company had orders for nine of the new craft and they were in business. The first A–9 came off the Afton line in January 1963, and for the next few months one was made every 2 weeks. In March, this climbed to one plane a week. As the A–9 became better known and its sales pitch reached far markets, orders came in an encouraging crescendo. After a year the production line was turning out a plane every 4 days; in July of last year it became two a week. Now it is one A–9 every other day, all spoken for at the time of production.

Along with the rise in output, of course, went an increase in employment. This now stands at about 75 full-time production workers and will reach 100 some time this year under present plans. In a village which numbers about 1,300 persons and a valley with a total population of 5,500, such a payroll obviously can mean the difference between complete stagnation and at least comfortable stabilization. The year 1963 saw gross sales of about $500,000. Last year this passed an even million, and 1965's projected income is $1,750,000.

Such sales, obviously, have hinged on the economical production of a plane which can hold its own in a competitive market, one which is both attractive and efficient. Neither the writer nor AOPA are in the business of plugging any particular brand of aircraft, but to give some idea of how an aircraft is sold and a community therby benefited, here are some of the features which were considered essential to the new CallAir:

First, the old arrangement which placed the hopper beside the pilot in the wide cockpit may have had some good points, but visual appeal was not one of them. The 170-gallon hopper thus was shifted to a safe place below and in front of the pilot, allowing the pit itself to be narrowed.

Control of the older plane, although good, required considerable control pressure. Through redesign of the fuselage and wing, including the addition of Hoerner tips, this was lightened to the point that pilots used to the former product have a tendency toward overcontrolling the A–9.

Pilot safety, a key selling point in all agcraft these days, became a fetish at CallAir. "We want the pilot to be assured of survival in all ordinary application accidents," says Herb Andersen. "Except for diving the plane deliberately into the ground, he's pretty close to that right now."

Fuel tanks were moved to the wing, reducing the danger from fire. An emergency dump valve allows the hopper to be emptied in 5 seconds. A fuel warning light and bell are activated when the pressure drops to 1 pound, giving the pilot 15 or 20 seconds to switch tanks. The chrome-moly birdcage over the pilot will support four and a half tons without bending. Wire cutters are mounted on gear and windshield, and the aft control section was altered so that a wire cannot catch in the gap between vertical stabilizer and rudder. The spruce main spar is itself considered a safety factor, since it shears completely when excessive force is applied rather than transmitting loads to other parts of the structure.

These and other improvements seem to have accomplished much of the purpose. In the past 2 years 10 CallAir planes have been demolished in application accidents, several in South America where pilot experience is often low. Yet in producing this impressive pile of junk the only serious injury to a pilot has been a broken leg and some burns.

Then there is the matter of spare parts. CallAir uses no dealers or distributors. Each A–9 owner is given an easy-to-read parts manual, from which he can order direct from Afton. The procedure has been streamlined, and airfreight speeds many deliveries. When Carl Petersen, who spends much of the year bouncing from one sales prospect to another in an A–9, ruined a wing in Memphis, Tenn., it took just 2 days to get a replacement to him.

These are the kind of selling points which make any applicator do more than glance through a brochure, and which eventually mean that Star Valley may provide a good home for more people. It is a continuing fight which can never be relaxed, as the small CallAir management staff well know. This past year, when Jim Robertson had finished his outstanding job of converting standard Cessna products into STOL craft, he received a summons from CallAir to do somewhat the same for the A–9. This was deemed particularly advantageous to the company, since about half of their production now goes overseas, often to countries where strips are short and terrain steep. Flight tests are now being completed on the new full-span lift flap, which permits the A–9 to operate with its full payload of 1,350 pounds from a 1,000-foot strip. At the same time, full certification under part 3 is being pushed, primarily for the benefit of oversea trade. In addition, a two-seat trainer version is under development.

Obviously, there are economic handicaps to locating in Star Valley, primarily those of freight costs. The company's Lycoming engines come from Pennsylvania, spruce wood from Oregon, machined parts from Florida, and aluminum from California. To offset these costs, however, is that of Wyoming labor.

"We certainly aren't exploiting cheap labor here," says Herb Andersen. "Rather, we have designed our production around that which is most valuable."

In doing so, he has faced the same bugaboo which concerns many similar manufacturers. This is the huge gap existing between college-trained engineers and completely unskilled laborers. There seems to be no middle ground nowadays. A skilled machinist, for instance, is a rarity; semiskilled operators, who can seldom set up their own machines, have taken their place and limit their field to one task. This is middle-cost labor, potentially abundant in places like Star Valley where a high school education is the average and inherent skills and intelligence high. To set up a completely automated plant with high-cost labor would involve considerable capital and require expensive training of a limited number of persons, probably at the manufacturer's expense.

"To be successful in this locale, I believe an operation such as ours must be designed around our semiskilled labor," Andersen concluded. "We take persons with no experience in industry, train them for specific jobs, and plan our production with this situation in mind."

Pay here is understandably lower than in metropolitan areas, averaging about $350 a month. But the exodus from Star Valley was not only stemmed by such wages; former residents have actually returned from higher paying jobs in places like Los Angeles.

"Sure, I made a hundred dollars more there," one lad reported. "But it cost me half that much just getting back and forth to work."

And what about the hours wasted in such travel, and such an environment? Significantly, only one CallAir employee left in 1964, and one was fired.

Here may be the crux of the matter. More and more Americans are growing weary of watching the mirage of high pay disappear into the mists of high living costs. Many have attachments to places like Star Valley, or would like to have such attachments. There are advantages both to employee, employer, and to the country in avoiding the pileup of our population in megalopolis.

In order to avoid this, smaller communities must come up with marketable products. General aviation manufacturers, perhaps more than any comparable segment of industry, have managed to do this.

Mooney is located now in Kerrville, Tex.; Meyers in Tecumseh, Mich.; Bellanca in Plainview, Tex.; even the giant—Piper—is in Lock Haven, Pa., and Vero Beach, Fla.

Certainly there are limits to this success. Only in Government reports do such stories appear in simple black and white. Star Valley will be hard pressed for some time to come to hold its population and will depend on a sawmill sponsored by the same private development group as much as on the aircraft plant.

But the general picture has improved immeasurably in the last 2 years. Today, the world's population, like it or not, is booming. Food production is becoming more and more of a problem which must be met with aerial application methods. It is of more than local interest that this problem, international in scope, will be solved at least in part by the production of planes in a Wyoming valley. And, in helping to solve this larger riddle, the people of Star Valley have gone a long way toward solving one of their own.

Population Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. TODD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, in behalf of my concern with the problems of population growth I would like to insert the following article written by Sid Moody, of the Associated Press, and printed in the Kalamazoo Gazette of April 18, 1965.

This article clearly explains the imminence and enormity of the world pop-

ulation problem. I believe this essay offers badly needed understanding of this important field:

POPULATION CRISIS: WORLD'S NO. 1 PROBLEM—ONCE TABOO SUBJECT NOW OF VITAL CONCERN

(By Sid Moody)

She wore a pair of men's shoes, muddied from the yard and its skeletons of junked cars. She rocked shyly in a tiny chipped chair as she cradled her youngest in her lap. A safety pin did duty for a broken zipper. The sun, angling through the open door of her cabin, caught her blonde hair when she looked up to speak.

She was a mountaineer's wife, in Kentucky, with six children. But she was everywoman, too. A world symbol, a world headache and, maybe, a world heartache.

She did not know it, but she was speaking for many millions when she looked, nervously but with the resolution of a mother's love, across the doorway and told of her harsh decision.

"I thought about it a lot, and I decided it's more of a sin to bring children into the world that you can't take care of than to stop having them."

Her name was Ruby Gray, 25, wife of a man with a game leg who hasn't worked in months and who supports his family with food given free by the government. She is also the child of a gathering world crisis: overpopulation.

Ruby Gray embodies it all: too many children, dwindling food for them, no means to buy more. In their despair Ruby Gray agreed to her husband's decision to have himself sterilized. That was their private decision. It will not be the world's. But the problem is the same and the world with sudden awareness had come to see its immensity, complexity, its urgency.

POSSIBLE SEEDS OF WORLD WAR III

The problem is an unbalanced equation in which billions of mouths do not equal nutrition, health, work to sustain life in decency. It is a problem that holds in its relentlessness the possible seeds of world war III.

Can mankind's greatest gift become his greatest curse? It is a heated argument. But now it is being argued.

There is some—but not much—opinion that the unprecedented world burst of population is a base upon which to build a utopia of consumption and prosperity. Others see it as a burden of such pressing weight as to condemn the world's poor to lives of static futility—or worse.

And while the argument goes on among experts of economics and demography, the science of population, the governments of the world have seemingly overnight been moved to action.

Reversing an earlier position, the United States has offered on request to help foreign birth control programs with advice—but not contraceptives. The United Nations reflects increased world concern in considering what role it should play in family planning. Several countries have widespread birth control programs underway.

Science has made several major breakthroughs in contraception, and a family planning expert exhibited the other day a new contraceptive he felt could change the history of the world. No one has quite been able to say why it works, just as no one can accurately forecast where the surging birth rate, rightly called an explosion, will end. Hence the argument.

The argument has a bitter arithmetic, questioned by some, admitted to be only an educated guess by many. But the figures are there.

Babies are being born faster than a person could name them. There are 192,000 births every day, according to the United Nations, over 60 million a year, more than the population of Great Britain. At the current 2 percent annual rate of increase, world population in 600 years will be one person per square yard. Anthill arithmetic. An impossibility. But where will it stop? And how?

POPULATION MAY DOUBLE BY 2000

U.N. projections for the year 2000 show a world population, now 3.3 billion, of about double that. Mexico, with a current population of 40 million, will have 71 million by 1980 at its present 3.1-percent rate of increase, one of the world's highest. It will be 13.5 billion in 200 years if the same rate is sustained, says the National Academy of Sciences. It took all of history for the world population to reach 1 billion by the 1840's.

The reason for the swift change in population is twofold: high rates of birth, especially in the underdeveloped nations, and a steady drop in the death rate which accelerated astoundingly after World War II due to the developments of science.

Because of this postwar surge, a high percentage of the world's people is young. In Latin America over 40 percent of the people are under 15, noncontributors requiring education and food supplied by their producing elders. But if almost half the population is not producing and the country is already poor, as most of the Latin American nations are, how can this huge segment be supported?

That is the immediate crux of the population problem; not how can the underdeveloped nations achieve the promise of rising expectations they feel their new independence entitles them to but how, in fact, to keep their standard of living even at its present marginal level?

The Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations says that up to half of the world's people suffers from hunger and malnutrition. By 1975, says the FAO, world food supplies will have to be increased by a third "merely to sustain the population at its present unsatisfactory level." A reasonable improvement would require a 50-percent increase by then and a tripling of food production by 2000.

Should famine come, surely the great food producing nations would not stand idly by. But it would require 20,000 freighter shipments a year to take care of India's current food deficiency.

The Population Reference Bureau in Washnigton, a statistic-gathering organization, estimates that if all the huge U.S. food surplus were distributed to the world's hungry, it would provide each person the equivalent of 2 cups of rice every 17 days.

But overpopulation is not only a matter of hunger. It is economics, the economics of too little for too many. A country with an annual 3-percent increase in population must increase its national output by that much yearly just to stay in the same place. But it takes an estimated 9-percent increase in capital investment to produce a 3-percent increase in national income and where is the investment to come from in unindustrialized countries?

Under India's first two 5-year plans, national income was increased $8.9 billion. But in the same period population increased 85 million, so per capita income went from $59.64 to only $69.30.

Philip Hauser, University of Chicago sociologist, notes that even if the world's wealth were equally distributed, per capita income would only come to $223.

If the have-nots are to have highways and schools and factories and hospitals, they must have money. And much of what little they have is spent on just staying alive. Ceylon, for instance, spends about $50 million in valuable foreign exchange each year to buy rice.

In 1959 President Dwight D. Eisenhower said the U.S. Government had no business in the field of population control. Yet last January, President Johnson said in his state of the Union address:

"I will seek new ways to use our knowledge to help deal with the explosion in world population and the growing scarcity of world resources."

The Agency for International Development had already begun giving advice on population problems and helping foreign nations, on request, with fertility control.

Similarly, Egyptian President Gamal Abdel Nasser said as recently as 1962 a nation's population was one of its main natural resources. Overpopulation is now considered by the Egyptian Government to be a matter of life and death. Faced with a doubling of population in 27 years, Egypt has begun distribution of birth control pills.

India allocated $56 million for a family planning program in its current 5-year plan, five times the amount in the last one.

"We must stabilize the population at no more than 700 million," says Deputy Health Minister D. S. Raju. "Beyond that we will not be able to cope even all our measures to improve the economy work out."

South Korea, with help from the Population Council, is trying to cut its birth rate a third by 1971 through new birth control clinics.

Japan, where birth control has been national policy since 1949, has had 20 million legal abortions in the last 15 years as the birth rate fell from 34.3 in 1947 to 16.5 last year.

In Latin America, dominantly Catholic, birth control is nonetheless a topic of increasing concern. "Up until very recently," said an Argentinian physician, "It was bad manners to talk about the whole issue. Things have changed in the past year."

RED CHINA UPS MARRIAGE AGE

Even in the Communist world population has drawn official attention. Marx preached—and the party line still does—that overpopulation is a capitalist plot perpetuated by industrialists to insure a ready market of cheap, surplus labor. Under socialism everyone works, so the gospel of Marx goes, hence the problem simply evaporates. Except it hasn't.

Red China, which in the next 15 years will add an estimated population almost equal to that of the United States, has raised the official marriage age and imposed rationing restrictions on parents who have more than three children.

Even in the Soviet Union, where birth control is legal, orthodoxy has softened. "Marxist-Leninists have no objection against humane measures over decreasing the birth rate," a Government official said recently.

The U.N. General Assembly now has before it a report of the U.N. Population Commission which said the organization "must play a wider and more active role in population fields than it has played up to the present." Recommendations included increased U.N. aid on request in compiling census statistics, research into fertility and the effects of population on society.

"The common view of governments," said a U.N. official, "is that the population problem is acute. The difference of opinion is what to do about it."

In the United States the amount of public and quasi-public activity in fertility control has spread quickly and widely. In Corpus Christi, Tex., the Federal Government has given $8,500 to run birth control clinics in poor areas. Oregon is considering a State welfare department request for $135,000 to buy birth control devices. Nineteen counties in Tennessee have family planning clinics. Only one had them a year ago.

Twenty-five family planning projects have applied for Federal funds, and Sargent Shriver, Director of President Johnson's antipoverty program, says if the clinics have local support, the money will be approved.

The stated purpose of much of this is to reduce the rapidly growing amout of welfare to mothers with many dependent children. It is less expensive to give birth control services, the argument runs, than to spend money to support impoverished children.

Nationally, aid for dependent children is costing a reported $1.5 billion a year for 4 million children compared to $639 million for 2.2 million youngsters in 1955.

Despite the urgency of the world population problem, a relative pittance is being spent on it.

"Just listing the causes of death would fill a huge volume," says Robert Cook, director of the Population Reference Bureau. "There is only one cause of life." Yet for the billions spent on mortality control, only a few millions go to study the very source of life. The Ford Foundation, probably the biggest single source of funds in fertility research, awarded grants totaling $3 million last year.

Yet, it is through research, many feel, that some way will be found to the perfect birth control device, one that is cheap, easily used, long lasting and could meet Roman Catholic Church objections that any mechanical interference with procreation is a sin against natural and moral law.

In recent years the church has softened its position by permitting couples a measure of natural birth control, the so-called rhythm method. And now, confronted with radical new developments in birth control as well as the growing crush of population, the church has shown itself to be anything but a monolith. A dialog has moved into the open, one in which conflicting opinion is strongly held and remarkable for its outspokeness.

CHURCH HASN'T CHANGED STRICTURES

The church has not changed its strictures against birth control. But a papal commission has begun studying the whole area of fertility and population. And, as Pope Paul VI said last year:

"[Birth control and population] is an extremely grave problem. It touches on the mainspring of human life. It is necessary to face attentively this development. And this is in fact what the church is doing. But meanwhile we say frankly that up to now we do not have sufficient motive to consider out of date and thus far not blinding the norms given us. Therefore, they must be considered valid at least until we feel obliged by conscience to change them."

If that statement reads less than dogmatically, the addresses by three liberal cardinals last October at the Ecumenical Council sounded almost revolutionary.

One, Cardinal Seunens, of Belgium, said, "Of course there is no question of modifying or challenging the truly traditional teaching of the church. But no one epoch can boast of having fully perceived the unfathomable riches of Christianity."

He urged the council to "meet the immense problem posed by the present demographic explosion. The matter is difficult but the world is waiting. I beg you, my brothers, let us avoid a new Galileo case. One is enough for the church."

Patriarch Maximos IV, of Antioch, spoke of "hundreds of millions of human beings condemned to a life that is without hope" and torn between their faith in the church's teachings and their inability to support more children.

"Are we not in the right," he said, "to ask if certain official positions are not to be attributed to outdated conceptions?"

Where its introspection will carry the church is impossible to say. But one of the factors the church must be aware of is a seeming gulf in certain areas between its theory and the practices of the faithful. Italy, almost universally Catholic and where contraceptives are illegal, has one of the world's lowest birth rates. Why? "There are two things Italians do not regard as sinful," said a non-Italian priest, "missing Sunday Mass and using contraceptives."

In heavily Catholic Chile, a doctor has estimated that between 35 and 49 percent of pregnancies end in abortion, a sin.

Dr. C. Lee Buxton, Yale physician who is fighting to repeal Connecticut's birth control law, received a letter from a young Catholic father.

"I have a very personal interest in birth control because for lack of it in one way or another I lost a wonderful wife and mother of six children. She was only 31 years old when she died 8 hours after our last child was born. What do people who find themselves in our predicament do? Man and woman living together in a life of matrimony are also living a life of sin because they use means to prevent further childbirth. Is the health of your wife and children to be disregarded?"

In 1951 Pius XII, in affirming the legitimacy of regulation of offspring through the rhythm method, said, "I may even hope that science will succeed in providing this licit method with a sufficiently secure basis."

Maybe it has.

Two new contraceptives—the pill and a little plastic curlicue called an interuterine device—IUD—have brought worldwide population control to the point of possibility. And they have raised profound questions for theologians.

Dr. John Rock, a Catholic gynecologist who was a leading developer of the pill, notes the pill does not kill the female egg but simply interrupts its monthly cycle.

"Should this be stigmatized as temporary sterilization?" Rock asked in his controversial book on birth control "The Time Is Now." What is the difference between a conscious effort to avoid conception by rhythm and use of the pill? Both, he says, are in exercise of the intellect vis-a-vis nature to safeguard the family.

And, he says, "the frustration of nature, far from being immoral is man's vocation."

Both Catholics and Protestants condone birth control for various social, medical and economic reasons. "They disagree on methods, not objectives," he says.

Apart from its philosophical implications the pill has come into widespread use throughout the world. Widespread ignorance, however, has frustrated its maximum effectiveness. The wife must maintain sufficient motivation to take it daily. Science hopes to find a better pill that can work over longer periods. Or a pill or injection to sterilize temporarily the male.

IUD SAID 98 PERCENT EFFECTIVE

The IUD is another breakthrough. An official of the Population Council pulled one from his desk drawer the other day. "It only costs pennies to make. But I say, and I believe, that this little piece of plastic is going to change the history of the world."

For reasons that medicine does not fully understand, the IUD is 98 percent effective in preventing pregnancy. It can readily be inserted in the uterus—and taken out should pregnancy be desired.

Because it is cheap, effective, does not require continuous motivation, the IUD is receiving scrutiny from many of the world's underdeveloped nations including South Korea, Pakistan, Ghana, Nigeria, Egypt, Tunisia, India, Jamaica and Malaysia.

In the city of Taichung on Formosa an intensive pilot project by Nationalist Chinese health officers with help from the Population Council has indicated such a concerted effort could reduce the birth rate eventually by almost half. The program is being extended to rest of the country.

There are dissenters, not only as to the morality of mass birth control but its effectiveness.

Asks Monsignor Knott: "What scientific evidence exists to prove that (birth control) programs in the past have succeeded? No contraceptive program to date has been accepted in any effective manner by people in the backward parts of the world."

A spokesman at the Population Reference Bureau agrees to the extent that reaching and motivating people presents one of the most difficult aspects of the population boom.

"The $64,000 question is how do you get the word to people, that the third child is enemy to the first and second?"

The task may not be insurmountable. A survey in Guatemala, for instance, showed that 91 percent of parents wanted to space their families. "The requests by mothers for sterilization are truly incredible," said Dr. Roberto Santiso, head of the department of gynecology at Latin American hospital in Guatemala.

Under the South Korean program, 90 percent of couples interviewed wanted less than four children but had more than five.

Many thousands of men have been voluntarily sterilized in India under its family planning program.

"The most significant preliminary finding of Taichung," said the Population Council, "is that people do not have to be motivated. The program suggests that a planned effort inspired fertility control—not so easily or as fast as death control—but nevertheless substantially."

The motivation does not come from an awakening to the landslide of humanity some fear is forming. The motives stem from a source as personal as the purpose of procreation itself: the family.

"From the Indian village to Scarsdale, N.Y.," says an officer of the Population Council, "it is the economic welfare of the family, not the health of the mother or the world, that's primary. Scarsdale wants to send its children to Harvard. The more children, the remoter their all going to Harvard is. The Indian just wants to be able to feed them. What we are after is to have people have as many children as they want—when then want."

SURVIVE ON GOVERNMENT FOOD

Back in Kentucky a county doctor ground his jeep into four-wheel drive as the vehicle wallowed through mud up to its axles. It took an hour to reach the two-room hovel where Dora and Everett Canada and their seven children live.

They survive on Government food and whatever Mrs. Canada and the children can make sawing wood or plowing the scraggly fields of their neighbors with their one mule. Canada has been unable to work for 2 years, even if there had been work.

Over the swaybacked bed where three of the children slept was a fragment of a page from "The Night Before Christmas" showing a rosy-cheeked ma and pa sleeping blissfully waiting for St. Nick. The page had been tacked over a crack to keep out the raw late winter wind.

Mrs. Canada, 39, but who looked 20 years older, knew about population explosions.

"My mamma had 11 kids. I never wanted as many as that, but I didn't know there were ways to use your head knowledge to stop from having them. It makes me feel so bad toward myself."

The Canadas have the same answer the Grays had. He is going to be sterilized under a privately financed program operating in the Kentucky hills.

And history will have its own answer, too.

"The reduction of births will happen, some day, somehow," says Alfred Sauvy, a French demographer.

True. A cup holds only so much water. The issue is whether the trend will turn voluntarily because of the efforts of man's intelligence—or because the Four Horsemen of the Apocalypse did, indeed, ride again.

Percentage increases of food supply needed during 1958–80 to meet anticipated requirements in various regions of the world

Regions	Percentage of projected population growth, 1958–80	Per capita increase of food supply to provide a minimal satisfactory present diet	Total increase of food supply, 1958–80 required to meet present food requirements and population growth	Rate of annual increase needed, 1958–80	Recent annual rate of increase in food supply
Underdeveloped countries	56	33	107	3.4	2.7
Latin America	85	5	94	3.1	2.5
Far East	55	41	86	2.9	3.0
Near East	62	17	90	3.0	3.1
Africa	36	28	55	2.0	1.3
Developed countries	28		28	1.2	3.6
World (average)	48	14	69	2.4	2.9

POPULATION BILL FILED BY REPRESENTATIVE TODD

Third District Congressman PAUL TODD, JR., Democrat, Kalamazoo, has introduced a bill to focus attention on the population explosion problem. His bill calls for Assistant Secretaries in the Departments of State and of Health, Education, and Welfare to coordinate Federal research and information dissemination efforts. The bill also authorizes President Johnson to call a White House Conference on Population Problems.

Now in the hands of the Government Operations Committee, TODD's bill is drawing support from some Michigan Republicans, notably National Committeeman John B. Martin, and praise for his courage from Representatives ELFORD A. CEDERBERG, of Bay City, and JAMES HARVEY, of Saginaw.

Warsaw Ghetto Uprising: A Commemoration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, April and May this year mark the 22d anniversary of a great and tragic event. It was during this period in 1943, from April 19 to the end of May, that a few thousand Jewish survivors of the Warsaw ghetto staged a desperate last-ditch resistance to the Nazi campaign of extermination and for a brief time and against overwhelming odds demonstrated a type of courage and heroism that the world has not very often seen.

When the Nazis and Russians moved into Poland at the opening of World War II, Poland was divided for another time. Forthwith the Nazis rounded up the Jewish population and forced many of them into the Warsaw ghetto, swelling its numbers to about 450,000. In the summer of 1942 the Germans began their campaign to exterminate the Jews. And during July and August of that year they systematically removed the Jews from the ghetto, placed them in prisons, and eventually destroyed them in their crematoriums.

As the numbers of the imprisoned Jews dwindled, the survivors were determined to stage a last-ditch resistance against the Nazis. Open resistance began in January 1943, but on April 19, the eve of the Jewish Passover, the Nazis attacked en masse and in desperate fury, and with tanks, artillery, and troops, they set out to destroy the ghetto completely. For a month the battle raged and even in the summer token resistance could still be detected, but the ghetto was reduced to rubble by the end of May and most of its inhabitants either killed or shipped off to concentration camps.

It is well for us to commemorate the anniversary of the Warsaw ghetto uprising; for here is a tragic demonstration of man's courage in the face of a fearful and overpowering enemy. But more important, Mr. Speaker, such commemorations can serve as a continuing reminder to us all of the extremes to which man can go when his soul has become filled with racial prejudice and racial hatred.

In recognition of this fact, the Essex County Warsaw Ghetto Commemoration Committee has arranged a memorable commemoration for Sunday evening, May 2, at the Weequahic High School Auditorium in Newark, N.J. The event is being sponsored by 55 Jewish and non-Jewish organizations and will be attended by 2,000 persons, including State and local officials and representatives of religious groups. Among the distinguished speakers will be Dr. Joachim Prinz, president of the American Jewish Congress; Mr. I. Goldberg, director of the New Jersey Service Bureau for Jewish Education; and Mr. Kenneth Gibson, cochairman of the Business and Industrial Coordinating Council. Three local choral groups will participate. There will be a dramatic presentation of "The Witness" followed by a candlelighting and memorial service.

As we mourn this tragedy, may we be inspired to a greater dedication to our Judeo-Christian ethic.

Our Continuing Struggle in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, today it was my sad duty to write a letter of condolence to the widow of one of my constituents killed recently in Vietnam—Capt. Kenneth L. Dean, Jr., U.S. Army.

This morning, Captain Dean was laid to rest at his alma mater—the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. He was killed on April 20 as a result of gunshot wounds while accompanying a Vietnamese Army unit engaged in a fight with the Vietcong. When he attempted to move a Vietnamese soldier, he was hit by hostile small arms fire. At the time of his death, he was a first lieutenant and was recently posthumously promoted to the rank of captain. His widow, Mrs. Sheila Dean of Dobbs Ferry, has received two Government citations—one from the President and an Army Honorary Service Award.

Captain Dean died defending freedom and honoring our commitments to free nations to protect them from the spread of world communism. While his death is a deep loss to all of us, his widow and other Americans can find some comfort in knowing that he did not die in vain. His life, and those of other American servicemen killed in Vietnam, were given to afford the people of Vietnam the opportunity to once again become free from intimidation and harassment by the forces of aggression. He died so that one day the Vietnamese will be able to decide their own future.

His tragic death could have been prevented if the Vietcong and the Chinese Communists had accepted President Johnson's offer to achieve peace in that strife-torn area through unconditional negotiations. The gauntlet has been tossed and for the moment it appears that world communism will accept nothing less than the total destruction and control of their smaller and peaceful neighbors.

The President, in his speech at Johns Hopkins University earlier this month, placed the responsibility for the quest for peace squarely upon the Communists. Their failure to respond clearly indicates their desire for continued hostilities. These forces have been accurately identified as the perpetrators of continued bloodshed in Vietnam and their unwillingness to discuss this matter at a bargaining table demonstrates their continuing desire to establish a totalitarian empire in southeast Asia.

There is so much which can be done in this area to assist all peoples to gain a healthier, better educated and more prosperous and peaceful life. As I stated in this distinguished body earlier this month, this war certainly grows as much as anything from the frustrations of hunger and deprivation. The responsibilities of all nations in southeast Asia, and most particularly in Vietnam, are to build rather than destroy, to educate rather than subvert, to heal rather than wound, to cultivate rather than plow under. The quest for peace is the goal for which we are all fighting.

Mr. Speaker, let us never forget the sacrifice of Captain Dean and the other gallant Americans who have shed their blood in this quest for peace. All Americans, and all the peoples of the free world, should stand in honor to Captain Dean and his comrades and pay tribute to their enduring contribution to world peace through the giving of their lives.

The United States Stands Firm in Vietnam

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, all of us can be proud of our President in his determination to protect the people of South Vietnam until the aggressors agree to sit down at the peace table.

We cannot and must not allow the North Vietnamese Government to conquer her neighbors because of our failure to defend their right of self-determination. Abandonment of our policy in Vietnam would be submission to the will and whim of the Chinese Communists everywhere.

Those who demand our withdrawal in the face of aggression recognize this fact in their refusal or inability to offer an alternative to our present policy.

The following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of April 28, 1965, supports the position of our Government in what is truly a war that we do not want, together with an article by the distinguished columnist, Roscoe Drummond, of the same date demonstrating the support the President has with regard to our policy in Vietnam.

The articles follow:

THE PRESIDENT'S REPLY

President Johnson set out yesterday to answer the vociferous critics, both at home and abroad, of his policy on Vietnam, and also the Communist aggressors, who seem not yet to believe he means what he says. He did so clearly and convincingly.

He upheld his decision to bomb North Vietnam by explaining that his previous policy of restraint was misconstrued as weakness and therefore served to encourage the Communists in their attacks. He replied to criticism of the bombings by pointing out that air attacks were restricted to legitimate targets such as bridges and munition dumps, thus to reduce the power of the Communists in the north to take the land and the lives of those who are resisting them in the south.

He recalled some of the lessons of history—the lesson of Munich, where retreat encouraged Hitler to advance; and the lessons taught by Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, and Kennedy, who stopped aggressions by standing firm. These evidently had receded in the mind of President de Gaulle when he went before the television cameras almost at the same time President Johnson did. The French leader declared himself against foreign intervention in the internal affairs of another state, yet he refused to endorse the American effort to turn back intervention.

It should now be doubly clear, following Mr. Johnson's speech at Baltimore, that the United States will not retreat; that it will continue to hit the enemy both in the north and south, without recourse to nuclear arms; and that it will continue to fight until the Communists are convinced that armed attack will not yield domination over others.

Once convinced of that, they may be ready for a negotiated settlement. And when they are, they will find the United States ready. The President extended to any of their governments (as distinct from the rebel Vietcong in South Vietnam) another invitation to come to the conference table at any time and any place.

They can have peace if they want it; or continued war and punishment if they insist on them before they are persuaded that they have nothing to gain by their present course of aggression.

FIRM POLICY BACKED—PRESIDENT MAINTAINING HIS CONCENSUS ON VIET

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—There is every reason to believe President Johnson will widen and hold a decisive consensus in support of a strong policy in Vietnam.

He has one special asset. He is occupying his usual stance at the center. His policy is wedded to neither extreme. He rests on two pillars: clear determination to defend as long as the aggression continues; clear willingness to talk whenever Hanoi will start talking.

There are other factors which contribute to the President's support:

The Gallup poll shows that the minority which wants Mr. Johnson to step up the war more than balances out the minority which wants him to quit.

His senatorial, newspaper, and professional critics can offer no acceptable alternative. They are prepared to accept Chinese Communist domination of all southeast Asia. This is an alternative the American people will not accept without trying to do something about it.

The President has the backing of many Democrats in Congress (his offer of "unconditional discussions" won the approval of the ADA) and most Republicans. His Republican support runs the whole gamut from Barry Goldwater to the GOP leadership in Congress, including Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN and Representative GERALD FORD.

Despite the honest, emotional student pickets and the college teach-ins, this leaves Mr. Johnson in a strategic position. And here is the evidence:

The Gallup poll finds that 29 percent of the country would like to see the United States withdraw completely from Vietnam, stop the fighting whatever the effects, and start negotiations whatever the outcome. It also finds that 31 percent of the country favors stepping up military activity, and going the full distance of declaring war.

The President embraces neither extreme. He does not propose to withdraw or even cease defending. But he will start talking even while defending. He does not seek a solution by military means alone, but he will use military means until Hanoi is willing to use the conference table.

Where does this leave Mr. Johnson with respect to a public consensus? To obtain further evidence of the public's attitudes toward the handling of the situation in Vietnam, Dr. Gallup put this question to the people in the same survey cited above: "Do you think the United States is handling affairs in Vietnam as well as could be expected, or do you think we are handling affairs there badly?"

The result was that by a ratio of more than 2 to 1 the Amercan people approve of the Government's handling of the situation. As the air raids on the North have become more intense, public opinion has remained firm in its support because 2 months ago support for the President was at the same 2 to 1 ratio.

If there is any threat to the President's expanding and holding this consensus on Vietam, it would only come, I think, from any sign of weakening in his policy.

Republican support is crucial to the Johnson consensus. The President knows it. This is why he has been so appreciative in private and on the telephone for what Senator DIRKSEN has done in his behalf. He wishes that some Democrats were even half as helpful.

But the President knows that at any sign of appeasement, intended or accidental, Republican support would vanish like a rocket into outer politics. As they did to President Truman over Korea, the Republicans can never call this "Johnson's war," but they could fight and possibly win election if it ever turned into "Johnson's appeasement."

The President is determined that it won't.

Law Day, U.S.A.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. CORMAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, our American history has been marked by a valiant struggle for equal justice under law and the preservation of individual liberty and dignity.

Recent events throughout the world and within our own borders make it clear that this struggle is far from over—that our commitment to the concept of individual liberty and freedom under law is constantly being challenged.

The American legal profession, of which I am proud to be a part, is making an outstanding effort to give citizens a deeper awareness of this continuing challenge and to alert us to our responsibilities as free, law-abiding people.

One means of doing this is the annual observance of Law Day, U.S.A. on May 1. The theme of this year's observance, "Uphold the Law—A Citizen's First Duty," is designed to direct public attention to the rights and duties of citizenship.

As Americans, we enjoy wide freedoms, guaranteed by law, which distinguish our society from a totalitarian system. But with these rights and freedoms go individual responsibility which all Americans must exercise.

While we enjoy the right to equal protection of laws, equal justice in the courts, and the right to be free from arbitrary search or arrest, we are bound to obey the laws which give us these rights and to respect the rights of our fellow Americans.

We are privileged to be able to choose our public officers in free elections, but as members of a democratic nation, we are charged with the responsibility of voting in elections.

We are indeed fortunate that we live by a government of laws, where legislation is subject to the perfecting process of judicial review.

The eighth annual observance of Law Day, U.S.A. will focus national attention on our rights and responsibilities as citizens of the greatest Nation in the world—a Nation whose greatness stems from our dedication to rule of law.

The legal profession is to be commended for its work in helping Americans to understand more fully the value of our system of liberty under law. As we observe Law Day, let each of us commit ourselves to the fulfillment of our responsibilities as beneficiaries of that liberty.

Address by Hon. Eugene M. Zuckert, Secretary of the Air Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. MENDEL RIVERS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I wish to invite the attention of my colleagues to the address made by Hon. Eugene M. Zuckert, Secretary of the Air Force, at the Arnold Air Society's 17th national conclave awards banquet, on April 14. The Secretary entitled his speech "The Profession of Progress." It is an excellent speech. It was grand occasion—made even more memorable by the presentation of the Man of Year Air Award to our beloved colleague, Hon. F. EDWARD HÉBERT. Congressman HÉBERT is the first person to receive the Man of Year Award, and no person could be more deserving of being singled out for this honor. I congratulate Secretary Zuckert on his fine speech, and pay tribute to Congressman HÉBERT and the honor bestowed upon him by the Arnold Air Society.

Under previous leave to extend my remarks, I insert at this point the RECORD the speech by Secretary Zuckert and urge that each of my colleagues read it:

THE PROFESSION OF PROGRESS

(Address by Hon. Eugene M. Zuckert, Secretary of the Air Force, Arnold Air Society 17th national conclave awards banquet, Washington, D.C., Apr. 14, 1965)

General Markey, Chairman RIVERS, General Power, Mr. HÉBERT, Mr. BATES, other distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, Bob Hope has done a lot of things for the Air Force, but I think he probably did the maximum when he put his writers to work 100 percent on General Markey's introduction.

We have Chairman RIVERS up here—chairman of our Armed Services Committee in the House—along with Mr. HÉBERT and Mr. BATES, acting ranking minority member, both of the same committee.

This is a rare occasion for me, because it's probably the first and last time I'll ever sit on the same side of the table with them.

I have a very good speech here which was written by me and my associates. It's called "The Profession of Progress," and I recommend it to you. But I don't feel like giving a prepared speech tonight, because my friendship and kinship with the Arnold Air Society and its members makes a prepared speech seem inappropriate.

This is the third conclave I have attended of the five which have been held during my term as Secretary of the Air Force. In addition, I've had the opportunity to meet with Arnold Air Society members in my office—for example, we had a meeting there a few months back.

If I may be permitted, there's a certain somber note for me today. This morning I went to Arlington Cemetery where I attended the funeral of a major general of the U.S. Air Force: Commander of the 17th Air Force, John K. Hester. He died in a jump, a parachute jump, his fifth and last qualifying jump.

I've been amazed at how many people have said to me: "What's a major general in the Air Force doing jumping?" I looked over from that hill, to that beautiful springtime beginning foliage, looked down toward the Pentagon, over the city of Washington and I thought about that. What was he doing? I thought about you, the members of the Arnold Air Society, and I thought about tonight.

What was he doing? He was doing his duty. He was jumping because one of the jobs of the U.S. Air Force is support of the U.S. Army; transporting troops to places where they can fight; putting them out of airplanes onto the ground with parachutes.

John Hester, whom I first knew 20 years ago, was trying to make sure that he, as an Air Force man, understood what the people he was supporting went through in jumping from an airplane to their destination, the battlefield.

I thought of a lot of things this morning. I thought of how indispensable people are, people's bravery, people's nobility. The individual counts for so much even in a large organization such as ours.

And I thought of the demands on the military profession, the profession you in the Arnold Air Society are interested in. This profession not only demands that we plan for the wars ahead, that we have the vision to see technological developments in an untold variety of fields; it also demands—importantly and as far ahead as we can see—skill in the air and in the management of airplanes, bravery, and the willingness of a man to die—sometimes for a cause ad sometimes for progress.

I thought of Vietnam where our people are dying, where people are fighting in a strange inchoate type of conflict, the product of these times, the thing we paradoxically call the cold war. This is part, just part, of the demands of this profession which you are interested in entering.

And then—and I speak sincerely—as I stood on that hill I thought of tonight, the opportunity of talking to you. Tonight we honor the past, survey our present, and anticipate our future. It is fitting that we do so, because after all the man who gave this society its name is truly representative of the Air Force's great past as well as the author of its present and the prophet who foresaw so much of its future.

I had the privilege of knowing "Hap" Arnold. Today I thought: Where do you stop when you start recounting his accomplishments? He was an air pioneer; he was a great builder of the Air Force; he was a great leader; and he was a great administrator. He built the greatest fighting machinery that the world had ever seen. Yet with all that, he was, in addition, a great prophet of research. He understood that the racing technology would have indelible, illimitable effects upon aerospace power and the Air Force. His name of course, is but one of those who share that great past: Vandenberg, Spaatz—you could name them by the hour.

What about our present? We have an Air Force that is making a tremendous contribution to the strength of this country. Its versatility, its ability to meet war at any level of conflict, is one of the great sources of strength of this Nation today. We have powerful weapon systems like the B–52 and the Minuteman Missile, a solid propellant missile that has become operational in an amazingly short span of time. Not far behind is the Titan III, a giant booster rocket which will be our workhorse in lifting very heavy payloads into space.

The Air Force today is a force improved significantly over what it was only a few years ago in many respects. For example, our airlift capability has increased 200 percent. And our tactical forces, in number and quality, are vastly increased.

What about the future of the Air Force? Certainly we don't see all of the outlines clearly; what weapon systems; what will we be using for aircraft in the late-1970 time period; what will there be in space. We do know, however, not only with our hearts and with our minds, that we will continue to build upon the foundations that we have now, and we will produce weapon systems that will be fully adequate to meet our future responsibilities.

There is no doubt in my mind that space is a medium of the future. If you ask me tonight exactly how, and in what way, I can't tell you. But I know that if we unharness the ingenuity of people, we will progress into that medium just as we have progressed before.

There is always a tendency to believe that we have reached a plateau—a plateau of opportunity, a plateau of technological progress. Nothing could be further from the truth. Progress is as remorseless as life itself.

We have only broken the surface in many fields of knowledge. We will look much further into the potential of lasers and the marvels of electronics. We will learn much more about metallurgy, optics, thermodynamics, astrophysics and other branches of study as yet unnamed. There will be great advances in communications, guidance, and propulsion. We will need knowledge in all fields of science and technology to produce the weapon systems of the future. Ahead lie great and new dimensions of challenge and times of opportunity for man, not only in the scientific and technological, but in every form of human endeavor.

This is why I envy the members of the Arnold Air Society here tonight. We look to you as an important segment of the military profession in that future of challenge and opportunity. Past, present, and future, it is a profession dedicated to the public interest; a profession devoted to the survival of all that we believe constitutes civilization; a profession that demands so much in dedication and subordination of self and more in diversity of skills than any profession I know.

I am honored that your society—our society—has asked me to sponsor an award "for outstanding contributions to the furtherance of professionalism in the Department of the Air Force." Believing as I do so strongly in professionalism as the might and main, head and heart of progress, this is the award I would choose to bear my name. I am told that it will be awarded for the first time at your conclave next year.

Thank you for permitting me to spend this rewarding evening with you.

David G. Osterer Receives the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross and Diploma in Recognition of His Distinguished Service to Mankind

SPEECH
OF
HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am privileged to insert the highlights of the decoration ceremony, held on November 19, 1964, at the Westchester Country Club, when the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross and Diploma of the Fundacion Internacional Eloy Alfaro of the Republic of Panama was conferred upon the Honorable David G. Osterer. This honor was given Mr. Osterer in recognition of his

distinguished service to humanity, charity, ethical conduct in the business world, comparative religions, and in further recognition of his efforts toward the establishment of international peace.

The ceremony was opened by an outstanding address delivered by Dr. Herman A. Bayern, of Yonkers, N.Y., the American provost of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation. In his speech, Dr. Bayern set forth the aims and purposes of the foundation and explained why Mr. Osterer was unanimously voted to receive this high honor, as well as setting forth the achievements and accomplishments of Eloy Alfaro, President of Ecuador from 1895 to 1901 and 1906 to 1911 and promoter of hemispheric solidarity.

Mr. Speaker, I present the investiture speech delivered by the Honorable Albert Conway, Justice of the Supreme Court of the State of New York:

INVESTITURE SPEECH OF THE HONORABLE ALBERT CONWAY

Judge McCullough, my colleague and toastmaster, Dr. Bayern, and the fine committee that has put in many hours to arrange this affair, guests and friends. This is a meaningful occasion. The purpose of making awards is not merely to honor an individual or reward him for his service, but to encourage others to follow by example.

Briefly, I would like to talk to you about David Osterer and the nature of this man. His friends at first suggested an elaborate dinner affair, which he refused because he felt it would place a tariff on people to see him honored, since it was not for a cause to which funds would go. He accepted the idea of public presentation when it was suggested to him that the purpose of a public presentation was to encourage others by example, whereas anonymity would not.

As a matter of fact, he has any number of honors he even refused to refer to. Our honored guest is known nationally and internationally in certain circles and is beloved, admired, and respected by many because of his charitable and civic activities. The place he has won in the business world alone—because of his ethics and principles—merits this high honor.

The board of dignitaries of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation were very happy to unanimously vote him its highest honor—the Eloy Alfaro Foundation Grand Cross—and he now joins those famous Americans who likewise distinguished themselves in the service of humanity. Briefly, to delve into Mr. Osterer's background, I discovered that he is a dynamo.

He was not born on the East Side. However, he was a product of New York public schools, graduated from Brooklyn Law School, (LL.B. cum laude). It is also interesting to note that while attending law school, Mr. Osterer worked 10 to 12 hours a day in the State of New Jersey, attended Brooklyn Law School and lived in the Bronx.

He engaged in the general practice of law until the early forties, at which time he became active in industry. He participated in the organization of the Induction Heating Corp. Subsequently, he became chairman of the board and executive vice president. He is one of the founders of Hydra-Power Corp. Later, while president of New Rochelle Precision Grinding Corp., he conceived of and was one of the founders of New Rochelle Termatool Corp., which is now a subsidiary of American Machine & Foundry.

It is interesting to note that while under his stewardship, the Induction Heating Corp. received the Army and Navy E for its outstanding contribution to the war effort and the Termatool Corp., the E Award for its contribution to international trade.

Mr. Osterer has been the recipient of a number of testimonials from employees, and lectures from time to time on personnel and management policies, among other honors, he holds the Humanitarian Award from the United Cerebral Palsy Association of Westchester County, N.Y. He is currently a member of the board of the Harrison Community Center and a member of the board of the St. Agnes Association—as well as having been "entrusted" with the key of the city of New Orleans while being made an honorary citizen.

During his military career, he rose from the rank of private to major in the New York Guard. The man who can testify to this is Colonel Lopaus, who is with us tonight.

Mr. Osterer has always demonstrated the quality of leadership and devotion to public service. His belief in man has been practices with success. He has been "stiff necked" and rebellious against following the beaten paths in business and has been equally "stiff necked" and rebellious when pursuing the course of principle. A picture of Mr. Osterer can be derived not only from his activities, but from his writings and sayings which reflect a concern for the dignity of man. For example, he has written * * * "There is more potential drive in man than horsepower in machines."

This evening, we signally honor a man who knows a depth of concern for his fellow man and who, because of this concern, has led an exemplary life. His unwavering faith in the ideals of mankind and his tireless effort in the advancement of charitable service and humanity richly merits the honor he receives tonight.

On behalf of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation, of which I have been an earlier recipient and in the language of the foundation's board of dignitaries * * * "In recognition of his distinguished service to humanity, charity, outstanding ethics in the business world, comparative religion, and in further recognition of his efforts toward the establishment of international peace" * * * I am honored to confer this diploma and Grand Cross on an outstanding citizen and a friend of all, the Honorable David G. Osterer.

Judge Conway then conferred the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross and diploma upon the Honorable David G. Osterer, assisted by American Provost Dr. Herman A. Bayern.

The Honorable David G. Osterer then acknowledge the receipt of this award, as follows:

"Judge Conway, Judge McCullough, Reverend Clergy, Dr. Bayern, Mr. Gerner, ladies and gentlemen, I hope you will not consider the nature of my acceptance of this distinguished decoration as a display of immodest modesty.

"I cannot bring myself to believe, however, that I was chosen by a process of competitive elimination. I know and you know that there are thousands of Americans who have devoted themselves to the service of community and humanity and who are equally, if not more deserving than I am for such recognition. It is just that I was lucky enough to be noticed.

"So it is with a feeling of gratitude—mingled with a sense of being lucky, and as symbolic of all those who serve, that I accept this decoration.

"I feel it important to make further comment. If there is any basis to the concept of the true partnership of marriage, then any moneys I have expended, any service I have rendered, any anxieties I have experienced (and there is anxiety entailed in the service of causes), all has been equally shared in the giving of my wife, Marti.

"This Foundation, which bears his name, was decreed by the President of Panama in order to perpetuate the philosophies and purposes to which Gen. Eloy Alfaro devoted his life. I think it is only fitting and proper that I make expression relative to the purposes of the Foundation, which constitute my beliefs as well.

"The history of mankind reveals that the caveman's community of concern was his cave, his mate, his offspring, and the surrounding elements and animals he had to contend with in order to survive. He did not know, nor did he care about what was happening on the other side of his mountain.

"When man evolved to the tribe his community of concern was not only the tribe and its welfare, but the surrounding tribes, their problems, their weaknesses, their strengths, their purposes and their intentions.

"And so evolution continued until today. Man's community of concern is global, and happenings anywhere in the world (particularly with instantaneous communication and almost immediate impact) affects man in his community of residence, wherever in the world that may be.

"We are today confronted with a truism that we must recognize and deal with.

"That there is no area—whether it be in the community of our residence (city, State, or country—take Harlem for instance), or whether it be in a far distant land, that has not proved to be an area fertile for the growth of the root and the weed of destruction.

"I thank you, Msgr. James T. McDonnell, Rabbi Aaron Singer, Rev. Alfred S. Powell, for gracing this dais. I thank John Mann, president of the United Cerebral Palsy Association of Westchester County, N.Y., and my colleagues for your courtesies. I thank Dr. Herman S. Bayern in the name of the foundation for the recognition that you have extended to me, and to Henry M. Gerner, a member of the foundation. I thank Judge Frank McCollough, whom I have known both as a legislator and as a judge, as one who has never turned his back on causes he deemed right, for your good offices as chairman. And I thank Judge Albert Conway upon whom the State of New York has conferred its highest judicial honor—chief judge of the court of appeals—for the deference that you have shown me tonight.

"I thank the committee, whose generosity—more so graciousness—has made tonight possible.

"To you, my friends, who have so honored me with your presence tonight, I extend my deep gratitude."

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I insert an editorial which appeared in the Gannett newspapers in the State of New York. The following editorial appeared in the Daily Argus, Mount Vernon, N.Y., on Monday, November 23, 1964:

AN HONOR FOR MR. OSTERER

Chances are that few in Westchester are familiar with the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation of the Republic of Panama or that they even knew it existed until Thursday night when it honored David G. Osterer of Harrison with its Grand Cross and diploma.

But there are a great many people in Westchester who know and admire David Osterer and there are many more who are better off because he is the man he is.

The foundation, named after a former President of Ecuador, works toward improving the health of the peoples of the world and promoting the establishment of peace. It has numbered individuals among those chosen for its honor.

Its citation of Mr. Osterer reads: "In recognition of his distinguished services to humanity, charity, ethical conduct in the business world, comparative religions and in further recognition of his efforts toward the establishment of international peace."

Mr. Osterer is a man of deep religious conviction, close family ties, and wide charitable instincts.

Out of the regard for his own fine and healthy children and his conviction that man does not exist to serve himself alone, he came to accept the presidency of the United Cerebral Palsy Association of Westchester some years ago, when it had fallen on bad times.

Badly disorganized, perhaps because it was caught up so in the emotional problems of the parents of the afflicted children who tried to keep it afloat, the association was given a firm hand and strong leadership. Mr. Osterer brought into it many distinguished and influential Westchester people and put their talents to work. The result has been an ever-widening and increasing beneficial program for those stricken with cerebral palsy.

Mr. Osterer is an industrialist, and a successful businessman. The NBC is only one phase of the variety of activities which capture his energetic attention, but he is summed up to those who know him in the philosophy with which he approached the challenge of raising and disbursing funds for the UCP. "The public dollar is a public trust" is his slogan and he never let his colleagues forget it. His award is well deserved.

Polish Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 2, 1965, Americans in communities throughout the Nation will celebrate the 174th anniversary of Polish independence. I join my colleagues in paying special tribute to the framers of the Polish Constittuion of 1791. The people of Poland and those Americans of Polish descent can be proud of this rich heritage of freedom which stemmed from the adoption of their constitution. This document was inspired by the American Declaration of Independence and it included within its framework the fundamentals of freedom written into the U.S. Constitution several years earlier. It is fitting and proper that we remember each year this document of freedom which symbolizes with our own the will of man to achieve liberty.

While the people of Poland have been less fortunate than we in preserving their freedom in their homeland, they have preserved in their efforts to regain liberty each time it was taken from them by war and political partitions. In addition to their brave resistance to tyranny at home, they have sent to our own shores their sons and daughters who have made a major contribution in our own struggle to maintain the institutions of democracy. Americans of Polish descent who live in Cleveland as well as in other American communities, have been stable, prudent, and reliable citizens. They have contributed in every line of endeavor. They have been a part of the greatness of our country.

It is to be hoped that a relaxation of artificial barriers which exist in Europe will permit greater communication between citizens of the free world and Iron Curtain countries. Communism cannot long survive in its present tyrannical form if it is thus exposed to the free exchange of ideas which would result from increased personal contacts between citizens of our countries.

The 50th Anniversary of the Armenian Massacre

SPEECH

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, at this time of the 50th anniversary of the cruel and inhuman Armenian massacre of infamous history it is most fitting that the U.S. House of Representatives should suspend its business in order to express its great horror and deep sorrow concerning this awful example of man's inhumanity to man and to pay just tribute to the faithful and courageous people of Armenia.

Back on the 24th day of April in 1915 and during the following several weeks, thousands of Armenian leaders in all walks of life were arrested throughout the Armenian communities, by Turkish authorities, in the middle of the night and deported in groups to distant areas and a great number were murdered with extreme cruelties.

At the same time young Armenians who had been faithfully serving in the Turkish Army were disarmed and murdered by their Turkish fellow soldiers under the orders of their officers.

Having decimated, in this frightful manner, the country of its leaders and fighting men the Turkish Government then next proceeded to deport the entire Armenian population in historic Armenia to distant, desolate regions in Turkey.

Nearly 2½ million Armenians, mostly old men, women, and children, were forced to abandon their homes, their businesses, their belongings, their churches, and schools to form caravans for a terrible journey which reached from the Armenian Plateau to the hot sands of the distant Arabian Desert.

It is estimated conservatively that 1½ million weak and defenseless human beings died in the course of that indescribably inhuman journey from hunger, thirst, exposure, or at the murderous hands of cruel gendarmes and Turkish and Kurdish ruffians all along the way.

Mr. Speaker, the full extent of this most barbarous happening of unprovoked and senseless murder and rapine of even innocent women and children will never be known but even a summary account of only a very small part of such a baseless and brutal political crime is more than enough to cause any decent civilized human being to be filled with horror and revulsion.

However, the most amazing and remarkable thing in this long and excruciating visitation of persecution, injustice, and extreme suffering is that the Armenian people retained their faith, their courage, their beliefs, and their hopes and survived as a Christian nation.

It is unhappily true that their national existence is even now dark and discouraging, under the domination of brutal atheistic communism but, by our recognition here this afternoon, we express our determination and our conviction that neither we nor they will ever despair about their future liberation.

Those of us who have lived among American-Armenians as friends and neighbors know full well why the native people of Armenia will never give up their fight for freedom. The American-Armenians have been second to no other nationality in accepting their share of the burden and contributing their full measure of sacrifice to the development and progress of this country.

In private life the American-Armenian is an honest, industrious, cooperative citizen in his community.

When our Nation has been attacked by armed aggression, the Americans of Armenian origin have distinguished themselves in all ranks of our Armed Forces, and may be justly proud of their military record here.

In the fields of business and professional life in America, the Armenian descendant has exhibited the highest qualities of character and accomplishment.

Having lived and worked among Armenian-Americans practically all my life, I can personally state my own conviction that the spirit of the homeland, as evidenced by the descendants, will never be defeated by any type of barbaric persecution.

As a fellow-American, I take heart and courage from their example and the example of the valient people in their native land.

The struggle of Armenia today is essentially the same struggle in which the United States and all other Christian nations are now fiercely engaged against the most ruthless enemy the civilized world has ever known.

Mr. Speaker, as we, then, today salute the martyrdom, the faith, the courage and the dedication of the Armenian people let us here renew our pledge to persevere in our common fight against the modern Communist enemy until the free cause of the United States, Armenia and all other peace-loving nations is achieved and may the Almighty speed that happy day.

Pittsburgh Director of Public Safety

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the city of Pittsburgh, which I have the

honor to represent, has an able new director of public safety; Mr. David Craig. As a former law partner of Mr. Craig, I am pleased that KDKA, the Westinghouse radio and television stations in Pittsburgh, praise his appointment. I include a recent KDKA editorial as part of my remarks:

GOOD START FOR MR. CRAIG

David Craig seems to be stepping into his new job at city hall with a clear idea of the problems he now faces. Mr. Craig has just taken over as director of the department of public safety. His first public statement had some things in it which point to some badly needed improvements, and we were very happy to hear them.

We have repeatedly criticized the Pittsburgh Police Bureau for its poor public image. We pressed for an investigation of the bureau on the grounds that something drastic had to be done to raise its standing in the eyes of the public. We harped on this idea, because there is a definite connection between public confidence in the police and the ability of the police to keep law and order.

In the minds of many Pittsburghers, the police are tarnished with the suspicion of incompetence and dishonesty. Some of the suspicion is probably deserved, but we also believe that the police are no different from any other group of people. Most of them are honest and trying to do a good job. The problem is to get the public to understand this.

Mr. Craig indicates he is fully aware of that problem. In his first statement as public safety director, he said he will work hard on building the prestige of the police. He mentioned training for police officers in handling civil rights cases, a better public information policy, and promotion of more courtesy by traffic officers. He also says he wants to establish his department as a key organization in the Pittsburgh renaissance—a positive force for improvement, not just a defense against crime.

It could be that the most positive force in the Public Safety Department right now is Mr. Craig's own attitude, and we congratulate him for it. If he can put his ideas to work, he will be making Pittsburgh a better place, and a safer place, to live.

VA Closings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TENO RONCALIO
OF WYOMING
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, all too often Federal administrators are inclined to ignore the people most concerned and most affected by their decisions. Almost equally often these people could have contributed much in terms of wisdom, insight and successful implementation of needed changes had they been advised.

The cries which arise after the announcement of these decisions are many times not the cries of hurt because some tangible injury has been inflicted, but rather they are the cries of hurt dignity and pride by interested people when they had not been afforded the common courtesy of notice, or the opportunity to be heard.

The unannounced "final decision" strikes a strangely unfamiliar chord in our democratic society.

Recent cases in point include the closings of Veterans' Administration facilities, the closings of Department of Agriculture facilities and, most recently, the rerouting of railway postal services.

Because of the manifest magnitude of these misfires, I am proud to read into the RECORD an editorial from the Sheridan, Wyo., Press, with which I heartily agree. This editorial, entitled "Good Sense and Good Government," is as follows:

GOOD SENSE AND GOOD GOVERNMENT

Closing of Federal facilities is frequently accomplished by a method best described as the sudden procedure. That is, facility closing is announced before anyone has a chance to be heard.

Studies made by Federal bureaus are done on the quiet. Usually local interests know nothing about them and are not consulted. Often Congressmen know nothing of these studies. Then by the sudden procedure it is announced that certain facilities are to be closed.

Such procedure is highly questionable as a matter of public relations, and as a matter of democratically arriving at just decisions. Governmental departments should be all means be considering methods to make the best use of the tax dollar, and giving the best service possible. But the job somehow seems half done if the Congressmen of a State, and if spokesmen for local interests have been ignored.

Closing of Federal facilities should include studies and recommendations made by the agency involved, studies and recommendations on the part of Congressmen involved, and study and recommendations on the part of States and localities involved.

There is beginning to develop in the case of Veterans' Administration facility closings an idea, which if expanded, might well be followed in connection with all proposal to close Federal facilities.

President Johnson has announced appointment of a Special Advisory Committee to study the closures. A Senate independent offices subcommittee is already at work and has revealed information which does not entirely agree with that of the VA.

Study committees, if they function to hear the Department making a proposal, if they hear the Congressmen involved, and if they hear spokesman from the specific localities involved, could provide an essential service—a means of communication between Government and people. Such procedure would be fair to all concerned, and would provide necessary overall information upon which to base a final decision.

It is important that Congressmen and spokesmen representing localities involved be heard. Too often recommendations from Federal agencies overlook essential considerations, which can best be found by listening to local spokesmen.

We would recommend this procedure because it will uncover much more information upon which to base a decision, because it will give localities themselves a chance to be heard, and because it makes good sense and means good government.

Mr. Speaker, never before have we had so many current examples of inconvenience and waste resulting from "final decisions" being announced by our administrators before considering all of the factors involved and consulting all of the people concerned.

I hope they will classify this as a lesson learned.

Are the Unsuspecting Being Duped Into Supporting the Communist Cause?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 8, 1965

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of organizations operating in the United States through American agents and engaged in the business of selling gift certificates and other merchandise to those of our citizens who wish to send such items to friends or relatives living behind the Iron Curtain.

Under the usual practice, standard gift packages of food can be ordered for delivery abroad, or specific items ranging from bicycles to grand pianos can be ordered through a catalog reference for similar delivery, or gift certificates can be purchased to be mailed abroad so that the intended beneficiary can do his or her own shopping. American dollars are, of course, used in each instance, with the actual purchase being made from state stores where the same exist, or through such other retail outlets as may be available behind the Iron Curtain, and the presumption is that most, if not all, of such goods are of Communist manufacture.

To a certain extent, the humanitarian purposes which the advertisements of such services emphasize are actually achieved. However, it would be wise for those of our citizens using such services to remember two things: First, at a time when there is a mounting concern within the United States over our balance-of-payments problem, this is an effective device whereby Communist nations may build up not inconsiderable dollar credits. Second, and perhaps even more important, this type of activity could very easily place American citizens with friends or relatives living in Soviet bloc countries in a rather compromising position in that they may feel encouraged to act almost as subagents for such a trade practice because of the vulnerability of their faraway loved ones.

According to the Department of Justice there are nine such organizations in this Nation transmitting American dollars to the Soviet bloc. All are registered under the Foreign Agents Registration Act. The names of these services and the amounts transmitted within recent periods are as follows:

First. The Pekao Trading Corp., 25 Broad Street, New York, N.Y., transmitted a total of $10,505,585.53 to Bank Polska, Kasa Opieki, Poland, during the period beginning August 23, 1962, and ending August 23, 1964.

Second. The Package Express Co., 1530 Bedford Avenue, Brooklyn, N.Y., transmitted a total of $2,673,421.10 to Vneshposyltorg, U.S.S.R., during the period beginning August 24, 1962, and ending August 24, 1964.

Third. Utsch & Associates, Inc., 39 Broadway, New York, N.Y., transmitted a total of $5,547,110.42 to TUZEX Stores,

Prague, Czechoslovakia, during the period beginning January 1, 1963, and ending December 31, 1964.

Fourth. Central Parcel Service, 220 South State Street, Chicago, Ill., transmitted a total of $386,653.26 to Vneshposyltorg, U.S.S.R., during the period beginning December 31, 1962, and ending December 31, 1964.

Fifth. Cosmos Parcels Express Corp., 45 West 45th Street, New York, N.Y., transmitted a total of $1,907,722.65 to Vneshposyltorg, U.S.S.R., during the period beginning January 10, 1963, and ending July 10, 1964.

Sixth. Globe Parcel Service, Inc., 716 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, Pa., transmitted a total of $1,801,315.55 to Vneshposyltorg, U.S.S.R., during the period beginning December 31, 1962, and ending December 31, 1964.

Seventh. Gramercy Shipping Corp., 118 East 28th Street, New York, N.Y., transmitted a total of $8,363.96 to Vneshposyltorg during the period beginning March 25, 1964, and ending June 25, 1964.

Eighth. Joseph Brownfield, 15 Park Row, New York, N.Y., transmitted a total of $2,805,391.90 to Monimpex, Hungary, during the period beginning November 29, 1962, and ending November 29, 1964.

Ninth. U.S. Relief Parcel Service, Inc., 245 East 80th Street, New York, N.Y., transmitted a total of $2,255,000 to Monimpex, Hungary, during the period beginning November 29, 1962, and ending November 29, 1964.

Mr. Speaker, it is not my point in bringing this information to the attention of my colleagues to pass judgment, in any way, on this particular activity. However, I do believe that this is a matter that the Congress ought to be aware of as it considers ways and means for dealing with our balance-of-payments problem, and that the appropriate legislative committees of this or the other body might well take it upon themselves to review this activity in order to insure that none of our citizens are misinformed or misled in any way concerning such gifts and the full implication thereof to all the people of the United States.

George Washington Good Government Award to Hon. Oren Harris

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL G. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, last Sunday, April 25, at the annual George Washington dinner given by the American Good Government Society, celebrating the 176th anniversary of the inauguration of the First President of the United States, the society's 1965 George Washington Awards were presented to the Senator from Nebraska, Mr. HRUSKA, and our distinguished colleague in the House, the gentleman from Arkansas, the Honorable OREN HARRIS.

The award, in the form of a scroll, was presented to Congressman HARRIS by former Congressman Harold O. Lovre, a trustee of the American Good Government Society. In making the ward, Mr. Lovre hailed him as one of the greatest legislators and public servants of our time. Said Mr. Lovre:

He has achieved this high standing largely because of his unswerving dedication to the principles laid out for us long ago by the revered Founders of this glorious Republic. He is sincere of purpose. He is loyal to his people and his country. He drives himself to the limits of his endurance, and he has an uncommon capacity for looking objectively and in great depth, at all sides of an issue. His judgments, when finally passed, reflect logic, a keen sense of fair play and, above all, the courage of his convictions.

Mr. Speaker, I include herewith the inscription on the scroll presented to Congressman HARRIS and his acceptance remarks at this point in the RECORD:

Lawyer and statesman, has served the people of Arkansas and the United States almost 30 years: first as prosecuting attorney, and then as Representative in Congress for 25 years, and the last 8 of these as chairman of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

His broad knowledge and clear understanding of commerce, gained in long years of work with his able colleagues, have made him an outstanding committee chairman. This all-important work includes such diverse elements as transportation of every kind; public safety in trade, in food and drugs, and in less air pollution; financial underwriting and stock exchanges; communication by telephone, telegraph, radio, and TV; and interstate movement of natural gas, oil, and electric power.

Representative HARRIS' character, ability, industry and judgment have won him the high regard of his colleagues, and of the host of citizens whose affairs make up the work of his committee.

Arkansas can be justly proud of her illustrious son.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN OREN HARRIS ON ACCEPTANCE OF GEORGE WASHINGTON AWARD, AMERICAN GOOD GOVERNMENT SOCIETY, WASHINGTON, D.C., APRIL 25, 1965

Mr. Lovre, Mr. Chairman, fellow colleagues, honored guests at the head table, and friends all, let me express my deep and sincere appreciation for being here tonight as one of the recipients of the George Washington Award of the American Good Government Society.

I don't know whether or not it is simple coincidence but it's interesting to note that this is the 13th annual awards banquet. It honors a man who originally started out leading 13 colonies. I started my political career as prosecuting attorney for the 13th Judicial District of Arkansas. I am looking forward to my 13th term in Congress, and as if that weren't enough, my lovely wife Ruth, who is here with me this evening, celebrates her birthday on the 13th. Another interesting fact about tonight's awards presentation, and I am sure that it, too, is coincidental, has to do with my good friend, Senator HRUSKA, and the State from which he comes. Although we appear here tonight as equals, I am mighty happy to say that was not the way things ended up in the Cotton Bowl last January between Arkansas and Nebraska.

After those introductory remarks by my good friend and former colleague, I thought of the story of the widow upon hearing the remarks of the preacher at her husband's funeral. She leaned over and said to her son, "Boy, step up there and see if that is your paw in that wooden box."

At any rate, I feel like the confused and excited recipient of an award who said, "I don't know whether I appreciate it or not but I sure deserve it."

Seriously, to be selected as the recipient of this George Washington Award is a tribute and honor I shall ever cherish. To be included with so many great and distinguished Americans honored by this patriotic organization, one of whom is seated at the head table tonight—my close personal friend, Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN, of my State—and a third member of our Arkansas team, the Honorable WILBUR MILLS, who was unable to be here tonight, but who sends his regards in a nice telegram, is a recognition I have never expected or dreamed of.

I am deeply grateful and humbly accept your generous accolade in recognition of 25 years of service as a Member of the Congress of the United States. It is my fervent hope and prayer that I may continue to serve our country during this pathway of life that will justify your confidence.

As Harold has already told you, back in 1940, a lot of good people in Arkansas elected a young district attorney as their Congressman. I suppose they thought that anyone who had made it through the depression, survived the confrontations of a district attorney, and who had the nerve to proclaim that he could be elected to Congress ought to have a fling at it for them in Washington.

Regardless of the reasons, however, I am profoundly grateful that they gave me the opportunity and that they have done me the signal honor of serving in this great institution during these years.

Many of those same good folks have come to Washington and are here tonight to share this occasion with me. As I look out over this gathering, I see so many friends from Arkansas, and permit me to express my thanks and appreciation for your being here.

I fully recognize that whatever success I may have had, or the contributions I may have made toward better government, have come through the assistance, cooperation, and confidence of the people from my district. This occasion tonight must in a large measure be shared with my lovely wife, Ruth, other members of the family, and the people of my district and State. It is to them that I give the major credit.

I want to pay my compliment to the American Good Government Society, an organization whose heritage and contribution to our Nation, the principle of constitutional goverment, and the strength of our society, speak for themselves.

The problems of government are always intense and, therefore, in need of constant concern on the part of the people. By constantly calling attention to these problems, your organization provides a practical service of great consequence to all Americans.

As a student of government, I am convinced that the most exceptional governmental system yet conceived by man is ours as originally established under the Federal Constitution in 1787. Prime Minister Gladstone, perhaps the greatest in the history of Great Britain, said of our Constitution that it was "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

As observers of political events, we are familiar with the fact that controversy has raged for 177 years, since the adoption of our Constitution, over the question of its basic purposes.

And yet, the fact is clear to us all that the supreme issue in American life today as in the past is whether or not our political system with its remarkable institutions and their traditions shall be maintained in the face of great and continuous pressure from without, as well as from within.

If we are to resist these pressures, we must first insure a basis of stability without which all government is subject to di-

vision, confusion, and turmoil. The first step—the primary consideration—toward stable conditions is, of course, good government, the constant guarantee of law and order, and freedom from chaos.

To Americans good government is better known perhaps than to any other people in the world. Yet, even here there are examples of the opposite from time to time in all levels of our system.

Moreover, to us—to all Americans—good government has come to mean far more than honesty, efficiency, and competence on the part of public officials, which is important and imperative. In the eyes of our people the true measure is in terms of achievement, achievement along the lines on which our Government was organized, instituted, and ordained.

Under our unique governmental arrangement, the people chose to create a Federal authority to whom they granted certain powers, dividing the rest between the State governments and the people themselves—the last retaining full sovereignty in the moral realm of personal liberty.

And yet, no sooner was the vehicle of American democracy in motion than disputes arose as to the interpretation of the rules set forth in the Federal Constitution. In consequence of this, the struggle over constitutional interpretation has raged along endlessly from the foundation of the country until this present day.

The voice of the Federal Government is louder today in the operation of our national tasks than ever before in history. There is always a need to keep the balance between Federal, State, and personal authority, and when the scales tip too far in one direction, there must arise a force to strike and rectify the condition.

To such a purpose we must be dedicated in order to preserve democratic tradition. Let us in our day have cause to rejoice in the fullness of our service, knowing full well the value of vigilance to the cause of freedom.

It is with this profound sense of humility and deep appreciation that I receive this token of esteem, which I shall cherish throughout my life.

The 1965 Sylvanus Thayer Award—Citation James Bryant Conant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN M. MURPHY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Association of Graduates, U.S. Military Academy, has awarded the 1965 Sylvanus Thayer Award to Dr. James B. Conant. The presentation will be made Saturday, May 1, 1965, and the citation follows:

THE 1965 SYLVANUS THAYER AWARD—CITATION JAMES BRYANT CONANT

James Bryant Conant has played a major role in advancing the welfare of the United States in peace and in war for almost half a century, and his endeavors are as vigorous today as they have been in the past. He served as an officer in the Army Chemical Warfare Service in World War I, then became professor of chemistry and later president of Harvard University. During World War II, as Chairman of the National Defense Research Committee and Deputy Director of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, he played an important role in initiating the Manhattan Project that developed the atomic bomb; later he was a key figure in the success of that project. After the war he served as a member of the General Advisory Committee of the Atomic Energy Commission, as U.S. High Commissioner for Germany, and as U.S. Ambassador to the Federal Republic of Germany. For a number of years now, he has been the foremost authority on education in America and in the world. As scientist, educator, and statesman, this distinguished citizen has long served the United States and the world unstintingly in the highest positions of responsibility and influence.

Through his long and dedicated duty to his country, Dr. Conant has greatly enhanced its honor and its strength. Accordingly, the 1965 Sylvanus Thayer Medal is hereby awarded by the Association of Graduates of the U.S. Military Academy to James Bryant Conant.

LESLIE R. GROVES,
Lieutenant General, U.S. Army, Retired, President.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include some pertinent information about the background and life of Dr. Conant:

JAMES B. CONANT

Few living Americans rank with James Bryant Conant in the breadth and depth of service he has given to his country.

In recent years Dr. Conant has been directing his energies toward the improvement of educational opportunities for the youth of America, and school systems across the country are already realizing the benefits of his probing studies. This commitment to our public schools had its beginning when, as president of Harvard (1933–53) Dr. Conant sponsored the Harvard National Scholarships. A measure of the fame he has achieved as an educator is the more than 30 honorary degrees that have been conferred on him by colleges and universities at home and abroad.

But Dr. Conant's successes in other fields are equally impressive.

As a professor of organic chemistry he was chairman of his department at Harvard, and won international recognition and many awards for his research work on the structure and characteristics of chlorophyll and on the nature of hemoglobin; and during World War I he served as a major in the U.S. Army Chemical Warfare Service working on the development of poison gases.

In 1941 Dr. Conant was summoned to Government service again and for 8 years served as chairman of the National Research Committee. In this capacity he played a major part in the development of the atomic bomb; was scientific adviser to the Manhattan project; and, in 1947, was adviser to the American delegation to the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission.

Although he continued as president of Harvard, he again accepted a call from Government in 1950 to join 24 other prominent men on the Committee on the Present Danger; that is, the naked aggression of communism. As the committee's spokesman, he presented the Conant plan, outlining the obligation of young men for active military service, the same plan that was the basis for the proposals adopted by Secretary of Defense Marshall.

Dr. Conant was named U.S. High Commissioner for Germany in 1953 and in 1955 became U.S. Ambassador to the Federal Republic of Germany, a post he held for 2 years.

As a member of President Kennedy's Committee on Youth Employment in April 1963, Dr. Conant headed a committee panel that called for "bold and imaginative" action to help the country's 800,000 youths who were facing desperate job problems. Later that same year, the President named him as one of the small, select group that was to receive the new Presidential Medal of Freedom.

As late as January of this year, President Johnson selected Dr. Conant as a member of the National Advisory Council for his anti-poverty program.

A New Englander whose American ancestry dates from 1623 in Salem, James B. Conant was born on March 26, 1893, in Dorchester, Mass., a suburb of Boston. He is married to the former Grace Thayer Richards and has two sons, James Richards and Theodore Richards, both of whom served in World War II.

Crime, Voting, and Punishment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BASIL L. WHITENER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, law enforcement and the increase in crime in the District of Columbia has attracted nationwide attention for the past several years. The House recently passed H.R. 5688, a bill to provide for more effective law enforcement in the District.

The Shelby Daily Star of Shelby, N.C., carried a very fine editorial on April 12, 1965, on crime in the District and the need for legislation to strengthen law enforcement. I believe my colleagues will find the editorial to be of great interest, and I insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

CRIME, VOTING, AND PUNISHMENT

An omnibus crime bill for the District of Columbia and a voting rights proposal aimed at selected Southern States and a few others hit by mistake form one of the great legislative paradoxes of our time.

The crime bill languishes on a bed of irrational complacency. The voting measure is accorded star billing and is pampered and petted. The voting bill carries the unequivocal blessing of the President of the United States. The crime bill does not.

The record on both is interesting.

House bill 5688 (a 1965 twin of an omnibus crime bill passed by the House in 1963 only to die in the Senate) passed the House of Representatives March 22 on a 250-to-131 rollcall vote. The measure, as far as can be determined, has been virtually ignored by the Senate since then.

This district's Congressman BASIL L. WHITENER, as chairman of the responsible subcomimttee of the House District of Columbia Committee, is a major architect of this legislation, which is designed, in his words, to "bring the enforcement of law back into focus" within the District of Columbia.

Stern focusing is long overdue. Federal Bureau of Investigation statistics show that major crimes in the District of Columbia between 1957 and 1964 increased by a staggering 94.1 percent. The increase between 1963 and 1964 alone was a frightening 25 percent. The District of Columbia experienced an average of 84 criminal offenses daily during 1964. And, yet, with all the fantastic increases in crime, the population of the district's penal institution at Lorton actually decreased between 1957 and 1964 from 1,932 to 1,456—a drop of 25 percent. District of Columbia criminals are performing more but paying less.

The House of Representatives through House bill 5688—would attempt to stem the

tide by nullifying the Mallory and Durham rules of evidence, by permitting investigative arrests, by adding robbery to the existing list of crimes of violence, by setting mandatory and minimum sentences for certain crimes and by providing temporary and permanent measures for controlling the distribution of obscene publications and other materials.

The President's solution, as spelled out in a March 8 message to Congress, calls, basically, for better training for law enforcement officers and the creation of a commission to study the crime problem. He wants a probing of the root causes to be found in the "environment around us" or "deep in the nature of individual men."

Specific recommendations for handling symptoms of root causes escaped him on March 8, although he was specific as the mischief on March 15 about how the symptoms of voter registration discrimination might be attacked.

The President's position is about in line with past congressional resistance—backed by the Justice Department—to a toughening of the fiber of District of Columbia law enforcement. A minority committee report on H.R. 7525 (the 1963 forerunner of House bill 5688) criticized the approach of WHITENER and others with the argument that the bill should attack the "roots of crime in social and economic misery" rather than punish "the criminal symptoms of this misery."

In addition, the opposition—backed by the Justice Department—argues that it would be unconstitutional to detain a suspect for investigation, to make robbery a crime of violence, to place the burden for proving insanity upon the defense rather than upon the prosecution as presently provided for under the Durham rule.

Yet the present leader of the Justice Department has so little regard for constitutional grounds and due process where the President's voting bill is concerned that he actually told the Senate Judiciary Committee, while testifying in defense of the measure, that "the judicial process, upon which all existing remedies depend is, institutionally, inadequate to deal with practices so deeply rooted in the social and political structure."

Katzenbach was saying, in effect, that, despite the very obvious constitutional limitations (once argued for by Senator Lyndon Johnson) upon the Federal Government's right to meddle with local and State election machinery, the symptoms of random registration shortcomings justifies wide-ranging unconstitutional means.

All of which seems to mean that the Attorney General feels that the Constitution is to be zealously upheld and stretched to ridiculous lengths in the criminal field and flagrantly violated in other areas, depending, of course, on whose ox is about to be gored.

The ironies of the parodox are astounding, and frightening.

Endorsement of Farm Program Proposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GRAHAM PURCELL
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, on April 13 in Kansas City, Mo., the Missouri Farmers Association called a meeting of leaders of national farm organizations, the producers of all major food and fiber commodities, and their commodity organizations. The purpose was a detailed discussion and review of the administration and other farm program proposals. The group consisted of representatives from all over the Nation.

It was my pleasure to participate in the discussions and to address the group during their session. Secretary of Agriculture Freeman also attended and addressed the group. I placed his remarks in the RECORD for April 15, 1965.

The statement adopted by this gathering in Kansas City is a most significant endorsement of the administration's agricultural proposals. I ask my colleagues to read the statement, which follows, and give their serious consideration to the views contained therein:

This meeting has assembled, from California to New York and Texas to Minnesota, the producers of all major food and fiber commodities, their commodity organizations and all national farm organizations.

The expiration at the end of this crop year of the legislation on the books prompts us to the unanimous declaration that the farm programs must be extended, strengthened and improved.

Since the beginnings of the farm programs 40 years ago, we have heard much talk about the need for parity and equality for the farmer. For the first time, we see and we are heartened by the administration's proposal, in specific legislative form, of a program which will provide a means of obtaining 100 percent of parity.

This bill will provide a basis for assuring that our agricultural commodities are fully competitive in world markets, within the terms of our international agreements.

This group endorses the direction and approach embodied in the Food and Agricultural Act of 1965. We hope that other commodities and other legislative needs will be taken into account by the Congress as the bill is deliberated and moves through the legislative process. To this end we pledge our strong support and urge the Congress to act favorably and promptly.

Up From Slavery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BASIL L. WHITENER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, I received a letter today from Portia Washington Pittman, the daughter of the late Booker T. Washington, the founder and for many years president of Tuskegee Institute at Tuskegee, Ala.

Mrs. Pittman's father was one of the great leaders of the Negro race. His many contributions to the advancement of his people and in the cause of better race relations have been unequaled in our history.

In 1901, Booker T. Washington published his autobiography entitled "Up From Slavery." The book is the classic story of the American Negro and his hope for the future. Justice William O. Douglas who wrote the foreword to the 1963 edition of "Up From Slavery" said that "it tells the story of minorities the world over who seek equality under the sun. It has an appeal which is more universal than when first published."

Mr. Speaker, I feel that everyone should read "Up From Slavery." Booker T. Washington's message of tolerance and his hope for the dignity of man is as important today as it was in 1901.

Portia Washington Pittman has many of the characteristics of her father. She believes in toleration, moderation, and has faith in the future of her people. I place the letter I received from her and the paragraph from her famous father's book, "Up From Slavery," to which she refers in her letter, in the Appendix of the RECORD.

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
April 29, 1965.

Congressman BASIL L. WHITENER,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: On page 161 of my father's autobiography, "Up From Slavery," second paragraph, is stated his philosophy, and its simple truth holds today.

We have in our South many splendid men and women of both races, and it is to them we are to look for guidance and justice.

It is unfortunate that the image of the South is being destroyed by the other group, but I have confidence that these problems will in time be solved—especially by leaders like yourself, and it is to you and others in your same category upon whom we are depending for direction.

It is a privilege to have known you and your fine office force.

Sincerely yours,
PORTIA WASHINGTON PITTMAN,
Daughter of Booker T. Washington.

Paragraph 2, page 161, "Up From Slavery," by Booker T. Washington:

"The wisest among my race understand that the agitation of questions of social equality is the extremest folly, and that progress in the enjoyment of all the privileges that will come to us must be the result of severe and constant struggle rather than of artificial forcing. No race that has anything to contribute to the markets of the world is long in any degree ostracized. It is important and right that all privileges of the law be ours, but it is vastly more important that we be prepared for the exercises of these privileges. The opportunity to earn a dollar in a factory just now is worth infinitely more than the opportunity to spend a dollar in an opera house."

Our Kids Filled the Breach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANCHER NELSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, much has been written in the Nation's press these past few weeks about the struggles of the people of Minnesota against the worst flood in our State's history. But no report I have seen sums it up quite so well as one sent to me by Roy V. Aune, acting director of the Minnesota Department of Civil Defense. Mr. Aune discusses the wonderful cooperation demonstrated during this time of crisis in our State, particularly the outstanding job done by our young people. It is a refreshing story which I would like inserted in the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

OUR KIDS FILLED THE BREACH

When the history of the Minnesota flood of April 1965 is written, the context will be well documented with the names of such organizations as the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the U.S. Coast Guard, the Salvation Army and, of course, the American National Red Cross, all of which contributed heavily to the tremendous efforts expended during the flood fight.

The well-versed historian, however, will be hard put to come up with specifics on the tremendous contributions made by the Mennonites from Mountain Lake, the Seventh-day Adventists, the many other churches and schools, and the innumerable ladies' auxiliaries.

Of all of those that served as the disaster struck, none were more resolute, none more dauntless than the Minnesota teenagers.

They had no high-flying banner to wave, no shining insignia to flash; they were recognizable only by their youth and the determination with which they were obsessed.

Of the 6,000 unpaid, unsung volunteers that slogged in the mud at the dikes in Mankato, literally thousands had not yet seen their 20th birthdays; many not their 15th.

Those young people worked to the point of exhaustion in the mud and rain, catching a few hours' sleep only to join the battle with the renewed vigor that only comes with youth.

While the younger ones filled the sandbags with blistering hands, the older or more sturdy types struggled with the weight of them to the top of the dikes—girls as well as boys.

This was not going on only in Mankato. A coast-guardsman was quoted as saying that if it wasn't for the kids in Minnesota, there wouldn't have been a volunteer dike raised in the State. The teenagers in every affected city and town carried the fight to the rivers. It was seen in Rockford, in Henderson, in Wabasha, and in East Grand Forks.

Our kids filled the breach left open by the lack of adequate control measures.

Civil Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SILVIO O. CONTE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the April 21 edition of the Berkshire Eagle has been called to my attention. The editorial comments on our civil defense program and the measure of protection that can be added to our defense efforts through fallout shelters. I commend the full text of this editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

THAT LUMP IN THE RUG IS CIVILIAN DEFENSE

A disconcerting commentary on our reluctance to acknowledge the distasteful realities of the nuclear era can be found in the mercurial story of the civil defense program over the past 15 years.

If one were to chart the ups and downs of public concern about civil defense it would make a pretty accurate cold war fever chart. When things get tense abroad, the concern spurts. When the tension eases off, civil defense is quietly swept under the rug until the next crisis occurs.

Obviously this irrational attitude results largely from the odd mixture of fatalism and blind optimism with which the public regards the possibility of nuclear war. But a good deal of blame also must be placed upon the Washington policymakers who have blown hot and cold on the civil defense question with bewildering inconsistency. The attitude of the Johnson administration is a good case in point.

In his defense message to Congress 3 months ago, the President said that "without fallout shelter protection for our citizens, all defense weapons lose much of their effectiveness in saving lives." In February, Secretary of Defense McNamara said that fallout shelters "should have the highest priority of any defense system" and estimated that a $5 billion investment in shelters could save 30 million civilian lives in the event of a sneak attack.

Yet this year's defense budget, prepared by Mr. McNamara and submitted to Congress by Mr. Johnson, is the first since 1960 which fails to provide funds for a fallout shelter program.

The ostensible reason for this omission is the administration's feeling that there is no point in asking Congress for appropriations that won't be approved; and on the record, this pessimism as to the attitude of Congress is probably justified. The late President Kennedy tried for 3 years to get an adequate shelter program through Congress and was thrown for a total loss, first by a House Appropriations Subcommittee and subsequently by Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia, the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee.

But quite evidently fear of congressional rejection is not the sole reason for the Johnson-McNamara failure to go to the mat in behalf of civil defense. There is also a reluctance to add $5 billion to the budget. And there is a fervent desire to avoid triggering a repetition of the 1961 wave of public hysteria which occurred when President Kennedy (in an effort to persuade Khrushchev that we meant business in Berlin) suggested that every American "take steps to protect his family in case of nuclear attack," thus fostering a spate of fly-by-night shelter construction companies as well as a preposterous national debate over whether one might shoot one's neighbors at the shelter door.

But whatever the administration's motives for putting the civil defense question on ice, the deferment is exceedingly hard to justify in the light of Mr. McNamara's own testimony as to the number of lives that an adequate shelter program could save. "If the program was an urgent one last year," one congressional proponent recently remarked, "it is an urgent one this year." The logic of this is, unhappily, irrefutable.

The 40th Anniversary of the Lions Club, Miami Beach, Fla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANTE B. FASCELL
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Lions Club of Miami, I am only one of hundreds who will offer their congratulations and tribute to the Miami Beach Lions Club on the occasion of its 40th anniversary.

As an example of the spirit that animates those who hold dear the purple and gold banner of Lionism, I may cite the resolution of Florida's Lions which I had the honor to bring to the attention of the House of Representatives on March 26. The resolution "recommended and requested that all Lions, Lions Clubs, and Lions districts in the State of Florida, and Florida Lions while assembled in the next Florida Lions State convention, do favorably consider the adoption of this active program of American citizenship and patriotism. We pledge ourselves individually and collectively to take vigorous and positive action by encouraging, participating, and helping to develop educational programs designed to emphasize the American way of life to include our traditions, ideals, and religious freedoms, as well as our political and economic rights as guaranteed by the Constitution of the United States, and to insure that our children, and the public are informed of the nature of the international Communist conspiracy to conquer the world."

The Lions Club of Miami Beach is only 10 years younger than Miami Beach itself, which celebrated the 50 years since its incorporation as a city on March 27. Of course, Miami Beach was already a going concern when the incorporation papers were signed in 1915. At that time there were plenty of hotels and bathhouses and a furious activity in construction. The man behind much of the activity was Carl G. Fisher who had planned and was building this beautiful resort city. He put up hotels, golf courses, polo fields, and playgrounds. Miami Beach has developed in 50 years from Fisher's plans and plats to a lovely city which entertains 2 million vacationers each year. For its own citizens it provides the services and joys of a true community.

The Lions Club of Miami Beach has had more than its share in the growth and development of this community. How could it have been otherwise, since Lions are men who are interested in good will and good fellowship, instead of distrust, fear, and hate. As the largest service club organization in the world, Lions International has achieved a truly outstanding record everywhere, but it is its achievements here in Miami Beach that we wish to honor on the 40th anniversary of our own Lions club.

Some of the entries for the early years in "The Lion" show how busy the Lions club of Miami Beach was, and describe the nature of the activities that it undertook in those days so long ago. In the April 1926, issue, it was noted that the club "arranged for the extension of streetcar lines; placed two signs of 'welcome' at the city's entrances, and assisted in the collection of subscriptions for the Miami University."

In the May 1926, issue, there was reported "a joint meeting with Miami club to meet President Benjamin F. Jones. Continuing the investigation of the school system with the idea of having the schools taken from county control and placed in the hands of a local board. Assisting the chamber of commerce in their advertising campaign."

The same spirit of dedication to country, community, and human welfare that

inspired the founders of the Miami Beach Lions club remains part of the club's greatness today. It deserves every salute that it will receive on its 40th anniversary.

Significance of Effective Resource Use

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, Ford Shepherd, vice president of Mead Corp., made a timely and excellent speech to the 30th North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference in Washington on March 8, 1965.

I commend this great address to the attention of the Congress and the people of the country.

SIGNIFICANCE OF EFFECTIVE RESOURCE USE

(Remarks of Ford T. Shepherd, vice president, the Mead Corp., presented to 30th North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference, Washington, D.C.)

It is, I think, a singular distinction for a representative of the paper industry to have a part in your 30th North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference.

Your theme, "Statesmanship in Our Changing Environment," focuses directly on a national situation requiring, I believe, new and concerted considerations as we reach midpoint in the "fabulous sixties."

Other speakers this morning have staked out the tremendous dimensions of "public responsibility for resource policy."

My subject, "The Significance of Effective Resource Use," presents an opportunity to discuss some results we have been able to achieve in our industry, and more importantly, these results furnish some needed direction for meeting the challenges facing us in the vast area of effective use of our natural resources.

As we all know so well, our natural resources have not always had the full appreciation of all our people. This accounts, in some measure, for the slowness with which we have approached the utilization of some of our greatest resources in the first place, and then in the maintenance, in the renewal, in the conservation of our resources' capability to contribute to our well-being, to our growth and development, to our environment.

In our drive to better our standard of living, we Americans, blessed as we are with so much in natural resources, have not always taken the time to count these blessings.

The early settlers of this country decided that progress in civilization was to be made and that blood and sweat and the resources at hand were expendable in attaining that civilization. This must have been the beginning of the American ambition—the American drive.

Evidently, those who followed in the pioneering of this great country believed the same way for they, too, concentrated their efforts on growing and developing as individuals, as communities, as States and as a nation.

The history of the United States is, indeed, a record of resourceful people using the resources provided by Providence to become the greatest Nation on the face of the earth.

Small wonder, then, that in the lifetime of those of us here assembled, we have witnessed and participated in the continuation of the American drive to secure the biggest, the best, the most of the material things of life.

The significance of effective resource use is a story the South can tell so well and so proudly these days. From Virginia to Texas, the land of "cornbread and cotton" that was, is now the largest forest region in the United States. I've even heard it called the "pulpwood capital of the world."

Those of you who live in the South and especially those who are engaged in forestry there know all about the "miracle" in the southern forests and the importance of that natural resource to your economy.

What better lessons in effective resource use can be found than the record of the South?

The Southern Pulpwood Conservation Association wrote a little book about this "miracle in the southern forests" and I want to relate the story it tells:

"In 1935 the Nation's No. 1 economic problem was the South. In the depression-wrought pessimism of the midthirties even many southerners believed it, too, and prophets preached a message of more economic doom yet to come.

"In the 1960's the whole Nation knew how wrong was its 1935 view of the South's economic potential. What had happened? The most startling and yet one of the least known factors was the 'miracle' which had occurred in the forests. Gone were the acres upon acres of sunburned stumps, remnants of virgin pinelands, for the South was growing more wood than was being used. A simple analogy tells the story: The South started 1935 with 12 trees, cut 15 trees in the next quarter century, yet still ended up with 13 trees in the sixties.

"Who disproved the prophets of death for the southern economy and the forests? Who led the 'miracle makers'?

"They were the hundreds upon hundreds of professional foresters—pulp and paper industry foresters, State and Federal Government foresters, men who came to landowners as missionaries of forestry, men who urged fire prevention, scientific selection of trees for harvest, reforestation and other measures to achieve increased forest productivity, men who promised a market for trees which otherwise would never have been sold.

"Backed by an assured market, the miracle-working foresters spread their messages well: More than 12 million idle acres were converted into profitable forests; cooperative forest fire control covering 9½ of every 10 acres of southern forests was instituted—more than double the coverage of 1935; the pulp and paper industry through continuing research learned how to utilize more kinds of trees and to use more of the wood from each tree."

This miracle of the southern forests has continued and since 1962 the pulp and paper industry has pumped well over a billion dollars into the economy of the South each year. That's over $20 million a week. It is almost $3 million every day in the week, Sunday included. This is $121,016.50 an hour pouring into the economy of the South every hour of every day.

And, all of this through the utilization of the resources of the southern forests which the 1935 prophets declared "* * * would not long be important to the South's economy."

Paper industry management does not claim that accomplishment as its own. But our industry furnished the incentive and a considerable part of the leadership for others to accomplish it.

I feel sure everyone will agree that this is a dramatic example of effective resources use. We will agree, too, that only conservation-minded, industrious, and resourceful people could have accomplished the miracle of the forests and led the way in the South.

We in the paper industry are always profit conscious—we have to be—and our conservationist attitude in the use of wood is no exception. We just can't make a profit and waste trees—or any of our resources—at the same time. Profit consciousness and wastefulness simply are not compatible.

The significance of effective resource use stands out also in the experience of the paper industry in the management of another great natural resource—water.

Water as the principal component of our manufacturing process is just as important to us as wood is as our principal raw material. Both are essential. Indeed, these two natural resources are the life blood of our business. Without either one, we could not supply your needs for paper.

We require almost 5 billion gallons of water per day for separating cellulose from the nonfibrous constituents of wood, for making paper and paperboard from wood pulp, for steam generation and for cooling purposes.

And all but 5 percent of that tremendous volume is returned to the stream. Our net use or consumption is small by comparison to our intake.

And, just as interesting is the fact that the runoff of rain on the 50 million acres of woodlands owned or controlled by our industry amounts to six times as much water as the total intake of the paper industry for all purposes.

The industry's efforts in conservation of our water resources are highlighted by the fact that our water use per ton of product has been cut in half in the last 20 years. This trend of decreasing water use per unit of production is continuing. However, our greatest gains in this area are still in the future, I am confident.

The industry's sensitivity to the importance of effective water resource use and our positive attitude toward management of our water resources was demonstrated first in 1939 when the Sulphite Pulp Manufacturers' Research League was formed in Wisconsin and then, early in 1943 when 16 companies established the National Council for Stream Improvement in the pulp, paper and paperboard industry.

The industry's record of performance in forestry and water resources to date is well established. It speaks for itself.

Now I would like to speak directly to the point that has much to do with the effective use of our water resources. It is indeed one of the great challenges of the "fabulous sixties" and, of course, I refer to the problem of stream pollution.

As conservationists you are concerned with all phases of natural resources restoration and management which includes the maintenance of the quality of our water resources.

And we, who are in the paper industry, are concerned with the availability of water both quantitatively and qualitatively for the purpose of carrying on our business.

You and we are dependent on the economic growth and development of all those things which contribute to our way of life, our well being and the growth of our national progress.

And, being people, we enjoy the same pleasures—fishing, camping, boating, etc.—and we are concerned with all phases of resources restoration and management. In short, all of us are conservationists.

Fundamentally, then, there is every reason to believe that we are in agreement on the multiple needs for our water resources. And yet, when the question of stream pollution comes up, the conservationists are on one side and industry is on the other side.

The debate doesn't go very far before the sole issue is "industry or fish," "sparkling, crystal clear water" or "filthy, contaminated, polluted water." In short, it is black or white and that's all there is to it.

Why must it be that way? Why can't we recognize the "gray area" in between the black and the white?

Dr. Edward J. Cleary, who has guided the Ohio River Water Sanitation Commission since its birth 16 years ago, said a short time ago in a discussion, "The Challenge of Water-Quality Management":

"On the one hand there are some who would tolerate an attitude of unconcern about stream pollution until a nuisance is created.

"At the other extreme are those who assert that users of water should return it to the streams as clean as 'technically' possible.

"Perhaps you might agree that somewhere in between these viewpoints on public policy—which range from acceptance of foulness to aspirations for pristine beauty—that an accommodation should be sought.

"Our 'effluent' society is not confronted with a choice of absolutes—of clean water versus dirty water or of fish versus factories. What we are faced with is the challenge of making an efficient adjustment to conflicts in water use."

And, in the Senate Public Works Committee document—"A Study of Pollution—Water," June 1963, we find two facts which, in my judgment, summarize this whole situation:

"The waters of our Nation constitute one of our greatest natural resources and are involved in all aspects of economic growth and well-being.

"Oversimplifying a very complex situation, the water resources problem confronting the United States from now on is one of making its relatively fixed supply meet a rapidly increasing demand by providing the right quantity of water of the right quality at the time and places where it is needed."

"Providing the right quantity of water of the right quality at the time and places where it is needed" is the job facing all of us. It is the great challenge of today and tomorrow.

The sixties and the seventies, too, will indeed be fabulous if we can turn this challenge into an accomplishment.

The Senate document I referred to outlines the responsibilities involved for the States, the local governments, the industries, the universities, and the Federal Government.

What are some of our shortcomings?

Well, one of them is our lack of understanding of each other's needs for water resources. We've all been too busy with our own problems to learn about those that affect our neighbors.

The greatest progress is being made in the abatement of water pollution in those areas or regions where the benefits, as well as the burdens, of the water resources are being considered in total.

The resulting attack on solving the problem is summed up in the words: "sensible management."

Regional water quality management is the result of the attitudes, plus the considerations, plus the realistic plans, of the people who are directly involved and want to solve the problem.

In my judgment, it can't be done by edict: it can and should be done by the constructive action of the people in the water resource areas and regions.

Effective resource use was never more important than it is right now. This is our common goal.

The paper industry has been a leader in stream improvement research and development. Accomplishments to date have been outstanding.

The magnitude of the industry's remaining problems will be a severe test of our scientific and engineering resources, our production resources, and our financial resources.

We believe we have the leadership capability for our part of the job.

To Be Judged by History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a mostly timely and pertinent editorial on the subject of China appeared in the Tuesday, April 15, edition of the Blue Island Sun-Standard. In view of its timely nature, I wish to place it in the RECORD at this point with the hope that Members will find these comments useful as they periodically review the Chinese situation:

TO BE JUDGED BY HISTORY

To every American, China should be a subject of top interest. Her actions and how the United States deals with them will have much to do with the hopes and prospects of all free people and with the world's success in avoiding the ultimate conflict of nuclear war.

What does China want? What are her strengths and weaknesses? What is the outlook for the United States and the West in Asia? The answers to some of these questions are outlined in a recent issue of Time magazine. Like most nations who have declined from a peak of power which they enjoyed at some point in history, China would like to extend her borders and her dominance of trade in adjoining countries along the lines which existed during the 1700's under the Manchu dynasty. Then, China included all of Mongolia, Korea, and Taiwan and held almost complete commercial and political control of the Rice Bowl countries of the Indochinese peninsula. Time magazine observes that since that time, "history has not favored Chinese ambition. First the colonial powers of Europe, then the Japanese conquerors early in World War II, and finally the United States—after assuming France's responsibilities in 1961—denied China control over the rice bowls of Indochina."

There is honest difference of opinion over whether we should face war with China in Vietnam. But the question is plain: "Can the United States and its allies retain their foothold on the rim of Asia, or must they eventually give way to China's insistent pressure?" Militarily, the West holds most of the chips. At sea and in the air, overwhelming force is lined up against China. U.S. forces in the Far East number over 220,000.

The 7th Fleet, with 120 ships, 650 planes, and 64,000 men can move quickly into action at any point, backed up with the 48-missile strategic nuclear punch of 3 Polaris submarines. The U.S. Air Force maintains 32 tactical squadrons of strike aircraft based from Japan to the Philippines and two squadrons of Strategic Air Command's B–52's stationed at Guam. On 24-hour notice, sizeable forces can be flown into Thailand. In any real showdown, the United States could probably count on the support of some 550,000 well-trained and equipped South Korean troops and Chiang Kai-shek's tough 600,000-man force.

Against this, China can bring to bear its sheer size and its immense infantry amounting to some 2.5 million troops, with 12 militiamen in reserve. These figures make it abundantly clear why no one talks seriously about conducting a land war on the mainland of China. Chinese troops are well-equipped with small arms but short on transport and armor. Her air force of 2,900 planes is largely made up of obsolete Mig–15's and 17's and except for some 28 submarines, she has no naval power.

As the military picture sums up, we do not have the human resources to face China on land, and China does not have the technical capacity or volume of equipment to face us at sea or in the air. It would seem that the winning hand will most likely go to the side with the greatest tenacity and patience. It is not likely that China anymore than Russia wishes to meet head on the full military power of the United States, but they will continue to foment and support all types of popular revolt and so-called wars of liberation as a cover up for Communist takeovers. In recent testimony before the House Armed Services Committee, Robert McNamara said: "The road ahead will be difficult, and continuing sacrifices will be required of our people, both in money and in lives. But the challenge must surely be met." Our success in meeting it will be judged by history.

Picketing White House by Unsightly Group of College Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a timely letter from Charles A. Orahood, a resident of my district and principal of the Charlottesville, Hancock County, High School:

CHARLOTTESVILLE, IND.,
April 27, 1965.

Representative RALPH E. HARVEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington,, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HARVEY: I have just returned from a trip to Washington, D.C., with a group of 71 seniors. We had the pleasure of visiting outstanding points of interest in our Nation's Capital. Our last place of interest was the White House. While the students toured the White House, I stayed with our tour escort and observed the dastardly, slovenly appearing group of so-called college students picketing the highest office of our land.

I spoke to the security officers, three of them, protecting this group or at least preventing trouble. They did not relish this assignment. This group had a reserved place on the walk and the free people had to detour around the group. This group had their bed rolls and had slept on the sidewalk all night, which I understand is a violation of a local ordinance.

It is difficult to teach young people patriotism, loyalty, and responsibility when this is observed.

I feel it is time that our Senators and Representatives face our issues squarely. I am speaking of freedom of speech and the other freedoms. I was taught that freedom does not permit license but brings about responsibility of the individual. We are becoming so tolerant that we are beginning to stand for very little.

As a school principal, I have instructed my teachers to open the day with the Pledge of Allegiance and a reference to Scripture. This I believe, along with the majority of Americans. We speak of church and state separation yet the school aid bill is including parochial schools indirectly. This is confusing to me especially after the previous Supreme Court ruling of church and state separation.

Our students were thrilled to sit in the galleries of the Senate and House, to visit the Lincoln Memorial and other interesting points, climaxed by a White House visit. As we boarded our buses, our last view was a group of dirty appearing, mixed up, cowardly, probably Communist-inspired beatniks. It is my opinion and the unanimous opinion of our group that a situation like this needs to end rapidly.

Sincerely,

CHARLES A. ORAHOOD.

Pittsburgh: A City Reborn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the lively magazine Advocate, published by the Retail Clerks Union, has published an excellent story in its May 1965 issue on my home city. I include the article, "Pittsburgh: A City Reborn," as part of my remarks:

PITTSBURGH: A CITY REBORN

When Charles Dickens visited Pittsburgh during the last century he described it as "hell with the lid lifted." But the city is proudly showing its face to the sun these days. The overhanging blanket of smoke has been banished, the grimy accumulation on the city's buildings has been sandblasted away, and a building program of heroic dimensions is transforming the city's skyline.

Before the rehabilitation Pittsburgh had fallen victim to its own riches. Throughout its history coal and three rivers, the Monongahela, Allegheny, and Ohio—have been the city's greatest benefactors. The reckless exploitation and neglect of these resources, however, had inundated the city under smoke and disastrous floods. Pittsburgh's emergence as a city reborn started with the control of these age-old enemies.

The battle against floods began in 1936, stirred by the infamous Saint Patrick's Day watery devastation. A series of 10 major flood control projects was planned to protect Pittsburgh and other cities along the rivers. Eight of the projects are completed, and a ninth is under construction.

A NEW LOOK

Meanwhile, revolutionary smoke control ordinances, plus the investment of millions of dollars in filtering devices by industry, gave Pittsburghers a new look at the sun. Of all Pittsburgh's changes, the clean air program has been the most striking.

Conquest over smoke and floods sparked a new spirit of civic enterprise which was soon to be translated into the rebuilding of a new and modern city.

The symbol of the entire city is the Golden Triangle. Here, where the Ohio River starts, once stood Pittsburgh's most blighted area. It is now the brightest civic spot with a park, skyscrapers, new hotels, and broad bridges.

Standing on the eastern fringe of the Golden Triangle is the Civic Auditorium which was dedicated in September 1961. This is the site of this year's AFL–CIO union industries show—the impressive showcase of union crafts and skills and the superior products and services of fair employers. Between May 21–26, the 50,000-square-foot exhibit hall will be crammed with visitors viewing 350 entertaining and educational exhibits.

Pittsburgh is a particularly appropriate place for the union-industries show, since it is one of the famous places in American labor history. As a leading manufacturing and distribution center, it has one of the Nation's largest concentrations of union men and women.

DIVERSIFIED INDUSTRY

The industry most closely associated with Pittsburgh is, of course, steel. But there is a much greater diversity of industry than most people realize. Nearly 6,000 different products are manufactured in the four-county area which makes up the Pittsburgh standard metropolitan statistical area. And to help produce this myriad of goods requires the services of nearly a quarter-million men and women whose combined income exceeds $1.8 billion a year.

Approximately 146,000 persons are employed in the retail and wholesale trades in the four-county area. Retail sales are presently more than $4 billion a year. RCIA Local 1407 represents the organized store employees serving this vast retail market. Secretary-Treasurer Theodore P. Homitz is the executive officer of the dynamic local union that represents employees of the major downtown department stores as well as other segments of the retail industry.

EARLY HISTORY

Geography and energy are the two great forces that have shaped the city. The city's history began in 1758 when the British erected a fort on the point of land where the Golden Triangle now stands. They named the stockade Fort Pitt in honor of William Pitt, then Prime Minister of England. The area is closely linked with George Washington, who conducted a military survey for Governor Dinwiddie of Virginia, and who fought with General Braddock in the French and Indian War in the area.

It was near Pittsburgh that the British forces finally triumphed over the French and determined the destiny of the United States as an English-speaking nation.

In the first years of the 19th century Pittsburgh was the most important town in what was then the Western United States. It had constant communication by packhorse trail and express riders with the populous cities on the Atlantic seaboard. Along this trail came endless caravans of new settlers. Westward the emigrants followed the forest trails into Ohio and the Great Lakes region. The channel of the Ohio carried thousands to Kentucky and adventurous boatmen were taking Pittsburgh products to distant French markets in Louisiana. Ships were built here and Pittsburgh products were sent direct to European ports without breaking cargo.

After coal was discovered, Pittsburgh became the hearth of America. The first blast furnace was built here, and its steel production amazed the world.

THE CITY TODAY

Today Pittsburgh is known as an education, health, cultural, and research center. More than $100 million has been spent recently in strengthening the colleges and universities in the city, another $60 million has been invested in Pitt's new Health Center, which in addition to providing for the finest in patient care in rehabilitation, has already produced far-reaching scientific achievements, including the Salk polio vaccine.

In an era when research holds the key to future growth, Pittsburgh has emerged as one of the greatest industrial research centers.

The Pittsburgh area is the site of the world's first full-scale plant utilizing the power of atomic fuel to produce electricity.

The city's renaissance, of which it is so proud, will continue as a source of pride for many years to come, as well as serving as a model for urban renewal and redevelopment everywhere.

Town Hall Meeting

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RODNEY M. LOVE

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. LOVE. Mr. Speaker, some of the prominent citizens in my district revived the idea of having a town hall meeting last week in the Dayton Public Library as a means for discussing some of the foremost issues of the day with my constituents. Their thought was that this type of public forum has been long overdue and, judging from the response and success of the meeting, I would agree.

Among those in attendance was Mrs. Harold E. Hayes, president of the League of Women Voters of the Greater Dayton Area, who presented a statement on behalf of the league. Mrs. Hayes' statement dealing with some of the serious issues that confront us, I believe, is noteworthy and I take this opportunity to bring her remarks to the attention of my colleagues:

STATEMENT OF MRS. HAROLD E. HAYES ON BEHALF OF THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF THE GREATER DAYTON AREA

The League of Women Voters of the Greater Dayton area appreciates this opportunity to present to Mr. Love the considered views of our members on some of the important issues that face the United States today.

Foremost among these issues is that of U.S. foreign policy which has long been a major concern of the league. Our studies have convinced us of the need for international cooperation to keep the peace and promote the development of a prosperous economy in this complex and diversified world.

The United Nations, it seems to us, is the best instrument yet conceived for this purpose. During the last 2 years our members have taken a new, hard look at this organization, examining its strengths and weaknesses with a friendly but critical eye. Our conviction has been sharpened that U.N. financing is a collective responsibility of all member nations and that peacekeeping efforts should be strengthened. Our support for economic development, a strong Secretary General, a truly international civil service, and greater use of the World Court has been reaffirmed. We have agreed to support the one nation one vote principle and negotiations under U.N. aegis to reduce the risk of war.

FOREIGN ECONOMIC AID

The LWV of the United States supports U.S. policies which promote world economic development, maintain a sound U.S. economy and further international and regional cooperation. The economic reality of this position is that in this interdependent world the few rich nations cannot continue to prosper unless the purchasing power of the many poor nations is broadened and increased. The political reality is that if the United States, the richest nation in the world, is indifferent to the needs of the less fortunate nations, they in turn will be indifferent if not hostile to the values which we hope will be widely shared.

We believe that the United States should continue to sponsor foreign assistance programs long range in scope, adequately financed, effectively coordinated and administered and which emphasize cooperative efforts by developed countries and maximum self-help by developing countries.

We believe that enough money should be appropriated for these programs to underwrite development loans and grants, technical assistance and U.S. contributions to international organizations in proper proportion our own great resources.

Private investment of U.S. capital in the less-developed countries can be an important supplemental means of helping these countries reach self-sustaining growth. The league, however, favors protecting these investors by continuation of governmental assistance, such as preinvestment surveys and investment guarantees.

TRADE

The league believes that a liberal U.S. trade policy will best serve the political and economic interests of this country and of its citizens collectively and individually by paving the way for political harmony with other nations, stimulating economic growth at home and abroad, and expanding the opportunities for consumer choice among a wide variety of products. We support a flexible effective and efficient trade policy based on the public interest rather than on special or sectional interests. We endorse systematic reduction of trade barriers, and broad, long-range Presidential authority to negotiate trade agreements on and across-the-board basis.

WATER

The league has been supporting legislation to improve water quality advance water research, and increase the effective partnership between States, cities, and the Federal Government in planning and financing water resource development and pollution control.

HOME RULE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The LWV of the United States has a long record of support of self-government for the District of Columbia. We place a high value on our own participation in local government affairs and have a hard time understanding how it is that our fellow citizens in Washington, D.C., have been compelled to live under the frustrating conditions that exist in the National Capital. We hope that you will support S. 1118, which would provide an elected mayor, city council, and nonvoting Delegate in the House of Representatives.

Hon. Barratt O'Hara

SPEECH
OF
HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to make this statement congratulating my good friend and colleague, BARRATT O'HARA, of Illinois, on his 83d birthday.

Soldier, educator, Governor, and now, legislator—where is the location of the fountain of youth that he has discovered and used to such good advantage?

Forthright and courageous—a man of dominant will, who could face down the devil, if necessary.

A champion of the disadvantaged, both individual and national, it has been my great privilege to serve with him on the Committee on Foreign Affairs where he has made a great and outstanding record upholding the rights of the Democratic African countries as chairman of that subcommittee. He has continually shown his friendship for that small Western-oriented country in the Middle East known as Israel.

May his breed continue; and may he, as the leader he has always been, continue to show us the light for many years to come. And may we again have the privilege next year of celebrating his 84th birthday.

Cutting Costs With Carpets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. J. BRYAN DORN
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I have been most impressed with the tremendous technological gains our carpet industry has made in the last few years. Carpets are no longer considered a luxury item but are now recognized by experts as a desirable and economical floor covering. The manufacture of floor coverings which wear longer, look better, absorb noise and reduce cost of maintenance has enabled this industry to expand their markets to many new areas thought impossible only a short time ago.

I would like to take this opportunity to commend our distinguished leader, Mr. MCCORMACK, his special committee and the Architect of the Capitol for their foresight in authorizing the installation of carpet in the new Rayburn Office Building. These carpets have created a dignified and wonderful environment, but most important of all, the Government can maintain these floors at a higher appearance level and at the same time save money on maintenance costs. You will be interested to know that they have installed the carpets over concrete slab, thereby eliminating the necessity of installing other expensive types of floor covering. I am convinced that the savings in maintenance costs alone will be more than enough to pay for the carpets and installation within a very short period, and in addition, the carpets have made each office a more efficient and desirable place in which to work.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the dynamic progress which the carpet mills in my district have made. Our research and development programs have been fascinating and the end results have been fantastic. South Carolina is considered one of the leading carpet centers in the world and our plants there are providing employment for thousands of people. They are making a lasting contribution to the industrial growth and welfare of my district and my State.

The installation of carpeting has been for many years an accepted practice in hotels, motels, and many offices, but in the last few years research has proved beyond any reasonable doubt that carpets are an economical and desirable floor covering in schools, hospitals, dining rooms and many other public areas. You will be interested to know that a carpeting is now being designed especially for kitchens. Research conducted at schools where carpeting has been installed shows that the carpeted area cost approximately half as much to maintain at a higher appearance level when compared to other types of floor covering. The savings derived from the use of carpeting in schools throughout the Nation has been most impressive.

The Bender Building, here in Washington, D.C., has installed carpeting in all its corridors and elevators consisting of approximately 1,729 square yards. Based on their own study, the owners estimate their maintenance costs alone have been reduced by $10,000 annually. On the basis of the desirable results obtained from this pilot project, this corporation is installing carpeting in their new office building located at 18th and G Streets NW. Carpeting will be placed in the corridors, elevators and all office space. It is my understanding that a substantial savings in maintenance costs will be made through this use of carpeting.

Acoustical qualities of carpet are another important factor which have gained recognition in the past few years. Dr. Harris of Columbia University, who has performed extensive acoustical research on carpeting, found that controlling noise at its source was far better than allowing noise to be created and then trying to control it with acoustical tile. He estimated that noise could be reduced in a room by as much as 50 percent through the use of carpet. The U.S. Bureau of Standards has estimated that sound-conditioning properties of carpet were not only 10 times greater than any other flooring product, but actually increased the efficiency of many acoustical products used on ceilings.

The Federal Housing Administration has given carpeted floors a higher rating for their ability to reduce impact noise in apartment buildings. A publication by the Federal Housing Administration points out that the rapid rate of apartment buildings currently in progress in cities throughout the Nation, plus the trend to lightweight structures and increasing noisiness of our environment, "have led to a growing number of complaints to the FHA of inadequate sound isolation in multifamily dwellings." In every series of tests reproduced in the report, the floorings using carpeting—with and without padding—surpassed other floor and ceiling combinations in their ability to reduce impact noise. Also, the carpeted floors tested exceeded the FHA recommendations for minimum noise control in every case.

You will also be interested to know that leading architects throughout the Nation are recommending carpeting in schools, hospitals, apartments and other public areas as a desirable and economical floor covering.

I have been intrigued with the expanded use of carpeting in public schools and the favorable reaction by pupils and teachers as well as the tremendous savings made through reducing maintenance costs. I would like to insert an excerpt from the American Carpet Institute's newsletter concerning a maintenance contract for schools:

EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES LABORATORIES, INC., NEWSLETTER REPORTS ON CARPET PLAN NOW OPERATING IN CALIFORNIA SCHOOLS

The current issue of EFL College Newsletter, fifth in a series published for college administrators by Educational Facilities Laboratories, Inc., reports on a carpeting program developed and operated by the School Research & Service Corp., 5201 Kenwood Avenue, Buena Vista, Calif.

Erwin Somogyi is president of the corporation which offers carpet to schools and colleges at no initial cost with a 5-year maintenance contract.

The newsletter reports: "Via the wonders of American enterprise, seven California public schools opened this fall, their interiors graced by 30,000 square yards, or almost 6 acres, of wall-to-wall carpeting that won't set them back a nickel initially. The carpet is not a gift. The secret ingredient—as they say in the soap commercials—is maintenance."

The report explains that schools contracting for 5 years of maintenance services get carpeting, installation, and service in the same package. This is made possible, the newsletter states, by two factors:

"(a) With carpeting, less maintenance is required than when the schools had hard surface flooring; (b) the contractor, using special equipment and techniques, is able to perform the work with greater efficiency than the schools' custodial staffs. Where a school formerly required eight men to do the job, the contractor can cut it to five. The savings on the cost of the three men amortizes the carpeting. The arrangement, therefore, is not possible without the carpeting."

The report explains that carpets used are of a high quality of the same type installed in Shaker High School, Newtonville, N.Y., and that colors, quality, installation, and care conform to specifications set up by the schools. Arrangements are made for renewal of the 5-year contracts, an option to buy the carpet, or termination of the contract after 2 years with carpet leasing or purchasing.

The newsletter quotes Frank L. Mattox, assistant superintendent of business, La Puente Union High School District: "A thorough cost study was made prior to entering into the carpet and custodial services contract * * *. We found that there would be no material increase in cost by contracting the service. We have been in operation in a new high school under this contract for about 1 month and our experience so far has been in line with our estimates. It would appear that by contracting this service, including the carpeting, we will experience no increase in cost of any significance. We plan to evaluate this program during each of the 5 years of the contract period."

This is impressive evidence of the overwhelming merits of carpeting and is full justification for expanded use of carpet in all Government buildings including hospitals, rehabilitation centers, nursing homes, housing for senior citizens and housing financed by FHA.

I have outlined only a few of the outstanding features of carpet which justify it as an economical floor covering. I am indeed pleased that carpeting has been installed in the new Rayburn Office Building and I would like to commend the carpet industry for the outstanding progress they are making in designing and manufacturing carpets which will contribute to making the new Rayburn Office Building a beautiful and more desirable place in which to conduct our business.

Russia's Guilt at Katyn Forest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD at this point an article written by J. K. Zawodny, which appeared in the Paris edition of the New York Herald Tribune, April 20, 1965, entitled "Russia's Guilt at Katyn Forest":

RUSSIA'S GUILT AT KATYN FOREST

PARIS.—Twenty-five years ago, during World War II, occurred the largest annihilation of prisoner-soldiers since Genghis Khan. In the early spring of 1943, German forces occupying a former rest area of Soviet security police in the Katyn Forest near Smolensk discovered bodies, eventually numbered from 4,400 to 4,800, of some of the missing Polish prisoners in mass graves. Each had been shot through the head; the hands of many had been tied behind them; a number of the bodies had bayonet wounds.

Germany immediately accused the Soviet Union of responsibility for the massacre and proceded to exhume the bodies, arranging for an international medical commission from German-occupied and neutral countries and a separate German Medical-Judiciary Commission to examine the bodies in order to establish the time of the massacre.

COUNTERCHARGE

The Germans contended that the Poles had been killed by Russians in 1940, before the German Army had invaded the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union almost immediately charged that the Germans were responsible for the deaths, because the Poles had been captured from the Russians when the German forces occupied Smolensk; the Poles, maintained the Soviet Union, had been employed near Smolensk building roads from the spring of 1940 until July 1941, when the Russians lost control of the prisoners, who were captured and then shot by the Germans.

At the time of the discovery of the graves the Poles believed no one. Poland in September 1939, had been attacked simultaneously from the east and the west by the Soviet and German Armies. Both took hundreds of thousands of Polish prisoners, and both had applied genocide on occupied Polish territory.

After Germany invaded Russian June 1941, and the Soviet Union became one of the Allies, the Russians signed an agreement granting amnesty to Polish citizens "deprived of their freedom" in the Soviet Union. A valiant Polish officer thus freed, Gen. Wladyslaw Anders, was to command a Polish army composed of former prisoners of war in Russia. After a time, when the army had gathered and counts were complete, 15,000 men—of which 8,300 to 8,400 were officers (about 45 percent of the Polish officer corps)—had not appeared.

STALIN'S SUGGESTION

Cross-checking revealed that the missing had been interned in three Russian prisoner-of-war camps until the early spring of 1940. At that time the camps had been evacuated and a small group of men from them had been gathered into a fourth camp or held in special prisons. The rest had not been seen since then. The men from the fourth camp, about 400 in number, were able to give much information which later provided some clues to the motive for the massacre. In fact, one witness, still alive, was saved literally minutes before execution.

General Anders organized a search office for the prisoners; all available information was gathered and collated. Inquiries in the Soviet Union at all levels produced conflicting statements and a suggestion from Stalin that the men had escaped, possibly to Manchuria.

The exhumations in Katyn Forest revealed the dead men all to have been from one of the three camps—Kozelsk.

From German-occupied Poland a Red Cross medical commission was permitted to investigate the graves at the same time the international commission did so. Into the Polish Red Cross commission the Polish underground managed to infiltrate several members to assess the evidence independently.

Finally, when the German Army withdrew and the Soviet Army reoccupied Katyn Forest, a Soviet commission investigated the graves. The international Polish Red Cross and German commissions placed the time of the deaths as the winter of 1940. The Soviet commission, in its report, stated that the men had been killed by the Germans in August or September.

COATS, BOOTS, ACID

All available evidence can be evaluated as follows:

1. The Poles were searching for these men from 1941; the Soviet officials could have reported that they had been taken by the Germans, rather than give the evasive replies which they did until the graves were discovered.

2. Heavy overcoats, tightly buttoned, on all but a few bodies, refute the time of year stated by the Soviet report as the time of the murder, as does the absence of bugs and insects in the graves.

3. The excellent condition of their boots, with soles almost unworn, indicates the fact that the men could not have been employed in roadbuilding for more than 1 year, as the Russians claimed, but were killed shortly after their capture.

4. The Polish, International, and German commissions unanimously agreed that the layers of bodies were literally fused together by a sticky acid produced by the process of decomposition and that this acid, together with the pressure, caused the bodies to leave mutual impressions upon each other which had not been disturbed from the time of death, destroying the Soviet thesis that the bodies had been removed from the graves previously by the Germans in order to remove some documents and insert others.

RUSSIAN ROPES

5. The latest date on the documents (letters, diaries, camp newspapers from Kozelsk) found on the bodies was May 6, 1940.

6. Young spruce trees had been planted on the graves. Microscopic analysis of the trees indicated they had been planted 3 years earlier, or in 1940.

7. The men in the graves were grouped in the same order in which they had left Kozelsk in the spring of 1940. (They had left camp in 20 separate groups.) Those remaining in camp made lists of the departing groups. These lists were kept and were taken out of the Soviet Union. The lists verify the grouping. Had the men been employed in roadbuilding for more than a year it is unlikely that they would have remained in the same order for that period.

FALSE DOCUMENTS

8. The rope, meticulously cut into pieces of uniform length, with which some victims had been tied, was unquestionably of Russian origin. Wounds on the bodies of younger men were from four-cornered bayonets, a type used only by Russians at that time.

9. The Soviet Government blocked an investigation by the International Red Cross which the Germans had requested.

10. All the commissions except the Soviet concluded on the basis of autopsies that the bodies had been in the graves for at least 3 years, again pointing to the time of the massacre as the spring of 1940.

11. The ammunition used was of German manufacture; however, it was verified that it had been exported to Poland, the Baltic States and the Soviet Union before 1939.

Points 6 through 10 were not handled in the Soviet report. No foreign medical representatives attended the Soviet investigation and even Polish Communists were excluded. The report claimed to have found on the bodies already searched documents with dates to June, 1941; however, as the report prepared by the Polish Government-in-exile states, all these had either been "issued by the Soviet authorities or passed through their hands" and concerned persons known not to have been in Kozelsk.

At the Nuremberg trials the Germans were indicted and prosecuted by the Soviet Union (which had taken the responsibility for prosecution in "crimes against humanity in Eastern Europe"), itself not cleared of suspicion in the crime.

No judgment was rendered, and the Katyn case disappeared from the trial, as did the file concerning it, marked "top secret" from the offices of American military intelligence.

What of the other 10,000 men? They have never appeared, but their fate can be surmised from that of the men from Camp Kozelsk.

CONGRESS INVESTIGATES

It was the American Congress which brought the affair to light again. A special committee was established in the House of Representatives which questioned about 200 persons and studied documentary evidence from 1951 to 1952. It unanimously concluded that the Soviet security police had perpetrated the crime, and it recommended that judicial proceedings against the perpetrators be instigated.

The motive for killing the prisoners will perhaps never be postively established, but a number of clues and some evidence point to the fact that the men were murdered because they were not susceptible to indoctrination and were members of the Polish military and professional elite, which, by prevailing standards of Soviet officialdom at the time, made them automatically enemies of the Soviet Union.

Twenty-five years have passed. The present Soviet Government, as evidence of good faith and dissociation from the bloodbaths of Stalin and Beria, should admit the responsibility for the mass murder, reveal where the remaining 10,000 men are buried, allow the return of all 15,000 bodies to Poland for honorable burial, compensate the families of the men killed, and punish the guilty who still live.

Mr. Speaker, J. K. Zawodny, author of "Death in the Forest," an assiduously documented study of the Katyn Forest massacre, wrote this article, pulling together the painfully gathered known facts of a mass murder that was appalling even amid the horrors of World War II.

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided*, That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H-112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

Appendix

The Role of Business in the Poverty War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH SCOTT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 30, 1965

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, a real war on the roots of poverty will require the participation of many different segments of our society. Keith Funston, president of the New York Stock Exchange, recently gave a most informative address on the role which business can play in the war on poverty. I ask unanimous consent that this address, delivered before the Greater Philadelphia Council of Churches, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CORPORATE WEAPONS IN THE POVERTY WAR

(Address by G. Keith Funston, president, New York Stock Exchange, before the Greater Philadelphia Council of Churches, Philadelphia, Pa., Friday afternoon, Apr. 23, 1965)

I must admit to feeling both grateful and wary in speaking on the subject of poverty before the Greater Philadelphia Council of Churches. Grateful because this is a problem of broad current interest to churches, to church members, to business organizations, and to the Nation at large.

The wariness crept in after a friend warned I'd be facing an overly expectant audience. "They plead poverty all the time in my church," he complained. Let me emphasize at the outset, then, that I can give you no advice on wiping out a church deficit.

Rather, I speak as president of an exchange whose members deal in the stock of more than 1,200 corporations—a position that has permitted me to observe the contribution these companies make to our national economy—a contribution which, of course, has an all important impact on the problem of employment and its antithesis, poverty.

I also speak from some self-interest in wishing for the well-being of Americans, for our central securities marketplace prospers in proportion to the health of our economy. Much of our effort at the exchange is bent toward expanding public share ownership in American business. We have seen the number of share owners grow from 6.5 million in 1952 to 17 million 3 years ago at the time of our last share owner census and to perhaps several million more today. All the more reason then, even beyond the humanitarian aspects, that we wholeheartedly support coordinated action in raising the living standards of those in poverty who still remain outside the mainstream of our dynamic economy.

Corporations also have an important stake in the war on poverty. Providing economic opportunity for the impoverished and unemployed results in better-trained and more productive citizens. This in turn means more customers with more dollars to buy the goods and services offered by American corporations. Thus, all businessmen have a self-interest in eliminating poverty. The public interest and their self-interest are identical. When such mutuality of purpose exists, real progress is possible.

While poverty in the United States today is not as prevalent as in other years within our memory, its presence is made more appalling by contrast with the prosperity that surrounds it. I am reminded of the beggar seen standing in Battery Park one day in early spring. The first buds graced the trees and the new grass had come to life. Birds winged overhead. A bright sun made of the whole scene a brilliant canvas on which the beggar stood, tin cup in hand, a string supporting a card suspended from his neck. On the card were the simple words: "It is spring—and I am blind." Poverty is indeed a sad condition in any season, but in the spring of a Nation's prosperity it is tragic.

Poverty may extend to 20 percent of our families, according to the President's Council of Economic Advisers, which bases its estimate on a total family income under $3,000 a year.

Such weeds of want in our garden of plenty result from many and complex situations, and their eradication points to a long and concerted national effort. As noted in a resolution last year by the National Council of Churches:

"The elimination of poverty requires many deliberate steps by many different segments of our society—by people of good will acting individually and through voluntary religious and welfare associations, by employers and others in the private sector of our economy, and by citizens and taxpayers acting through their government."

What I would like to examine with you today are the steps to deal with the problem that are taken and can be taken by business corporations. The corporate community is not new to the war on poverty. It has been doing battle for years, drawing on a vast arsenal of weapons bearing such familar labels as jobs, wages, fringe benefits, research, educational grants, on-the-job training, and taxes paid.

These are not secret weapons, and it is noteworthy that they conform with the objectives toward which the Fedarl Government has earmarked most of its billion dollar antipoverty budget: employment and education.

Looking at what corporations are doing in these areas, we come first to the oldest and most effective remedy for poverty—the creation of jobs. By expanding their operations, corporations have contributed to a growth in employment that brought the civilian labor force in mid-March to a seasonally adjusted total of more than 71 million, the highest ever.

Jobs generate wages, and wages are a potent weapon against poverty. In 1964, an average of about 66 million full and part-time wage and salary workers were employed in nonagricultural industries. They earned about $330 billion in wages and salaries. Another $30 billion was paid out in employer social security contributions and payments to health, insurance and pension plans.

New jobs are created by corporations through expanding their productive capacity, reducing their costs and broadening their marketing appeals. One benchmark of this overall effort is the money corporations expend on new plant and equipment. Over the decade, from 1955 through 1964, business spent a total of $364 billions or an average of $36.4 billion a year, on expansion and modernization, substantially more than the total value of all private plant and equipment in the United States at the end of World War II. This helped create millions of new jobs.

Another benchmark and probably the most important seed money, in terms of new jobs, is the money corporations invest in research. Research has been credited in a study by the Massachusetts Institute of Technology with stimulating a large share of the growth in the gross national product since 1900. Today's new and better technology can be traced to research financed by corporations. This spending has now reached $13 billion a year, nearly 100 times as much as was expended in 1940. Out of this research comes not only jobs, but new products and sometimes entire new industries.

Emerson once said: "Progress is the activity of today that is the assurance of tomorrow." Through their mulitbillion-dollar annual investments in research, corporations are seeing that this progress continues.

Like research, education is also an activity of today that holds assurance for the future. Here, too, corporations have been making an important long-term investment—an investment in people. A Department of Labor survey reports that some 3 million workers were receiving training within industry in the spring of 1962. Current estimates put the amount to be spent by corporations this year in the area of education at $4.5 billion—half what it costs to run the Nation's colleges and universities. Corporate expenditures per trainee are often two and a half or three times the national average for conventional educational institutions.

Liberal scholarship funds are extended by many corporations to their employees and to the families of employees. Further, corporations have a long history of giving aid to colleges and universities. Last year, such contributions totaled about $250 million. One of the leading organizations helping to raise funds for the support of America's colleges and universities is the Council for Financial Aid to Education. In the course of serving as a director of this active group for the past dozen years, I have noted a steady and encouraging growth in corporate support of education. One-fourth of this support is coming, however, from about 80 companies out of the thousands in our Nation. The council has its sights set on doubling the corporate contribution, and greatly broadening the base of the number of companies making gifts to the colleges of their choice.

The important role of education in alleviating poverty is dramatized in statistics which show the unemployment ranks heavily weighted with the unskilled and the least educated. Unemployment among college graduates last year was about 1½ percent, while the rate for workers with less than 8 years of schooling was about 8 percent. Among nonwhites (mostly Negroes), who compose about 10 percent of the labor force, the unemployment rate was almost 10 percent.

The urgency of education and on-the-job training is not lost on corporations. As technology increases, as automation progresses, higher skills are required in the average industrial job. More skilled jobs are available, and fewer nonskilled jobs. In certain respects there is a race between technology and education. Leading business companies have made the role of educator very much a part of the private enterprise system. Education is, of course, the job for many segments of the community, public and private, but corporate business is contributing an important, and often overlooked, share.

Jobs, wages, research, education, all are ways in which corporations are fighting poverty without most people being aware of it. Even less noticed, but nonetheless effective, are the taxes corporations pay to help defray the cost of Government projects, including the billion dollar Federal war on poverty. In 1964, corporate tax payments to the Federal Government came to about $31 billion, and State levies swelled the tax bill still further. Uncle Sam is a principal stockholder in the earnings of most all of America's larger companies.

To review such a list of contributions to the national economy—jobs, wages, research, education, taxes paid—is a graphic reminder of the fact that corporations play the largest role in creation of wealth, and thus by definition in the reduction of poverty. It follows therefore that a major contribution that corporations can make to the sruggle against poverty is to stay healthy, by operating at a profit. For unless private enterprise is healthy—and, yes, profitable—the additional jobs and the tax revenues needed in the long run will not be forthcoming. I think we can all agree therefore that the indispensable condition to permanent success in the war on poverty is a strong and expanding private economy that can create more jobs, pay out more wages, finance more plant expansion, underwrite more research, support more education, and pay its fair share of taxes. Only more jobs will permanently conquer poverty, and only an expanding private economy will provide sufficient jobs.

Vital as all this is, however, we now can afford to do more. Our affluence enables us to launch an attack on the kinds of poverty which have special characteristics and which also require specific countermeasures. Let us look at some of these problem areas.

It is disheartening in our socially enlightened times to consider the number of youths who wander our streets with little on their hands but time and little on their minds but trouble. In many cases, there does not exist even the motivation for finding work because their home lives have been conditioned to long-term unemployment and dependency on the public welfare.

Purely from the standpoint of their cost to society, I have read that $40,000 of public funds must be expended over a lifetime to keep these victims of poverty alive at the very lowest subsistance level.

Yet, it is not the cost that worries us, it is the lost opportunity that poverty respresents. Doles are of little avail in enhancing our output, our productivity, or permitting the maximum fulfillment of our Nation's human resources. Of more value are jobs—jobs that can help erase the twin ills of hopelessness and apathy that beset the poverty stricken. You who go into so many dwellings on missions of mercy are aware that employment brings more than money to a home—it provides self-respect and dignity. And it instills in the children in that home a realization of the need and value of earning a livelihood that would otherwise be absent.

Hopefully, many of these young victims of poverty will get a new lease on life through Job Corps training centers that are being operated by a number of private corporations as part of the Federal antipoverty program. The companies' aid was enlisted because of their extensive experience in training people for particular jobs.

It is expected that some 35,000 youth between the ages of 16 and 21—many of them school dropouts and illiterates—will enroll in the Job Corps during 1965, and that about 20,000 will graduate this year. Their training will encompass such subjects as basic reading, communication skills, practical mathematics, citizenship, history, human relations, basic business methods, clerical courses, instruction in truckdriving, and forestry.

Once trained, the overriding challenge is to find employment for these young people. At the New York Stock Exchange, in addition to our normal recruiting, we plan to help the Job Corps program to the fullest extent we are able. Although our total payroll is only about 1,700, and our turnover is limited, we plan to consider for employment in nontechnical jobs qualified graduates of the Job Corps who receive a certificate of recommendation from officials in charge of that program. In such cases, we would regard the Job Corps recommendation as a substitute for the customary high school diploma.

Still another way that businessmen can and do help fight poverty is by providing leadership in programs at the community level. For it is here—in the village, the town, the small city, and the neighborhood of the metropolis—that the real victories will come. Churchmen know this all very well. Poverty on a national scale is hard to define, and even more difficult to combat. But reduce it to people on a block, to a family across the tracks, to some children in a church organization and you have a problem capable of personal action.

To help organize assistance at the local level, a large number of industrialists, as individuals, have formed the Business Leadership Advisory Council in support of the Government's poverty poverty program. As part of its credo, the council stated:

"The economic opportunity program is essentially a businessman's kind of effort. Helping the poor help themselves is its keystone. It does not offer handouts; it offers opportunities. It is concerned with creating the conditions under which a child born in poverty can have the chance to help himself, to compete on equal terms with others not poor. This is the historic promise of American life. It has provided the impetus for American economic progress from the beginning."

With so much public and private support being directed at the elimination of poverty, there is an obvious need for pinpointing areas of need. This job is being undertaken by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, with Edwin D. Canham, editor in chief of the Christian Science Monitor, as chairman.

According to Mr. Canham, this group is making an intensive, hardnosed study into key areas of the poverty problem including needs of the aged, the sick and disabled, the minority poor, the uneducated, and the unemployed. They expect to begin publishing a series of reports shortly.

I do not envy the task force its job of preparing a subsequent report on the basic causes of unemployment and underemployment, but I welcome their effort. There is so much we need to learn on this subject. There are doubts raised about the very statistics of unemployment—whether the figures produced are truly reflective of the extent of unemployment. Some say the unemployment problem results from a slow rate of growth, which in turn is charged to a lack of demand. Others trace it to an imbalance which has developed between the skill and educational requirements of the new jobs and occupations in contrast to the qualifications of the workers who are unemployed. Others say we need to increase incentives for job providers, and decrease incentives for persons to stay on welfare.

But whatever the causes, it is incumbent on the private sector to find solutions. For as Secretary of Labor Wirtz observed at a symposium on employment sponsored by the American Bankers Association last year, the matter of employment must be left to the strengthening of the private economy.

Job retraining and the providing of a modicum of education is just a partial answer to this challenge. The big task is to put as many individuals as possible into the mainstream of our economy, a goal that depends on accelerated economic growth and expanded job opportunities. It is a continuous task to which business has long been making a major contribution and which today presents an even greater challenge for the future.

Businessmen have a stake in insuring that any steps taken in the poverty program are not temporary, but will contribute toward permanent alleviation of the problem. When we train or retrain the technologically unemployed worker, when we do all the things that are now in the poverty program, we make one solid assumption: that there will be someone there to hire these people and to use these new skills on a permanent basis.

The individual, the business community, and society as a whole suffer from the direct and indirect consequences of poverty—including physical and mental diseases, delinquency and crime, and loss of productive capacity. It has been estimated that the eradication of poverty would increase our gross national product as much as $15 billion annually, as well as lower the cost to the general taxpayer for welfare.

In summary, then, corporations fight poverty with many weapons, particularly jobs, wages, research, education, and taxes paid—all of which come from the arsenal of free enterprise. We can measure their success in the growth of our work force, the expansion of our productive capacity, and the gains in our national income and wealth. But the battle is not done. We have now attained a stage of affluence permitting us to focus our attention on those particular causes of poverty most resistant to general attack and solution.

I have attempted to sketch some of the tasks that lie before us—the necessity of providing jobs for the millions of young people who are coming out of our schools and colleges as well as out of the Job Corps camps—the necessity through education for fitting more and more Americans—old as well as young—for the labor skills needed by the economy.

The task of enlarging economic opportunity for those now being bypassed by the mainstream of economic growth is not an easy one. It will take great effort, much study, fresh approaches, money, and talent. Corporate America, I am sure, is already enlisting in this campaign. If our economy remains healthy and continues to grow, corporations can and will play a still larger role in solving this national problem.

No one profits from poverty, least of all corporations—for it is anathema to the very economy in which they operate. The corporate community will continue to fight poverty with all its resources—as must we all.

For it is indeed spring—and we are not blind.

Citizens and Public Officials—Partners or Rivals?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, April 30, 1965

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Arthur Naftalin, mayor of Minneapolis, recently made a forceful speech

calling for partnership between government and private agencies. He spoke at the Citizens Conference on Community Planning in Philadelphia earlier this year.

Mayor Naftalin is a member of the Surgeon General's Advisory Committee on Urban Health Affairs, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, the executive committee of the American Municipal Association, the Continuing Conference of Public Service, and the board of trustees of the National Institute of Public Affairs.

A University of Minnesota graduate, Mayor Naftalin was secretary to Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY in 1945–47 when the latter was serving as mayor of Minneapolis. He has held an associate professorship of political science at the University of Minnesota, was consultant to the International Cooperation Administration, Michigan State University project in Saigon in 1957, and commissioner of administration, State of Minnesota, from 1954 to 1960 when he became mayor.

I believe that Mayor Naftalin's address deserves the attention of many of us in Government service, and I therefore include excerpts from his address herewith in the Appendix:

CITIZENS AND PUBLIC OFFICIALS—PARTNERS OR RIVALS?

In case there is any suspense concerning the title of my talk, I will tell you at the start, so you won't leave the meeting in doubt, that I think citizens and public officials must be partners and not rivals.

* * * * *

When I was elected mayor in 1961 I had been in office only a day or two before I was facing a parade of problems in the health and welfare fields. I found that the perfectly natural thing to do was to call the Community Health and Welfare Council of Hennepin County and ask for help. What do I do about an appointment to the welfare board? Who is the proper person in the community for this or that appointment?

The next day there would be a health problem, the next day one in human relations, and so it went. It soon developed that whenever we were in trouble, the directive from me was: "Call the health and welfare council." And, that's the way it's been going ever since.

* * * * *

One of the crucial problems we face as we consider the role of social planning is: How do we get people in our community—leaders in commerce, industry, labor, the professions, education, religion—to see that we are a nation in conflict, that new values are emerging which clash with old values, that these conflicts and clashes are the outgrowth of a dynamic technology which is basically altering the world in which we live?

In other words, it is imperative that the indispensability and the inevitability of social planning be understood by all leadership elements in our communities.

We are in conflict on many levels and in many ways. The overall community is in conflict with the neighborhood. The central city is in conflict with the suburbs. The State is in conflict with the Federal power. Municipalities are in conflict with the State. And this is because our society seeks to respond to both the old and the new; it seeks to serve both the community and the neighborhoods; it seeks to preserve the status quo and still accommodate itself to emerging new groups demanding full participation.

It is apparent, if we reflect on these problems for a moment, that there are only three forms of social action.

The first is the historic approach of America—individual action. We have gloried in our tradition of individual initiative; we hallow the frontier virtue of each man taking care of himself, each man providing for his family and participating in a small neighborhood wholly with his own resources. This has been our pride and it has been a great strength in our national life. It has helped us discover and appreciate the values and qualities of the individual human being. This appreciation lies deep in our history—it is related to puritanism, to the Protestant ethic, and its finds continued emphasis in our religious and political life. We exhort each other to be masters of our own destinies and not to rely on our neighborhood or our government.

But, individual action—whatever its historic value—is not adequate for modern society, however adequate it may have been in frontier days. By himself, however gifted, the individual is increasingly helpless. He is more and more dependent upon society.

There is no way for the individual to work through a complex economy such as ours, and have a place in it, except as he is educated by the community; and, except as the community provides an economic and social organization in which there is a place for more and more people.

We came soon in our history to recognize the need for another form of social action, namely, the joining of our voluntary efforts in the service of the community. Thus emerged many forms of voluntary group action, often spontaneous and usually directed toward helping those in need. This was action in response to problems that were larger than what could be handled by individual action. From this need have come charitable drives, united funds, community health and welfare councils. These, too, are hallowed as being in the tradition typified by our national memory of the threshing bee, when neighbors got together to help each other during the harvest. It is the frontier response when need or tragedy strikes a neighbor. It is still an important value in American life.

The threshing bee, the volunteer fire department, the united fund, the community health and welfare council are all efforts by the people in the community, without prodding or compulsion, with compassion and concern for others, to say, "We'll help our neighbors and we will do this on a voluntary basis." But, in my view, it isn't enough, in this modern world, to leave the action we need to voluntary impulses of individuals, even working in concert.

The third great line of action is, of course, government. Historically, in America, we have looked upon government as a last resort. We have, in fact, regarded government action as a kind of evil. We look upon governmental assistance and public assistance and public direction as admissions of failure. There has never really been in this country an acceptance of public assistance programs. If you will reflect for a moment, I think you will agree that even today we malign the AFDC program and other assistance programs. We're often suspicious of any effort on the part of cities, or counties, or States, or the Federal Government, to help people through what we call "handouts." Even the terms we apply to these programs are often negative and critical.

* * * * *

There is now a long and growing list of Federal programs which are based on social planning on the part of local communities and on the part of nongovernmental agencies. I am thinking, for example, of the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime. At the start of this program it was recognized that we could not cope with juvenile delinquency by treating it as a problem for Government alone.

The program needed the voluntary participation of community agencies and a willingness, on their part, to participate in planning programs at the local level which would lead to effective implementation of the larger national effort.

The same is true in area hospital planning and in other public health programs. There is growing recognition that public health needs cannot be met by fiat or dictation from the Federal or State level. The growing effectiveness of urban renewal programs is due partly to the increasing insistence by the Federal Government that neighborhood groups and community organizations participate in their planning. It is true also in many other areas of government action such as the manpower development and training program of the Department of Labor, the many programs in the National Institute of Mental Health and, most recently, the Equal Opportunity Act or Anti-Poverty Program.

* * * * *

Community health and welfare councils, as citizens' organizations, have the power to instigate governmental programs and to initiate private voluntary programs. They have the power and the muscle to develop the kind of public interest that will help government fulfill its proper responsibilities.

Of pivotal importance to the success of governmental action is the increased participation by lay citizens in the planning and implementing of government-sponsored health and welfare programs. Governments at all levels are now placing increased responsibility on local citizenship and involvement. I would point, in this connection, to the close relationship which has developed between the Health and Welfare Council of Hennepin County and the city of Minneapolis because I feel this is illustrative of the kind of work that must be increased all over the country.

For example, our local health and welfare council responded with alacrity to a request of mine and appointed a countywide economic opportunity committee. This committee is functioning smoothly and competently, providing us with a proper joining of governmental and voluntary resources in the fight against poverty. Its existence rules out the possibility of rivalry or competition among public or private agencies that have an interest in the antipoverty program. The success of the program in my city will depend upon our ability to mobilize our local resources, not only for community action projects under title II of the Economic Opportunity Act, but for all phases of the comprehensive fight against poverty.

Our success will be measured not in terms of what we get in the way of Federal largesse but rather in terms of the community's capacity to mobilize its resources on a broad basis, involving all the people in our community. If we are not able to do this the best plans and intentions at the Washington level will not be successful in the antipoverty effort.

A second major relationship between the city and our council is in the field of youth development. Immediately after passage of the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act in 1961 I asked the health and welfare council to undertake sponsorship of a youth project and to apply for Federal support under the new act. It responded and as a result, Minneapolis has one of the major youth development projects in the country—a project that involves high-level citizen and governmental leadership. It has, in my view, the proper blending of the two—voluntary action with governmental action.

This project has already given us a comprehensive analysis of the problem of delinquency, as it exists in Minneapolis and the

surrounding area, and we know now, in a way that we never knew before, what our agencies, both public and voluntary, can do to make programs in this area more meaningful and effective.

A third major relationship between the council and the city government has been in our vast community renewal program. Some of you may know that Minneapolis enjoys one of the largest renewal programs in the Nation. We have continuously had the support of a contractual relationship with the council, providing us indispensable assistance in controlling and eliminating environmental blight.

A fourth relationship involves a specialized aspect of our renewal work. It is one in which I take special pride because I have seen, day after day, the effects of this excellent program. This is a working relationship between our housing authority and the council in the field of housing for the elderly. We are enormously proud of what Minneapolis has done in this area. We have over 1,500 units of low-rent public housing for the elderly, and I think it is fair to say that this activity has been so successful that it is today wholly removed from controversy and is widely applauded by everyone. It has brought to our community great physical and social improvements along with better housing for a large number of our older people.

Here again the council has served us well, not only by joining in the planning but, in helping to shape constructive community attitudes. At the moment, I might add, the council is working with our housing authority in the planning of a most attractive, highly functional senior citizens activity center which, while it won't be limited to residents of the projects for the elderly, will be, essentially, a center of service for the people who live in them.

Finally, just within the last few weeks, our board of county commissioners announced plans to construct a new correctional facility for delinquent girls. This projects grow out of an intensive study which the council made some time ago.

I have described these relationships in some detail because I feel that what we are doing in Minneapolis is precisely the kind of relationship that is dispensable for any community seeking to cope with its social problems.

Government is aware that by itself it cannot meet these problems. It needs the reinforcement and support, the planning and direction, the mobilization of voluntary efforts, that only an agency like the community health and welfare council can provide.

Now, having said all this, I want to turn to what I call the caveats in community planning. First, I believe councils should enlarge their scope. The ills we've mentioned here are so interrelated, so intertwined, and cover such broad areas of welfare, race relations, and poverty, that the effective council must view its field of activity as covering the full range of the community's social relationships. Social planning cannot be effective in isolated segments. It must be comprehensive and involve fully both sides of the partnership axis—the community and the government.

A second point is the need to broaden the base of the council's participation. Our community health and welfare councils tend to become too much oriented to the middle class. As we seek to enlist people of influence and people of leadership, we tend to overlook the fact that there is a growing disjunction between the upper 80 percent in our population and that lower dispossessed, deprived and denied 20 percent. It is extremely important that councils reach not only into the power structure but also into the neighborhoods for active participants. Councils must seek out these people and make sure they participate in policy discussions and insure that, through them, the entire community becomes aware of the pattern of community life—what the ills are, what the deficiencies are, and what the alternative programs to action may be.

Third, and this may sound contradictory, the council must insist upon the active participation of top leaders in business, labor, and the professions. Do not be content with second- and third-echelon representation. Demand that the community's leaders make the community's welfare needs a top-priority concern. As time goes on and as our problems become more complex, as demands upon the time of community leaders grow, many of them seek to withdraw or avoid deep involvement in the problems of the community. This is a great loss. It is especially difficult for the central city as more and more of the leaders in industry and the professions—even labor leaders—move to the suburbs, and turn their backs upon the central cities, because it is, of course, in the central city where the social ills are most manifest.

* * * * *

Here I must deliver my most serious warning and it is that we cannot expect community health and welfare councils to do their work unless they are adequately staffed. All of the exhortation, all of the developmental work will come to naught if the council does not have adequate staff and high-quality staff.

There are no miracles in social planning. Social planning demands the gathering of hard facts and information, the blending of diverse viewpoints, the shaping of programs that will work, the staging and evaluating of pilot projects; and then, by means of skillful public relations, selling them to the community. All this is not accomplished by wishing, it requires competent staff at every turn.

A further need must be emphasized—this is the development of a greater awareness of governmental programs on the part of those involved in voluntary activity. I am often surprised to discover the degree of ignorance on the part of well-educated and presumably sophisticated people concerning, for example, the categorical aid programs. They are often strong in judgment about the evils of public "handouts" but they have no real understanding of the public assistance programs, their objectives and the complexities in their administration.

Councils can and must educate those in positions of leadership with respect to governmental programs. More than 80 percent of all the money spent in the health and welfare field is spent by Government. Your success as councils will be measured only in part by what you do as organizations and more largely by what you accomplish by way of influencing and affecting governmental action. You must always be prepared to assist in the filling of positions on welfare boards or on governmental advisory commissions and in helping Government obtain the help of community leaders.

Thus it is that Government and the voluntary agencies face their common objectives side by side. Those of us in Government can make an effective impact only through mobilization of the resources of the community—the human resources.

* * * * *

Now there are two mechanisms for mobilizing people: One is through Government, the other is through voluntarism. We've got a wide range of governmental and voluntary agencies but there must be an agency to guide and direct the others.

In my mind that key agency is the community health and welfare council. Across the country many councils have already responded to this appeal and are moving with force and vigor to mobilize the best brains of their communities and the most effective individuals so that an impact can be made totally and fully and in a fashion that brings into the closest possible harmony the Government and the voluntary agencies.

In the end we will begin to find solutions as we achieve a relationship that is a genuine partnership.

Medical Care for the Elderly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROSS BASS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 30, 1965

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, as you know, our colleagues in the House of Representatives recently passed, and sent to the Senate, for our consideration, the measure providing for a medical program to care for our elderly citizens. This bill, in addition to containing the basic provisions of the President's proposal, also adopts the most desirable aspects of the so-called elder-care proposal. As a recent editorial in the Chattanooga Times stated, this measure "represents a landmark of progress toward assuring adequate medical care for those in the age span likely to need it the most."

I request unanimous consent that this editorial be reprinted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A GOAL NEAR REALIZATION

Extension of federally financed welfare benefits to cover the major costs of hospital and medical care for Americans over 65, an issue in Congress for 20 years and a prime objective of Democratic administrations since 1960, is now virtually assured.

The House passed the administration-backed bill on Thursday, 313 to 115. The Senate is almost certain to follow suit, when the measure comes up, having approved a somewhat less liberal program last September. That bill died for want of House acceptance.

As it stands now, however, the House-approved plan is far more than the familiar medicare proposals of recent years, which provided for hospital and nursing care for social security beneficiaries over 65 years of age.

To be sure, this feature has been retained, and will be financed by recurring increases in social security levies. But the benefits have been extended to cover all persons over 65; the costs for those not under the present social security system will be borne from general tax revenues.

Advocates of medical care have, in addition, picked up on proposals first sponsored by Republicans and broadened the program to include a supplementary plan for medical care insurance. Participation would be voluntary; those who desired the protection would pay $3 monthly premiums, matched by Federal grants, to finance the benefits. Generally, these would cover 80 percent of medical costs over and above an annual $50 deduction.

Funds for both the basic and the supplementary programs will be placed in special trusts, lessening the strain of indeterminable demands on the social security system year by year.

As written, the bill also broadened the medical aid to the aged program, which is

handled by the States on a matching Federal aid basis, and included material increases in current social security benefits under other programs.

Added together, the first year's cost is estimated at $6 billion, of which only about one-half represents benefits under the new medical care program.

The bill does not present a perfect answer to a very real problem. Difficulties are certain to arise, as for instance, the likelihood of more and more persons seeking early hospitalization in already overcrowded institutions. And we would have preferred an optional arrangement whereby individuals could have requested their social security hospitalization benefits in cash for the purchase of insurance as they chose.

The plan, however, does have the right framework of the social security system for the basic provisions, plus the desirable feature of voluntary participation in the extended coverage. As such, it represents a landmark of progress toward assuring adequate medical care for those in the age span likely to need it the most.

Anniversary of Armenian Massacre

SPEECH
OF
HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 29, 1965

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, half a century ago the people of Armenia suffered perhaps the first attempt at genocide in modern times. The Government of the Turkish Empire instituted a plan which led to the massacre of 1 million people and uprooted from their homes another 1 million. This terrible crime against humanity has gone virtually unnoticed through the years; in fact, Hitler, in 1939, contemptuously asked:

Who still talks nowadays of the extermination of the Armenians?

To reemphasize that sad history Armenians in the United States have established a commemorative committee on the 50th anniversary of the Turkish massacre of the Armenians. I congratulate them on this effort, for the terrible episode they commemorate should be ever present in our minds as further evidence of man's inhumanity to man. We must ever be aware that such terrible things can happen.

In recent days we have learned of wholesale murders in the Dominican Republic. In another part of the world we rightly fear that our withdrawal from Vietnam would lead to the mass murder and persecution of those who have gallantly fought to defend their land.

Even this terrible trial was not the end of troubles for the people of Armenia, for after becoming a free country in 1918, Communists invaded the army and labor unions and attempted an uprising, which was suppressed. Thereafter Russia made a secret deal with Turkey whereby Turkey would attack Armenia from the south and Russia would begin harrassing action on the north. In 1920 Russia offered Armenia a treaty, which amounted to an ultimatum. Despite a guarantee of sovereignty, Russia took over on December 2, 1920. The Russian treatment of the Armenians was so cruel that on February 19, 1921, an outraged people threw out the Communist government and established their independence.

Upon reorganization of the independent Republic, Prime Minister Simon Veratzain appealed to the free world to help keep Armenia free. No aid came, however. In August 1921, great concentrations of Soviet military forces broke down Armenia's military resistance.

So the troubles of the Armenian people have been many, but at least in the commemoration of their great tragedy in 1915, we can perhaps renew our belief in the freedom and dignity of man and rededicate ourselves to prevent further occurrences of genocide wherever and whenever they may occur.

Law Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 30, 1965

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, tomorrow, Law Day will be celebrated throughout our country. In connection with this national observance, the selectmen of Lincoln, Mass., one of our fine, old New England towns, have prepared and issued a proclamation reaffirming our faith in our system of laws and independent courts. Their proclamation is brief, to the point, and timely in its emphasis on the important stake each of us has in working to insure that justice does prevail. I am glad, therefore, to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the proclamation, which was published in the Fence Viewer, the weekly newspaper published for the towns of Lincoln and Sudbury, Mass.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"LAW DAY" PROCLAIMED

LINCOLN.—Although proclamations of special days are numerous at the State and national level, the Lincoln Board of Selectmen have traditionally proclaimed only a few of these for recognition by the town. One of these is Law Day, May 1. The selectmen's proclamation, signed by Chairman Elliott V. Grabill, Russell L. Haden, and Harold E. Lawson, follows:

"PROCLAMATION

"It is always fitting that every citizen give thought to reaffirming faith in our systems of law and independent courts. Our democratic system of life and government is based on delegation of decisionmaking and acting. The laws of the land, constantly changing, are our accepted and agreeable definitions of how we comport ourselves.

"It is not easy to change laws or to contribute to an equal and rational enforcement which treats all citizens equally. It is hard, dedicated work to bring about justice within the framework of our laws.

"Our democracy is firmly based on citizen acceptance of this harder way which requires diligent effort and a positive and imaginative approach to solutions. Toleration of violations which can only spread rips the societal fabric and destroys that discipline which constitutes democratic education.

"We, therefore, selectmen of Lincoln, do hereby proclaim Saturday, May 1, 1965, as Law Day U.S.A. in the town of Lincoln and call upon the citizens of the town to recognize this special day.

"Dated at the town of Lincoln this 5th day of April 1965.

"R. L. HADEN
"HAROLD E. LAWSON
"ELLIOTT V. GRABILL."

Credit Unions a Deterrent to Loan Sharks—New York Times Article by Sal Nuccio

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, prior to the beginning of the credit union movement in this country, a workingman who found himself short of funds to meet a financial obligation or to overcome a personal crisis, such as pressing medical bills, often turned to loan sharks in order to obtain the necessary money. These loan sharks often charged interest rates of 50 to 100 percent or, in some cases, even higher. When the borrower received his pay check, a representative of the loan shark operation was right at hand to make certain that the borrower made prompt payment, and it was not uncommon for borrowers who were late with payments or missed payments to receive threats from the loan sharks and, in numerous cases, physical violence was inflicted by the loan shark operators.

However, credit unions have helped greatly to bring about the end of loan shark operations. No longer is a workingman required to deal with these moneygrabbers but, instead, can work out his financial difficulties with a reputable, locally owned and operated credit union.

Recently, the New York Times published an excellent article on the value of credit unions to the working community. In order that every Member may become fully acquainted with the operations of credit unions, I am including a copy of the New York Times article:

PERSONAL FINANCE: VALUE OF CREDIT UNIONS

(By Sal Nuccio)

The young man was desperately concerned with the economic future of his wife and three children.

Misfortune and lack of credit knowledge had plunged him deep into debt. And the $186.88 in monthly payments on loans totaling $4,200 was considerably more than his $135 weekly salary could sustain. Falling behind in payments, he was about to take "just a small stop-gap loan," when his wife persuaded him to bring his problem to "the credit union at your office."

There, through family financial counseling, the couple saw a way out of their crisis. Not an easy one, by any means, but one with which they could live. Found qualified, the

husband was granted a single long-term, relatively low-cost credit union loan sufficient to eliminate all other debts. The credit union dealt with his creditors, minimizing the penalties of loan prepayment.

Repayment of the one large loan came to about $104 a month, deducted from his paycheck at the rate of $24 a week. It included nominal savings as well as interest and loan amortization. The ray of hope was that, after 5 years, the family would not only be out of debt, but also would have about $900 in savings.

But a credit union is not just a rehabilitation center for the financially disabled. It is of special benefit—in terms of dividends and often of supplemental life insurance—to the provident, whose savings make up the fund from which other credit union members may borrow.

In essence, a credit union—a State or federally chartered nonprofit corporation—is a group of people who agree to save their money together and to make loans to each other at low interest. It is organized by members of a particular group, such as employees of a company, members of a fraternal order, church, or labor union, or residents of a closely knit community. The members elect officers and committeemen and set policies at annual meetings.

More than 15 million people belong to the Nation's nearly 22,000 credit unions, which have a total of $9 billion in assets. The effectiveness to an individual of a credit union lies in the creative blending of the basic features, which are:

Savings plans: Regular savings, often by payroll deduction, are encouraged. In most credit unions, the allowable maximum savings (called "shares") in an account is $5,000, and the average return, or "dividend," is 4 percent a year, compounded semiannually.

Life insurance: Most credit unions provide life insurance without extra charge. Each savings dollar, usually to a maximum of $2,000, is matched with a dollar of insurance on the life of the individual account owner or the first-named owner of a joint account, provided that he or she is between the ages of 6 months and 55 years.

Under 6 months, or between 55 and 60 years it is 75 percent, and between 60 and 65 it is 50 percent. The protection does not depreciate, in that a depositor retains 100 percent coverage on money deposited before age 55, or 75 percent on money deposited between ages 55 and 60, and so on.

Loans: Personal loans are made "for provident or productive purposes." While the maximum allowable interest charge is 1 percent a month on the unpaid balance, many credit unions charge three-fourths of 1 percent. Some charge less, but they generally do not provide loan protection insurance, which automatically pays the debt—up to $10,000—if the borrower dies or becomes permanently disabled.

A monthly interest rate of 1 percent on the unpaid balance comes to an annual "true"—or actual—interest rate of 12 percent, and is equivalent to a 6-percent advance-discount loan for 1 year from a bank. The three-fourths of 1 percent monthly rate equals an annual true interest rate of 9 percent, and compares with a 4.5 percent discount loan.

The borrower generally will find the credit union's rates competitive, especially in that they usually represent the total cost of the loan and insurance provision.

In one instance, a high-salaried executive decided he wanted the life insurance protection afforded by a credit union account, but did not care to divert $2,000 to it in one lump sum. He borrowed the $2,000 from the credit union, immediately deposited it in an account and agreed to repay the loan in 100 weekly payroll deductions.

The result was $2,000 of life insurance from the account and $2,000 of life and disability insurance on the loan, which reduced as the loan was repaid. Over 2 years, the $175 interest cost of the loan was nearly offset by the $162.83 in dividends on the savings, at 4 percent a year, compounded semiannually.

Buying privately, a man of 30 would pay about $11.40 a year to age 65 for each $1,000 of term life insurance (generally has no cash surrender value). Buying at 40, the cost is about $14.60, and at age 50 it is $20.

Another case involved a 55-year-old father of a girl about to enter college. Concerned that his premature death might end her education, he borrowed $5,000 from his credit union and deposited it in an account. He periodically drew on the account as tuition bills came due, and, as in the preceding illustration, the cost of the loan was offset in part by savings dividends. Including the maximum of $2,000 of life insurance on the account, the father had a total of $7,000 of insurance, which reduced steadily as the loan was repaid—and as his daughter progressed through college.

The young man had started into debt safely and innocently enough with a $2,500 home-improvement loan from the credit union. Uninsured damage to his auto brought him to a commercial bank for a $600 loan, and medical expenses in excess of his health insurance coverage brought him to one and then another consumer finance company for an $800 loan at each. Further, there was imprudent use of a revolving charge account, on which a fixed amount is paid monthly until the outstanding debt is paid. The interest rate of 1.5 percent monthly on the unpaid balance put the actual annual interest at 18 percent.

When he went to the credit union, the unpaid balance and monthly payment on each loan was as follows:

Credit union	$2,000	$56.34
Commercial bank	600	30.00
Finance company	800	40.27
Second finance company	700	40.27
Charge account	100	20.00
Total	4,200	186.88

In the actual case, the man was able to secure a credit union loan of $4,200, with the credit committee's approval, consolidating all debts. He provided three substantial comakers willing to assume the debt, if he defaulted. However, it also could be secured with a wife's income or other assets, such as the cash value in a life insurance policy.

In general, effort is made to provide the largest possible loan that a man could secure, and then to eliminate or reduce the most burdensome of loan payments. This means that a debtor may not be able to obtain a large enough credit union loan to pay off all other obligations.

The Bank Merger Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 30, 1965

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Bank Merger Chaos," published in the Lorain, Ohio, Journal, of April 23, 1965.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BANK MERGER CHAOS

A bill (S. 1698) has been introduced in the U.S. Senate by Senator A. WILLIS ROBERTSON of Virginia, to do what the Bank Merger Act enacted by Congres in 1960 was intended to do.

The original measure was designed to put the decision on bank mergers in the hands of Federal banking supervisory agencies which have the specialized knowledge necessary to regulate the banking system intelligently.

No lesser a person than President Johnson, then a Senator, thought that the 1960 legislation solved the important and delicate problem of handling mergers by having them accepted or rejected on solid financial and economic grounds. On the day the Bank Merger Act was passed he stated:

"The bill establishes uniform and clear standards, including both banking and competitive factors, for the consideration of proposed bank mergers."

Almost as quickly as the act was adopted, the U.S. Supreme Court upset it by repudiating approved mergers at the behest of the Justice Department, thus in effect giving merger-approval power to this department. The congressional plan was thwarted by judical legislation.

In a recent decision the Court ordered dissolution of an approved merger in the Manufacturers Hanover case, forcing an end to a union made 3½ years ago in good faith and in accordance with the act of 1960.

Senator WILLIS, who is chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee and by virtue of this post well aware of the lack of a coherent merger policy, has proposed to make the issue clear. His bill provides: "The authority to approve mergers, consolidations, and acquisitions of stock or assets and assumptions of liabilities, herein conferred on the Comptroller of the Currency, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the corporation shall be exclusive and plenary, and any banks participating in a transaction approved or authorized under the provisions of this section shall be and they are relieved from the operation of the antitrust laws."

Banking is too sensitive a segment of the national economy to be buffeted by Justice Department legal attacks and court reversals after the parties to a proposed merger have acted in good faith and with approval of the Federal agencies authorized to decide the question.

The agencies have the knowledge and the facilities to reach a proper decision, and once made it should stand. Congress can still bring order out of the legalistic chaos which now surrounds bank mergers. Adoption of the Robertson bill should do the trick.

Barratt O'Hara's Birthday

SPEECH
OF
HON. FRANK ANNUNZIO
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am happy this morning to join my other distinguished colleagues to pay tribute to BARRATT O'HARA on his birthday. I have known my distinguished colleague for a period of a quarter of a century. He has always been a fighter in the public interest. In Illinois, we refer to him as the boy wonder of Illinois politics.

He has served his country in war and peace. He is the only Member of Con-

gress that is a veteran of the Spanish American War. At the early age of 30, he served our State as Lieutenant Governor of Illinois, the youngest in the history of our State. He led the fight for the passage of the State's first minimum wage law. He reentered military service during World War I and at the termination of hostilities, he resumed his law practice. In 1948 he was elected to the Congress of the United States. He served in the 81st Congress, the 83d, the 84th, the 85th, the 86th, the 87th, the 88th, and 89th Congresses with honor and distinction recognizing the needs and wants of the vast majority of the American people.

To my 83-year-old young friend, I say to you that America is stronger because of you.

Tribute to Dr. Gordon Seagraves

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROSS BASS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 30, 1965

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, at a time when there is so much adversity in southeastern Asia and so much worldwide attention to, and concern over, the acts of violence in that area of our world, the simple acts of humanity and brotherhood of one man, who dedicated his life to his fellow men of the same area, may escape notice. Yet, just recently one such person died while still attempting to minister medicine, kindness, and the Christian ethic to the people of Burma. As a recent editorial in the Greenville Sun, of Greenville, Tenn., stated:

Dr. Seagraves took the idea of the Peace Corps to Burma long before it was ever discussed in this country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial tribute to Dr. Gordon Seagraves be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GORDON SEAGRAVES, A REMARKABLE MAN

Dr. Gordon Seagraves, a practicing Christian doctor, has literally given his life for his fellow man in far off Burma. He died this week.

Born of missionary parents in that country, he spent the last 40 years ministering to the ills of the people of that country and manning a Christian outpost in an area where Christianity is almost unknown.

The first time I saw Dr. Seagraves was at a small field hospital deep in the jungles of Burma during the Ledo Road campaign in the spring of 1944. A vigorous, outspoken man who wore a major's insignia on his shoulders, he was ministering to Chinese casualties in a field hospital.

He probably never would have been considered a great surgeon in the eyes of modern experts. But he was the only surgeon in that area and except for him hundreds and maybe thousands would have died before medical attention could be given.

A few months later when northern Burma was liberated and Dr. Seagraves returned to Namhkam where his hospital and headquarters had been occupied by the Japanese for 2 years, I visited him for a day and watched literally hundreds of people being treated in his clinics.

It was the most unusual hospital I have ever seen. Kachin headhunters from the mountains of the Tibet border would come and bring an entire family with all their possessions while a senior member of the family was being treated. There must have been several thousand people in the area who belonged to the families of those actually under treatment. The men would sit around little bashas and smoke while the women did most of the work of feeding and caring for the family.

Late in the afternoon there was always a softball game and Dr. Seagraves would take part in it along with nurses, patients, and other personnel. Sometimes a visitor would be asked to pitch.

Church services were held regularly and many of the northern Burmese became practicing Christians due to the influence of Dr. Seagraves and his family.

Dr. Seagraves took the idea of the Peace Corps to Burma long before it was ever discussed in this country. His work survived in spite of Government opposition, harassment from natives and others who may have been jealous of him and his work, and a lack of funds which was always a serious problem.

He gave his life and all his labor to the people of that area. The Burma Government may never recognize his service, but we hope that his fellow Christians in the United States will continue to give assistance to the work which he started so long ago.

Hon. Lawrence Wood "Chip" Robert, Jr., Receives the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross and Diploma, in Recognition of Distinguished Public, Private, and Philanthropic Service, for and in His Efforts Toward the Establishment of International Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN E. TALMADGE
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, April 30, 1965

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, on April 14, 1965, in New York City, the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross and diploma of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation of the Republic of Panama, was awarded to my warm personal friend, Lawrence Wood "Chip" Robert, Jr., of Atlanta.

This is the highest honor of the foundation, and it is well-deserved recognition of "Chip" Robert's outstanding humanitarian service.

I am particularly happy to make note of this special occasion, since it again gives me the opportunity to pay tribute to one of Georgia's outstanding and dedicated Americans, my good and dear friend, "Chip" Robert, Jr. "Chip" is an outstanding engineer and architect, and is known all over the world. He rendered outstanding service for all our Presidents, and we in the State of Georgia are very proud of him and his charming wife, "Evie" Walker Robert. Unfortunately, my duties in Washington, D.C., prevented me from participating in this award ceremony.

I ask unanimous consent that highlights of the procedure of the award ceremony be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the procedure was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The invocation was delivered by Henry E. Alexander, American deputy provost of the foundation, who afterward introduced Dr. Herman A. Bayern, American provost, in the following language:

"It now gives me a great pleasure at this time to introduce Dr. Herman A. Bayern, American provost. His worldwide humanitarianism has brought him honors from many nations and honorary doctorates from many colleges. He is associated with many fraternal organizations, and he is a representative of MONY. Dr. Bayern will make the presentation address, honoring Mr. Robert, Jr.:

"When Franklin D. Roosevelt died just 20 years ago, I was reminded of my personal efforts to help him make sufficient recovery, so that he could run for Governor of the State of New York, for two terms, and President of the United States for four terms. I took an outstanding bracemaker to his then summer cottage in Marion, Mass., June 1926, who made him braces of leather and steel, for both his back and both limbs.

"Major Bowles, Mr. Waldo Mayo and "Chip" Robert, Jr., and I helped provide funds for the Warm Springs Foundation, directly and indirectly, when over 6,000 dinners, balls and other functions started the campaign to raise sufficient money to permit polio research. Mr. Robert, Jr., paid a great part in this worthy cause, for which we are all grateful.

"We are gathered here today to honor a great humanitarian, public spirited citizen of the world, educator, architect and engineer, a dedicated leader who helped elect and reelect former President Franklin D. Roosevelt, as a top-ranking member of the Democratic National Committee, and who served in the Treasury Department during his administration.

"You, Mr. Robert, Jr., were awarded the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross by the unaimous vote of the board of dignitaries of this foundation, in recognition of your outstanding service to mankind, charity, education, ethical conduct in the business world, comparative religions, architecture and engineering, and in further recognition of your untiring efforts toward the establishment of international peace, and finally because your merits and accomplishments comes within the framework of aims and purposes of this foundation.

"The Eloy Alfaro International Foundation, named after the soldier-patriot-statesman-martyr, the former President of Ecuador, at the turn of the century, is for the perpetuation of principles of justice, truth and friendship among peoples and nations, and seeks to promote moral values with personal integrity, for which Gen. Eloy Alfaro devoted his life.

"The philosophy of President Alfaro (1842–1912), known as the Abraham Lincoln of South America, was based principally on service to his fellow human beings and to the cause of international peace. The public and private activities of the Honorable Lawrence Wood "Chip" Robert, Jr., comes within the framework of this kind of service to mankind. In recognition of this fact, the ruling body of the foundation grants you its highest honor—the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross and diploma.

"You know, my dear 'Chip' Robert, Jr., that you join a goodly and select company of fellow Americans, who have been similarly honored in the past. They include President Lyndon B. Johnson, Vice President HUBERT

H. HUMPHREY, Senators MANSFIELD, RUSSELL, DIRKSEN, the late former Presidents, Franklin D. Roosevelt, John F. Kennedy, and Herbert Hoover, former Presidents Harry S. Truman, and Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, the late General of the Armies, Douglas MacArthur, Gen. Eugene McAuliffe, U.S. Army, retired, Gen. Willis D. Crittenherger, Maj. Gen. Robert E. Condon, U.S. Air Force, retired, J. Edgar Hoover, Governors Rockefeller and Harriman, Hon. Robert Moses, Lieutenant Governor Malcolm Wilson, along with James A. Farley, who typify the caliber of men who hold this honor."

Mr. Alexander then made the investiture, reading the diploma, translated from Spanish, as follows:

"THE AWARD

"Eloy Alfaro International Foundation—'Thus One Goes to the Stars'—recognizing the special value of the service rendered by the Honorable Lawrence Wood Robert, Jr., in support of the objectives of this institution, he has been awarded the Cross of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation. In witness whereof, this diploma, with the seal of the foundation, is presented in the city of Panama, Republic of Panama, on the 14th day of April, 1964." (Signed by the officers of this foundation, the three sons of the late Ambassador Colon Eloy Alfaro, and the grandsons of Gen. Eloy Alfaro, President of Ecuador at the turn of the century).

ACCEPTANCE SPEECH OF THE HONORABLE LAWRENCE WOOD "CHIP" ROBERT, JR.

"Dr. Bayern, Hon. Henry E. Alexander, and friends, I am overwhelmed and deeply appreciative of receiving this great honor, which has just been conferred on me by two old and true friends, Dr. Bayern and Mr. Alexander for their part in this ceremony. I feel very happy that I now join such a distinguished select group of fellow Americans, many of whom have been good friends of Evie and I.

"To be the recipient is indeed a high honor, and I shall regard it as an inspiration to accelerate my efforts in carrying out the high ideals and principles of the aims and purposes of the Eloy Alfaro Internaitonal Foundation of the Republic of Panama. I shall be glad to continue my efforts to promote world peace through prayer to divine providence.

"I wish to again express my personal appreciation and gratitude for both Dr. Bayern and Mr. Alexander, in conferring this Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross on me, and I hope and pray that we may have peace in our time."

Captive Nations

SPEECH

OF

HON. GEORGE M. RHODES

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 28, 1965

Mr. RHODES of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my voice in support of the bipartisan effort to establish a Special House Committee on the Captive Nations.

It is true that there have been some welcome changes in the Captive Nations, and even in the Soviet Union itself which indicate a degree of relaxation in police state rule. There has also been some reduction in Soviet economic denomination of the captive nations, however, the captive nations are still occupied or surrounded by Soviet armies. Their economies are still largely dominated and controlled by the Soivet Union.

The Sino-Soviet dispute has temporarily given the captive nations some degree of bargaining power, and indeed the Soviet Union has made gestures toward giving them some independence. But how deep do the changes really go? This Committee would help the Congress and the Nation in keeping abreast of these changes, and would also symbolize to the world that the American people are still aware of the fact that the captive nations are involved in a struggle to free themselves from Soviet imperialism and colonization.

Edna H. Mack Receives Distinguished Service Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JULIA BUTLER HANSEN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 26, 1965

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of attending this year's spring convocation at Gardner-Webb College. When alumni awards were presented for distinguished service, among those receiving an award was Edna H. Mack, of Toledo, in my own Third District of Washington. It gives me great pleasure to place in the RECORD at this time this award:

Born in nearby Gaffney, S.C., Edna Elizabeth Humphries Mack came to Boiling Springs High School for her secondary education. In 1929, she graduated with a bachelor of arts degree from Limestone College. She has, in addition to her undergraduate work, studied at George Peabody College for Teachers, at Western Washington College for Teachers, and at the University of Washington. Following graduation from Limestone, she began her long teaching career, teaching the upper elementary grades in Cherokee and Spartanburg Counties, S.C., for 14 years. For several years, she was a Sunday school teacher as well as pianist in Macedonia Baptist Church, Gaffney, S.C. At the present time, Mrs. Mack is teacher-librarian of Toledo High School, Toledo, Wash., where for 4 years she was class sponsor and where, since 1958, she has sponsored the Library Club and the National Honor Society. A longtime friend of hers said that Mrs. Mack's quiet, unassuming way has won her many friends wherever she has studied, taught, or lived.

CHANGE OF RESIDENCE

Senators, Representatives, and Delegates who have changed their residences will please give information thereof to the Government Printing Office, that their addresses may be correctly given in the RECORD.

CONGRESSIONAL DIRECTORY

The Public Printer, under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing, may print for sale, at a price sufficient to reimburse the expenses of such printing, the current Congressional Directory. No sale shall be made on credit (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 150, p. 1939).

RECORD OFFICE AT THE CAPITOL

An office for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with Mr. Raymond F. Noyes in charge, is located in room H–112, House wing, where orders will be received for subscriptions to the RECORD at $1.50 per month or for single copies at 1 cent for eight pages (minimum charge of 3 cents). Also, orders from Members of Congress to purchase reprints from the RECORD should be processed through this office.

PRINTING OF CONGRESSIONAL RECORD EXTRACTS

It shall be lawful for the Public Printer to print and deliver upon the order of any Senator, Representative, or Delegate, extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the person ordering the same paying the cost thereof (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 185, p. 1942).

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR SALE

Additional copies of Government publications are offered for sale to the public by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 20402, at cost thereof as determined by the Public Printer plus 50 percent: *Provided,* That a discount of not to exceed 25 percent may be allowed to authorized bookdealers and quantity purchasers, but such printing shall not interfere with the prompt execution of work for the Government. The Superintendent of Documents shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which he may authorize the resale of Government publications by bookdealers, and he may designate any Government officer his agent for the sale of Government publications under such regulations as shall be agreed upon by the Superintendent of Documents and the head of the respective department or establishment of the Government (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 72a, Supp. 2).

LAWS RELATIVE TO THE PRINTING OF DOCUMENTS

Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any executive department, bureau, board or independent office of the Government submitting reports or documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing the usual number. Nothing in this section relating to estimates shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding 50 pages (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 140, p. 1938).

Resolutions for printing extra copies, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on House Administration of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer, and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported (U.S. Code, title 44, sec. 133, p. 1937).